



Public Hearing
Information Package
Monday, July 15, 2024 at 6:00 P.M.
Council Chambers
4450 Happy Valley Road, Victoria, BC, V9C 3Z3

Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 698
and
Metchosin Land Use Amendment Bylaw No. 699
4499 Leefield Road

Package 3

Proposed Bylaw:	<i>Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 698</i>
OCP Amendment:	The purpose of <i>Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 698</i> is to amend the land use designation on 4499 Leefield Road from “Upland” to a split designation of “Rural” and “Rural Residential 2.”
Proposed Bylaw:	<i>Metchosin Land Use Amendment Bylaw No. 699</i>
Zoning Amendment:	The purpose of <i>Metchosin Land Use Amendment Bylaw No. 699</i> is to amend the zoning on 4499 Leefield Road from Upland (UP) and Rural (RU) to a new split zone configuration of Rural (RU) and Rural Residential 2 (RR2).
	The purpose of both bylaw amendments is to allow the applicant to apply for a subdivision to <u>create one new parcel</u> that is approximately 1.2 hectares.

Information Package Contents:

- a) Public Submissions received on or before July 15, 2024 as to Bylaw Nos. 698 and 699 1
- Philip Wadham, July 15, 2024
 - Selby & Kathy Saluke, July 15, 2024
 - Frank Mitchell, July 15, 2024
 - Derek Wulff, July 15, 2024
 - Andrew Spray, July 15, 2024
 - Marg Jorstead, July 15, 2024
 - Noreen Dennis, July 15, 2024
 - Bill & Linda Cave, July 15, 2024
 - Ruth Bennington, July 15, 2024
 - Ed Bennington, July 15, 2024

Please note that written and verbal submissions will become part of the public record

- Dean Hauca, July 15, 2024
- Barb Sawatsky, July 15, 2024
- Pattie Whitehouse, July 15, 2024
- Bev Bacon, July 15, 2024
- Jim MacPherson, July 15, 2024
- Heidi Tonn & Rodney Mitchell, July 14, 2024
- Owen Clarke, July 14, 2024
- Aneita Strauss, July 14, 2024
- Jim MacPherson, July 14, 2024
- Walter & Joyce Schnetzler, July 12, 2024
- Richard Jessen, July 12, 2024
- Wendy Schmelz, July 12, 2024

Please note that written and verbal submissions will become part of the public record

Tina Hansen

From: Info
Sent: July 15, 2024 3:55 PM
To: Tina Hansen; Jennifer Miller
Subject: FW: Variation request to building bylaw

-----Original Message-----

From: Philip Wadham [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 3:53 PM
To: Info <info@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Variation request to building bylaw

To whom it will concern,

As a resident of Metchosin who enjoys the rural nature of this beautiful part of Southern Vancouver Island I am opposed to the application for a variation to our current bylaws that will allow for the parceling off of a small (2 acres I believe) section of a 10 acre site. Should this be granted it will set a precedent for further similar applications. The phrase 'thin end of the wedge' is one that comes to mind. I urge council to reject this variation application.

Sincerely. Philip Wadham

Jennifer Miller

From: Selby Saluke <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 15, 2024 3:34 PM
To: Mayor and. Council; Bob Payette
Subject: Rezoning application for 4499 Leefield Road

Dear Mayor and Council and CAO Mr. Bob Payette;

Re: Subdivision re-zoning application for 4499 Leefield Road

With apologies for being unable to attend the July 15th Public Hearing, and for the very last-minute submission of these ideas, we would like to make a few comments before Council decides on this issue.

We understand that Metchosin staff is currently undertaking an overhaul of existing bylaws and a consolidation of amendments that we hope will include stronger language with regard to the natural environment and our climate action promises. This is long overdue in light of rapid climate changes occurring on Vancouver Island and elsewhere, and is awaited with much hopeful anticipation. In the meantime, zoning changes must be considered very carefully as the impact of even a few more residents, more roads, more trees removed from the landscape, more wells and septic systems, and more traffic all lead to increased pressures on the aquifer, surface water systems, and the overall hydrology of our region.

We agree with the arguments that Bev Bacon has highlighted in her letter to Council in this regard, and in opposition to the proposed bylaw change. We would not support such a motion at this point either. We would prefer to see Council wait for Staff's completion of the bylaw overhaul before moving ahead with any re-zoning or OCP changes. Metchosin needs to have a stronger legal position from which to defend and protect our natural environment.

Selby and Kathy Saluke
[REDACTED]

Jennifer Miller

From: Frank Mitchell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 15, 2024 3:15 PM
To: Steve & [REDACTED] Mayor and. Council; Lisa Urlacher; Shelley Donaldson; Jay Shukin; Sharie Epp; Marie-Terese Little
Subject: Fwd: Public Hearing today on 4499 Leefield Road application for rezoning

Dear Mayor and Council

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting, but would express my strong opposition to approving this zoning application for the reasons spelled out in the CAO's report and Bev Bacon's letter which I am forwarding below. Yours sincerely,

Frank Mitchell
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: July 15, 2024 at 12:20:39 PDT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Public Hearing today on 4499 Leefield Road application for rezoning

Hey everyone.

