

District of Metchosin

Minutes

**Buffer Land Working Group**

**July 26, 2023 at 4:30 p.m.**

Council Chambers

Metchosin Municipal Hall

**Present:** Councillor Jay Shukin (Chair), Councillor Shelly Donaldson (Vice-Chair), Bonnie Bouveur, Brian Grant, Anna Hall, Richard Simpson, Gary Smirfitt.

**Regrets:** Bailey Spiteri, Karen Hoffman

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 pm

**1. Agenda, Additions, Approval**

Jay called the meeting to order. The agenda was approved with addition of New Business items to get updates from members on last month's action items.

**2. Public Participation**

Chris Moehr, President of the Association for the Protection of Rural Metchosin (APRM) and resident of William Head Road, read a statement expressing concerns with:

- a) The Centre Mountain Estate's (CME's) stormwater retention plan not adequately addressing the long-term, downstream impact; and
- b) Selling to the Capital Regional District (CRD) options due to loss of Metchosin control.

Chris advised there is external support for an Ecological Reserve approach and the potential for provincial and/or federal funding. She requested that more aerial photo-type information be provided.

**Action:** Jay to recirculate Chris's May 7th email from APRM.

**3. Adoption of Minutes**

**Moved and Seconded** by Bonnie and Anna to approve the minutes of the Buffer Land Working Group meeting held on July 11, 2023.

**4. New Business**

Updates from Team Members on last month's action items

Jay provided an update to Council at its July 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, noting the Buffer Land Working Group's (WG) observations about the current definitions of parkland/greenspace (specifically P3) in the *Land Use Bylaw*, specifically around the lack of specific language around park/greenspace value preservation. The discussion at Council included concerns about the current zoning (Commercial Recreation 2/3), which allows for residential development.

The question was asked whether the WG felt that accelerating the rezoning process to parkland would be merited. The provincial government's housing strategy was referenced, including efforts with select municipalities on new zoning to allow for additional housing.

The WG discussed general support for re-zoning to parkland but noted process challenges (time (6-12 months) and public input). Consensus was that re-zoning should occur when a better definition of the zone was considered.

Bonnie reviewed the park zoning overview she had developed, looking at neighbouring communities; these were highly variable. Brian discussed how the CRD had different classifications of parks and maybe we could also use them as "go-by" definitions for different types of Metchosin park zones. All definitions included an element of recreation and that we should also include a zone defined more as an Ecological Reserve (similar to BC definition).

**Action:** Jay to send Brian's CRD park classifications and BC Ecological Reserve definition to the rest of the working group.

Richard gave update on the potential of working with Land Trusts. The general view is that this is not appropriate for the Buffer Land (BL).

Gary provided comments on stormwater matters related to Centre Mountain Estates (CME) and the retention pond that is planned for the BL. The report (April 2023) is conceptual and not at the level of detailed design required for Metchosin approval before construction of CME infrastructure. Discussion occurred on work done to date, particularly in relation to the requirements of the Section 219 Covenant and Easement, which allows for the detention pond to be sited on the BL. Questions were also raised about stormwater planning at present (i.e., during the construction process) and what standards were required.

**Action:** Jay to send out Gary's comments to rest of working team and to follow up with Metchosin staff about getting more information about CME stormwater plans and how they are being monitored.

**Action:** Jay to request Metchosin staff to attend the next WG meeting to discuss the stormwater management and detention pond review process, including oversight plans and activities.

**Action:** Request further information from staff on what the resource requirements (ideas about required resources, staff, budget) could be if Metchosin plans to operate and maintain the BL as park/greenspace, given that it would be different than Metchosin's other parks.

Discussion occurred on whether the WG could contact other organizations (e.g., CME developer, Langford regulators, CRD, etc.). Shelly has checked with Council and Metchosin staff and the answer is a clear "no." Communication with other organizations should be coordinated through the team chair/co-chair to the Metchosin staff.

The team understood but expressed frustration / concern about the length of time it takes to get answers to our basic questions, and yet we are still expected to make prudent recommendations on the October schedule.

Discussion occurred on environmental assessments and/or ecological inventories. Brian mentioned that he found some information about the cost to operate and maintain parks.

**Action:** Brian to email information about the cost to operate and maintain parks to the rest of the working group.

a) Buffer Land vision/concept statement

The WG provided feedback and reached alignment on merging the two versions of our BL vision statement into one statement.

**Action:** Brian to harmonize the two versions, based on input and to send out the updated vision statement to the group.

b) Round II Discussion of options and input into the tracking table

The WG will work with the concepts as presented at the July 26 meeting, with members taking a ‘first pass’ ranking. Discussion will occur at the next meeting.

**Action:** Jay to send out Concept spreadsheet showing the assessment criteria for the concepts being considered. The work team should fill in criteria ranking (1 poor -5 good scale) and consider sending to Jay to tabulate before the next meeting.

c) Confirming next meeting and steps

i. Next meeting: Wednesday August 16<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 pm

ii. Engagement with Council. There appears to be limited opportunity for a presentation by the WG at the August meeting. WG will prepare a 1–2-page summary report to Council with our insights to date. (Note - could also be used for pre-meeting background for the Metchosin staff at the Aug.16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Action:** WG members to send Jay a list of their insights to date by Aug. 6<sup>th</sup>; Jay to compile into a letter, circulating to the WG prior to sending to Council.

iii. The Public Engagement meeting #2 is coming up. Discussion occurred on developing a meeting format that allowed for dialog between WG and residents, as opposed to a series of public statements.

**Action:** Jay to send out proposed dates for next community information meeting (likely September). There was support for an article in the Metchosin Muse for this meeting. WG member to contact the Muse and start working on the BL article since the deadline for the Sept Muse is Aug 15<sup>th</sup> (before the next WG meeting).

## 5. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.



EVALUATION CRITERIA RANKING  
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION: May 30, 2024

	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Environmental Protection</b>	The option has the <b>highest potential</b> of achieving environmental & conservation goals.	The option has <b>strong potential</b> of achieving environmental & conservation goals.	The option <b>may</b> help achieve to environmental & conservation goals.	The option is <b>unlikely</b> to achieve to environmental & conservation goals.	The option has <b>little likelihood</b> of achieving environmental & conservation goals.	The option will <b>not achieve</b> to environmental & conservation goals.
<b>Neighbour Impacts</b>	The option has the <b>highest potential</b> that neighbours will not experience negative impacts.	The option has <b>strong potential</b> that neighbours will not experience negative impacts.	The option <b>may</b> help neighbours avoid negative impacts.	The option is <b>likely</b> to mean neighbours will experience negative impacts.	The option has a <b>high potential</b> of neighbours experiencing negative impacts.	Negative impacts to neighbours are expected to occur.
<b>Fiscal Impacts</b>	Fiscal impacts of the option are <b>clear and viewed to be manageable</b> .	Fiscal impacts of the option are <b>generally understood and generally viewed to be manageable</b> .	Fiscal impacts <b>may</b> be manageable (more research required).	Fiscal impacts of the option are <b>likely to be significant</b> .	Fiscal impacts of the option are <b>likely to be prohibitive (excessive)</b> .	Fiscal impacts of the option are <b>clear and viewed to be prohibitive</b> .
<b>Practicality / Feasibility</b>	The practicalities of enacting and maintaining the option are <b>clearly understood and viewed to be achievable</b> .	The practicalities of enacting and maintaining the option are <b>generally understood and generally viewed to be achievable</b> .	The practicalities <b>may</b> be achievable (more research required).	The practicalities are <b>likely to be challenging and not easily achieved</b> .	The practicalities likely to be <b>highly challenging and are likely not achievable</b> .	The practicalities of enacting and maintaining the option are <b>clearly understood and viewed to be unachievable</b> .
<b>Legal and Land Use Considerations\</b>	Legal and land use considerations regarding the option are <b>clearly understood and viewed to be achievable</b> .	Legal and land use considerations regarding the option are <b>generally understood and generally viewed to be achievable</b> .	Legal and land use considerations regarding the option <b>may</b> be achievable (more research is required).	Legal and land use considerations regarding the option are <b>likely to be challenging and not easily achieved</b> .	Legal and land use considerations regarding the option are <b>highly challenging</b> and are likely not achievable.	Legal and land use considerations regarding the option are <b>clearly understood and viewed to be unachievable</b> .