Please show up **today at 6:00 at the council chambers**. The applicants have approval and support from about 25 neighbours. There's a much bigger issue here with changing our OCP to spot zone a single property to enable subdivision. Don't just watch this happen. Say something, even if you just say that you are opposed for the reasons given by others.

I have just checked with Tina. She is sending emails to council as fast as they are coming in. She said about 10 emails were received over the weekend. Email submissions will be received up until 4:00 as part of the package and even up to 6:00 as "pinks". Obviously the sooner you send the better chance it will be read. I'm concerned that the public hearing is at 6:00 and the council meeting to vote on this issue is at 7:00. There will be no opportunity to speak on this issue at public participation in the council meeting.

Here's my submission.

Bev

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 11:52 AM
To: 'Mayor and. Council' <mayorAndCouncil@metchosin.ca>; 'Marie-Térèse Little' <mtlittle@metchosin.ca>; 'Jay Shukin' <jshukin@metchosin.ca>; 'Steve Gray' <sgray@metchosin.ca>; 'Shelly Donaldson' <sdonaldson@metchosin.ca>; 'Sharie Epp' <sepp@metchosin.ca>
Cc: 'bpayette@metchosin.ca' <bpayette@metchosin.ca>; 'Tina Hansen' <thansen@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Public Hearing on 4499 Leefield Road application for rezoning

I WOULD LIKE THIS LETTER TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON 4499 LEEFIELD ROAD. THANK YOU.

BEV BACON

Dear Mayor and Council,
Re: public hearing for rezoning of 4499 Leefield Road, July 15, 2024

I am strongly opposed to this bylaw change.

This is a quote from BC Government on Land Use Planning and Climate Change:

“Climate change mitigation and adaptation are closely connected to land use planning processes and are key to supporting community sustainability and resilience.”

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/local-governments/planning-land-use/land-use-regulation/zoning-bylaws>

When our Official Community Plan, bylaw 258, and our Land Use Plan, bylaw 259, were developed in 1995 we weren't thinking about or planning for Climate Change.

Both bylaws were consolidated in 2020 to incorporate about 20 amendments to the OCP and about 30 amendments to the Land Use Bylaw.

We have now documents put together with bits and pieces that various councils have approved. We haven't yet done an overhaul with respect to mitigation and adaptation to climate change. This is urgent and necessary.

Uplands zoning isn't arbitrary. It's based on topography. This property is clearly Uplands as characterized by steep slopes, variable rocky terrain, rocky outcroppings and thin soil cover.

The applicants and council can't change topography. We need our Uplands properties to remain intact with low development to protect our forests, air, wildlife habitat, and water resources.

The environmental reports describes the land as dry forest subject to drought. The neighbours report water shortage in the area. This will only get worse with climate change and development at our borders that we can't control. We should be protective of our aquifer and associated water courses and wetlands, and mindful of the value of the trees for cooling.

The challenge of fire suppression on a pan-handle lot at the end of an exceedingly long driveway in an area of no piped water is another consideration.

The “It's not fair.” argument doesn't fly. When neighbours were able to make panhandle lots, it was back in the Wild West before incorporation. That was then. This is now.

The planner's advice to council is that Metchosin's bylaws and policies do not support this application for rezoning. Accommodating family members is a very weak reason to subdivide.

The applicants are able to build secondary housing on their existing lot. There is no control that the new lot will remain in the family. People are free to move on. Then what? If bringing a grandbaby to a council meeting wins the day, I'll bring a baby lamb.

Sincerely,
Bev Bacon
Metchosin resident

Jennifer Miller

From: Derek Wulff [REDACTED]
Sent: July 15, 2024 2:53 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Re: Public Hearing for rezoning of 4499 Leefield Road, July 15, 2024

Dear Mayor and Council,

Re: public hearing for rezoning of 4499 Leefield Road, July 15, 2024

I would like to let you know that I am strongly opposed to this bylaw change. We have an OCP that specifically rejects subdivision of lots of this type and it should be upheld, especially as we voted for you on the premise that you would uphold the OCP and reject this type of application. There are more simple solutions to the issue of accommodating family on one's property.

By any measure the best solution for the owners of the property is to make an addition and get on with it. If it is for family members then that is the best solution to their need. Rezoning the land for two lots sets a precedent that could be used by anyone in Metchosin.

If you feel that you would like to rezone the property, then I respectfully request that you also dismiss this application, and during the next election run on a platform that you are amenable to subdividing property.

This has been a waste of our tax dollars that it has gone this far, I expected that it would have been rejected at the beginning.

The obvious course of action, that doesn't affect the rest of our community, and open it to other rezoning applications, which would undoubtedly follow, is to reject the application and indicate they are free to build an addition according to the OCP rules we presently have. That is, by any measure, the most fair to the people involved and the rest of the community.

Please reject this application for rezoning.