<b>Community Acceptance</b>	The option is <b>fully consistent</b> with public input received to date.	The option is <b>generally consistent</b> public input received to date.	The option is <b>not inconsistent</b> with public input received to date.	The option is <b>inconsistent</b> with public input received to date.	The option <b>does not reflect</b> public input received to date.	Public input received to date is <b>strongly against</b> the option.
<b>Recreational Value</b>	The desired (or allowed) recreational activities can be <b>fully</b> achieved; steps can be taken to prevent undesired recreational activities.	The desired recreational (or allowed) activities have a <b>high / medium likelihood</b> of being achieved; steps can be taken to prevent undesired recreational activities.	The desired recreational (or allowed) activities <b>may</b> be achieved; actions can be taken that <b>may</b> prevent undesired recreational activities.	The desired recreational (or allowed) activities are <b>unlikely</b> to be fully achieved; steps taken to prevent undesirable recreational activities are <b>unlikely</b> to be successful.	The desired recreational (or allowed) activities have <b>low potential</b> of being achieved; steps taken to prevent undesirable recreational activities have <b>low potential</b> of being successful.	The desired recreational (or allowed) activities <b>will not be</b> achieved; steps taken to prevent undesirable recreational activities will <b>not be</b> successful.

**KEY TERMS:**

- **Environmental and conservation goals** will be further defined by the Working Group, but could include habitat protection, strengthening wildlife corridors, building habitat for native plants (i.e. invasive removal), limiting access to prime environmental areas, limiting activities that can cause environmental damage (i.e. mountain biking).
- **Negative impacts** may include traffic, human activity, noise, trespass, garbage.
- **Fiscal impacts** would include municipal budget impacts; consideration should be given to longer-term financial impacts.
- **Legal and Land Use Considerations** would include zoning/re-zoning; disposition options; access agreements (covenants/easements), etc.
- **Recreational value** would include activities like walking, biking, dog-walking, equestrian, or activities that could occur within a designated multi-use trail area. Note: the “desired recreational activities” may also include “no activities.” For example, a certain area may be defined as conservation zone, which could include a goal of limiting human activity in these areas.

## Buffer Land Working Groups – Concepts for Discussion – Round II

### Updated: July 23, 2023

#### Note on this draft:

- The concepts below were discussed at the July 11, 2023 meeting.
- Based on that discussion the Working Group agreed to put the concepts into the following tiering structure:
  - Tier One – Develop and further explore as a viable option (green)
  - Tier Two – Investigate, continue to assess the potential (yellow).
  - Tier Three – Take no further action.
  - Two additional concepts are presented for discussion, which are identified in blue.
- For the Round II assessment, the numbering used at the July 11 meeting is maintained (the group may want to re-think this).

#### Tier One Concepts: Develop and Further Explore

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>“Do Nothing” / Status Quo (short term)</b></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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows time to gather additional CME information and complete a thorough assessment of the Buffer Land options.</li> <li>• Allowing time to complete the transfer of Section 95 as park to Metchosin following the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be seen by the Public as the Working Group and Council not being able to make a decision.</li> <li>• May be seen by Langford, industrial park and CME developers as Metchosin not concerned about the protection</li> </ul>	<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</p>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	

<p>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"> <li>The 113 acre parcel (Buffer Land) is adjacent to the Langford business park and Centre Mountain Estates (CME), which are currently under development.</li> <li><b>H.1 Status Quo assessment is focused on the next one to two years.</b></li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>completion of the Treaty process may enable a consistent, long-term strategy for both Section 95 and the Buffer Land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May provide additional time for Council to establish a collaborative relationship with Langford, and the CME developers to develop a better long term solution.</li> <li>Little or no financial cost to the District</li> <li>Does not restrict volunteer efforts to address removal of invasive species (rewilding).</li> <li>Does not limit current level of recreational use of the Buffer Land</li> </ul>	<p>of the greenspace or having a sense of urgency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May provides less opportunity for input into the construction of stormwater detention ponds in the Buffer Land</li> <li>The current zoning is not consistent with the planned use.</li> <li>This option may delay better options that would preferably be in place prior to additional construction and residents moving into CME or activity in the industrial park.</li> <li>There may currently be safety hazards for users (also potential liability issues) that may not be discovered and mitigated without a more proactive solution.</li> <li>There may currently be environmental issues that may not be discovered and mitigated without a more proactive solution</li> <li>May be increased wildfire danger from fuel load (downed trees and branches) directly adjacent to CME</li> </ul>	<p>CME subdivision is under construction.</p> <p>The demand for increased access to the Buffer Land is unlikely in the near future (&lt;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>	Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>					
				<b>Total</b>	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Re-zone to Park Land; explore zoning options supporting conservation / protection of the Buffer Land.</b></p> <p><i>(note: this option combines D1-D3 and E1-E3, which have been deleted from this draft)</i></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u></p> <p>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>This may involve creating a new zoning designation that provides greater protection and a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-zoning to Park will protect the parcel from development.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Although rezoning comes with complexities, the change could occur within the District's established administrative processes.</li> <li>Park land zoning allows for the possibility of ecological / environmental protection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning to Park has the potential of opening up the area to more visitors and activity (i.e. the BL becomes a "public" park).</li> <li>The District has limited resources to manage additional park land. Changing this situation may have fiscal (i.e. municipal tax) implications.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The OCP (section 5) describes four types of park, including "lands designated</li> </ul>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<p>conservation direction for the Buffer land.</p> <p>Ecological conservation zoning may provide an option to collaborate with a research or educational organization</p> <p>A model to consider may be the Blinkhorn Nature Park.</p> <p>Of note: a Metchosin owned/managed multi-use trail/park was not favoured by the Working Group (per July 11 mtg).</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District retains ownership (i.e. this is a municipal park).</li> <li>• 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></li> <li>• The Buffer Land is re-zoned using the District's current</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general, this adds new greenspace to Metchosin, which is consistent with the District's rural character and values.</li> <li>• Would aid in the increased demand for outdoor recreational use (such as hiking, etc).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There's the potential of complexities (i.e. legal matters; public input; differing views among Council) with the rezoning process. (likely a lower risk)</li> <li>• Potential for required parking, and increased vehicular traffic</li> <li>• Neighbourhood buy-in</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• If there's a desire for stronger environmental protection, a conservation covenant may be considered, potentially in partnership with a third party land trust.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		
--	---	---	--	--	--

<p>description of “Park and Greenspace (P3)”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That there is Council and public support for the change.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a new Park Zone (say Park – Buffer, or Park – Sensitive Environment) may be considered.</li> </ul>					
				<b>Total</b>	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Sell to the CRD for Park Options</b></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><i>** It is important that this option be considered in light of the assumptions below.</i></p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A fair sale price is negotiated between the CRD and Metchosin.</li> <li>• Via a sufficient public engagement process, there is public support for a sale.</li> <li>• There is a clear understanding of the CRD's goals for the Buffer Land.</li> <li>• Steps are taken to protect environmentally sensitive areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRD has significant more experience and resources (funds and staff for maintenance and technical studies) to manage parks compared to Metchosin.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• CRD parks receive routine maintenance and improvements to address public safety, such as waste removal, vegetation clearing, and hazard assessments.</li> <li>• The CRD offers interpretive programs that deliver education and outreach about</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community feedback to date has not supported CRD Parks concept. An effective stakeholder engagement process would be needed to further discuss a sale with the community.</li> <li>• Loss of local control; concern that the CRD's approach to managing the park would not reflect Metchosin specific goals/interests with the Buffer Land.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Perception that the CRD would not be as effective at protecting the environment compared to Metchosin resources.</li> </ul>	<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>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.”</li> </ul>	<p>natural and cultural values in regional parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CRD delivers a compliance and enforcement program emphasizes use of education to gain voluntary compliance leading to better protection of park, safer and more enjoyable experiences.</li> <li>CRD has a Strategic Plan in place to manage the parks in the face of a rapidly growing region.</li> <li>CRD had funding for land acquisition like BL.</li> <li>Selling would provide Metchosin with infusion of capital and eliminate the need for resources (funds and staff) in the budget to manage BL</li> <li>Adding more access points to BL will allow safe access for anticipated users and garbage bins will minimize waste pollution.</li> <li>New parking and bathroom for the anticipated users would be a benefit otherwise there would likely be unsafe</li> </ul>		<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>		
---	--	--	---	--	--

	parking on the streets and users potentially forced to go to the bathroom in the woods.				
				<b>Total</b>	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Swale and Trail Stormwater Detention</b></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> 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> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per N. Shukin presentation.</li> <li>Moving stormwater system further way from Metchosin Ck. will reduce risk of overflow of high rate water and sediment into creek.</li> <li>A Swale and Trail SW detention systems may be better at collecting SW from those other areas where SW proceeds directly into watershed.</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>There has been no technical studies done to validate if a swale and trail option at CME and BL is even feasible.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Final decision to make change will be by the CME developers and they will be hard to convince if there is significant</li> </ul>	<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</p>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	



<p>The appropriate land title surveys, deposits and 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</p>		<p>added costs or risks to the schedule.</p>	<p>development is not addressed in CME SWDP plan.</p> <p>Responsibility for maintenance of the STSWD will require substantial discussion.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>BL Detention pond (SWDP) from portion of CME. Other areas' SW proceeds into watershed as pre-development (although at lower rates).</p> <p>Discussions on the CME SWDP between Metchosin, CME developer, and Langford are in the works.</p>					
				<b>Total</b>	

## Concepts for further discussion

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Immediate re-zoning to Park</b></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Using the current park provisions in the Metchosin's Land Use Bylaw, that District Council commence the process of rezoning the Buffer Land to P3.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process will take several months to complete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rezoning may help keep the Buffer Land out of further considerations around housing development, as reflected in the provincial governments focus on additional housing.</li> <li>Public input to date appears to show strong support for rezoning to park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This move might be taking place before the full range of options for the Buffer Land is considered.</li> <li>Would be done ahead of any further considerations of what a new zoning designation for parkland could look like, particularly enhanced concepts for conservation.</li> <li>It's unlikely that we would see special provisions to protect the privacy and interests of the Neild Road neighbours.</li> <li>Considerations as to what kind of park the Buffer Land might be, are still un-developed.</li> </ul>		Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	
				<b>Total</b>	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Work with external parties on developing land use options for the Buffer Land.</b></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> That Metchosin pursue a parks objective, but involve other parties, including the CME developers, the City of Langford, possibly the CRD and the Centre Mountain Business Park developers.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Metchosin continue to own the land.</li> <li>• That conservation goals remain a priority in discussions with other parties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District might gain additional resources to develop and manage the right type of park.</li> <li>• A cooperative approach may create other opportunities: perhaps another iteration of the Trail and Swale concept.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In working with others (and accepting resources/funding) there's a likelihood that Metchosin loses control over what happens in the Buffer Land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That if other parties were involved in the planning / development of options, there would be some form of value-exchange (i.e. clear access for parkland).</li></ul>					
				<b>Total</b>	

## Tier Two Concepts: Investigate and Consider the Potential

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros)	Disadvantages (Cons)	Additional Comment	Overall Assessment
<p><b>Involve a conservation-oriented Land Trust</b>  <i>(i.e. Habitat Acquisition Trust (HAT), Nature Conservancy, The Land Conservancy of BC, The Nature Conservancy of Canada)</i></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u>            Develop a land trust/land conservancy strategy for the Buffer Land</p> <p><u>Assuptions</u>            A Land Trust option is viable within the legislative framework in BC, or with effort, can be made to work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Covenant – protects the ecological or heritage values of land in regard to long-term preservation.</li> <li>• Preserving biodiversity, addressing invasive species, promoting native plant and insect growth, supporting riparian areas.</li> <li>• Care for habitat – help protect, restore, and enhance wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Critical need to stop the loss and degradation of sensitive, rare natural areas, to protect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous Conservation Agencies and Covenant agreements available – level of commitment of an agency compared to DoM residents (specific interest groups).</li> <li>• Many covenants are a three-way agreement between landowner, local gov't and conservation organisation.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this the best long-term protection?</li> <li>○ Best use of resources to manage and monitor the land?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• a land trust option may not be an option (legally) for the Buffer Land. Goal 1 should be for the Working Group to determine if a land trust or conservancy is a legal option.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation, Land Trust and Foundations are numerous. Would any arrangement with these organizations benefit DoM?</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Would amending our OCP and/or bylaws be sufficient for the management of the BL?</li> <li>• What would be the cost/benefit analysis for the DoM? If any?</li> <li>• Does DoM have other steward options already in existence?</li> </ul>	Environmental Protection
				Neighbour impacts
				Fiscal Impacts
				Practicality / Feasibility
				Land Use Complexities
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)
				Recreational value
<b>Total</b>				

<p>BC Conservation Covenant Handbook:  <a href="https://www.wcel.org/sites/default/files/publications/bc-conservation-covenant-handbook_2023.pdf">https://www.wcel.org/sites/default/files/publications/bc-conservation-covenant-handbook_2023.pdf</a></p> <p>BC Assessment Conservation Covenants:  <a href="https://info.bcassessment.ca/services-and-products/Pages/Conservation%20Covenants.aspx">https://info.bcassessment.ca/services-and-products/Pages/Conservation%20Covenants.aspx</a></p> <p>A land trust is a non-profit charity designed to protect privately held land.</p> <p>BC had two land trust organizations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Nature Trust of BC</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">The Land Conservancy</a></li> </ul> <p>Conservation Covenants are agreements with property owners and their local government to help conserve their land.</p>	<p>and restore biodiversity, and to safeguard ecosystem values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Native plantings attract birds, butterflies and other pollinators. Native plants are drought tolerant and thrive in our region.</li> <li>• May have positive impacts on the development of the stormwater detention ponds, as trusts are designed to protect watershed areas, riparian areas, streams and other water sources.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive knowledge of land trusts by District Staff may be required</li> <li>• if a trust is legally possible, it may take considerable time and expense to develop and implement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What do they look like?</li> <li>○ Are they sustainable with time, energy and funds?</li> </ul>	
--	---	---	--	--

A recent example is the [Metchosin Foundation's – Bilston Conservation Corridor Project](#)



Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Different options for North Lobe &amp; South Lobe</b></p> <p><u>Basic Concept:</u> Look at zoning the two lobes differently to support either recreational or ecological conservation goals.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Buffer Land remains under the ownership of the District.</li> <li>The appropriate zoning is developed to support conservation / recreation outcomes. [NB: there does not appear to be such a zoning designation in the District's Land Use Bylaw]</li> </ul>	<p><u>South Lobe as an ecological conservation area.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will help keep the South Lobe natural, and parts of it untouched.</li> <li>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</li> <li>Neighbours' privacy will be maintained.</li> <li>Natural state forest will provide a wildlife sanctuary.</li> <li>Natural state forest will provide protection of flora and fauna – particularly those that are endangered.</li> <li>Assess funding for carbon sequestering and wildlife corridor perpetually.</li> </ul>	<p><u>South Lobe as an ecological conservation area.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South Lobe is adjacent to the residential development.</li> <li>Financial impacts to the District of managing this parcel.</li> <li>Safety concerns</li> <li>Fencing may be required, particularly around highly sensitive areas.</li> <li>Enforcing “no go” areas could be challenging. Forest will NOT provide a wildlife or plants sanctuary especially if people are permitted to roam.</li> </ul> <p><u>North Lobe Zoned as a Parkland with pedestrian access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North Lobe is adjacent to the Business Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are differences in topography, hydrology and potential land use between the North and South Lobes.</li> </ul> <p><u>South Lobe:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to the Centre Mountain Residential Development</li> <li>Adjacent to Neild Road property owners</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	<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> <p>Recreational value</p>	

<p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A key reason for exploring this option is the potential of trail access through the Buffer Land.</li> <li>• Looking ahead, there will likely be an access requirement (vehicle size) related to the stormwater detention pond.</li> </ul>	<p><u>North Lobe Zoned as a Parkland with pedestrian access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbours' houses are not close to the Northern Lobe border, so privacy is not a significant concern.</li> <li>• North lobe is in an upward slope so residences above are not likely impacted.</li> <li>• Water retention issues are probably minimal for the most part, but keeping forest will assist.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Other land acquisitions could be considered to add to the overall connectivity.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are access points to the North Lobe from the residential development.</li> <li>• Safety concerns: South Lobe: flooding, encampments, wildfire, campfires. North Lobe: impacts from business park; encampments, wildfire, campfire.</li> <li>• Fencing may be required (depending on the status/goals for the South Lobe)</li> <li>• Will need to enforce limits on activities (i.e.ad hoc mountain bike trails in sloped terrain).</li> <li>• Fencing not required but if it is needed, the Industrial Park can be approached to build and maintain.</li> </ul>	<p>consideration of those living adjacent to the South Lobe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The North Lobe contains the headwaters of Metchosin Creek.</li> </ul>		
					<b>Total</b>

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Rewilding effort info</b></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"> <li>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]</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Educational Studies – engage local institutions: Camosun College, UVic, RRU. Explore 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.</li> <li>Ecosystems are dynamic and constantly changing.</li> <li>Plans should identify core rewilded areas, how to connect them and ensure outcomes are to the mutual benefit of people and nature.</li> <li>Rewilding uses wildlife to restore food webs and food chains.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local engagement and community support are required. Commitment and cost.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Due to the level of destruction, previous habitats may not be resurrected/replaced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on the recovery of ecological processes, interactions and conditions based on similar healthy ecosystems.</li> <li>Anticipate the effects of climate change and act as a tool to mitigate its impacts.</li> <li>Rewilding is a paradigm shift in the coexistence of humans and nature.</li> <li>Conservation efforts to be sought out for the preservation of the BL acreage!</li> <li>Restriction of human activity in the sensitive environment of BL will be imperative for its recovery as a buffer between urban and rural neighbors.</li> <li>"Re-wilding is a fairly recent term generally meaning to restore an area of land to its natural state and possibly reintroduce species that</li> </ul>	Environmental Protection	
				Neighbour impacts	
				Fiscal Impacts	
				Practicality / Feasibility	
				Land Use Complexities	
				Community Input (consistent/inconsistent)	
				Recreational value	

<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"> <li>• Replanting species appropriate for the area with the guidance of experts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reintroducing wildlife – need sufficient and quantifiable food source.</li> <li>• Invasive species interfere with the ecological value of the environment. i.e. – scotch broom (also a fire risk)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>have been driven out through human activities. Rewilding is gaining popularity worldwide as a means of mitigating climate change and restoring natural habitat."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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".</li> <li>• 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-</li> </ul>		
--	---	--	---	--	--

			wilding is a progressive approach to conservation.		
				<b>Total</b>	

Concept & Background	Advantages (Pros) / Opportunities	Disadvantages (Cons) / Challenges	Additional Comments	Overall Assessment	
<p><b>Access Management Options</b></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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>In the CRD Parks case, as above with the following additions. Since many of the users would be driving to the BL, new parking would be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservation objectives may not be served by creating new access opportunities (i.e. increased human traffic).</li> <li>Additional access points and amenities cost money/ staff to install and maintain.</li> <li>Additional access points may encourage more users than wanted (for safety or environmental reasons)</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<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>	
				<p>Recreational value</p>	

<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>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. Strategic fencing may be used to support conservation objectives or privacy.					
				<b>Total</b>	



## **Tier Three Concepts: Take No Further Action**

- **Do Nothing Option (longer term) (C.2)**
  - The Working Group sees this option as having significant risks, particularly legal liability with Metchosin maintaining ownership, but (per the concept) “doing nothing” to manage the land.
- **A park allowing for multi-use recreation (E.4)**
  - The Working Group felt that this option would require significant resources to establish and maintain trails and amenities.
- **Sale of the Buffer Land to the adjacent landowners (G.2)**
  - This concept was seen as complex and that the sale of a public asset to private landowners was not likely to have public support.
- **Fence off the entire Buffer Land (K.1)**
  - This option was seen as unrealistic. The cost of building and maintain fencing would be significant, and may ultimately be ineffective at reducing human traffic.