Sincerely,
Derek Wulff



Member of 1% for the Planet

Tina Hansen

From: Info
Sent: July 15, 2024 3:38 PM
To: Tina Hansen; Jennifer Miller
Subject: FW: Change in zoning of 10 acre lots to allow 2 acre lots

From: Andrew Spray [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 3:35 PM
To: Info <info@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Change in zoning of 10 acre lots to allow 2 acre lots

I understand that a meeting at 6 pm will be discussing this change in the Metchosin OCP and would appreciate receiving details of this change. While I own a property of less than 1 acre I am concerned about the possible implications of this change to the OCP. Unfortunately I shall not be available to attend the meeting at 6 pm.

Andrew Spray
[REDACTED]

Tina Hansen

From: Info
Sent: July 15, 2024 3:38 PM
To: Tina Hansen; Jennifer Miller
Subject: FW: Amendment to land use designation on 4499 Leefield Road

From: Marg Jorstead <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 3:23 PM
To: Info <info@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Amendment to land use designation on 4499 Leefield Road

With regards to the land use amendment of 4499 Leefield Road to a split designation of "Rural" and "Rural Residential 2", I have no objections.

My name is Margaret Jorstead, living at, and owner of [REDACTED] Road.

Tina Hansen

From: Info
Sent: July 15, 2024 3:37 PM
To: Tina Hansen; Jennifer Miller
Subject: FW: Leefield OCP Changes

-----Original Message-----

From: Noreen Dennis <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 3:19 PM
To: Info <info@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Leefield OCP Changes

As a long time resident of Metchosin, I am strongly against the changes being considered for our long standing Community Plan. Keep Metchosin rural!

Noreen Dennis

Dear Mayor and Council,

Re: public hearing for rezoning of 4499 Leefield Road, July 15, 2024

We are strongly opposed to this bylaw change.

The current zoning for Metchosin properties does not reflect adequately the importance of protecting properties for their contribution to mitigating climate change. We believe that through an OCP review Metchosin should be reviewing each property that has the potential to be subdivided and consider the forest cover, the riparian areas, the wetlands, the topography, the wildlife that uses the property and the biodiversity as the determinants for rezoning to meet current priorities.

This is not the time we should be changing zoning lot by lot at the request of the landowners. It infers that the current zoning is not the best zoning for that lot rather than individual self-interest which is the actual reason.

The planner's advice to council is that Metchosin's bylaws and policies do not support this application for rezoning. That should be the end of it! We personally believe that no properties in Metchosin should be considered for rezoning until an OCP review of the zoning of all properties has been completed.

This property's zoning does not meet current subdivision requirements and for this reason alone Metchosin should be rejecting the application. Bad decisions cannot be undone once they are made. Metchosin allows secondary suites and detached small units under our bylaws.

Respectfully,

William Cave
Linda Cave


Metchosin

Tina Hansen

From: Info
Sent: July 15, 2024 2:38 PM
To: Tina Hansen; Jennifer Miller
Subject: FW: Proposed Subdivision of a Rural Metchosin Property

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Bennington <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 2:34 PM
To: Info <info@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Proposed Subdivision of a Rural Metchosin Property

I appose the approval of this application as it sets a precedence which undermines the OCP providing a loophole to substantially increase the development of rural property in Metchosin.

Ruth Bennington
[REDACTED]

Tina Hansen

From: Info
Sent: July 15, 2024 2:32 PM
To: Tina Hansen; Jennifer Miller
Subject: FW: Proposed Subdivision of a Rural Metchosin Property

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Bennington <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 2:30 PM
To: Info <info@metchosin.ca>
Subject: Proposed Subdivision of a Rural Metchosin Property

I oppose the approval of this application as it sets a precedence which undermines the OCP providing a loophole to substantially increase the development of rural property in Metchosin.

Ed Bennington
[REDACTED]

Amber Ward

From: Dean Hauca <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 15, 2024 2:15 PM
To: Info
Subject: Not in support of: Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 698 and Metchosin Land Use Amendment Bylaw No. 699 4499 Leefield Road

I formally put forward that my household is against such an amendment, this just sets a precedent and opens the door on countless other submissions for subdivision. Before we know we will be living in the crappy surrounding of Colwood and Langford.

Disappointed in council that this is even being supported, definitely will not have my votes next time. Tax hikes, and a Mayor that wants to be higher profile than Metchosin wants\needs to be.

https://www.metchosin.ca/sites/metchosin.ca/files/2024-07/07%2015%202024%20PH%20pkg1_REDUCED.pdf

Dean Hauca
[REDACTED]

Metchosin, BC

Jennifer Miller

From: Barb Sawatsky - [REDACTED]
Sent: July 15, 2024 1:44 PM
To: Mayor and. Council
Subject: opposed to rezoning application on Leefield Rd.

I am opposed to this rezoning proposal as should all of Council as it does not conform with to Metchosin's OCP and sets a dangerous precedent for other property owners to do likewise. Every application must be reviewed by staff, further costing the taxpayers of this municipality more money through staff time.

Property owners purchased with the knowledge that they could not subdivide. The District should not compromise its Official Community Plan because time has passed and the owners' circumstances have changed. They have options other than opening the door to more applications from others.

Please remember why you were elected and do the correct thing for Metchosin by voting down this application. We'll be watching.

-Barbara Sawatsky
53 year resident of Metchosin

Tina Hansen

Subject: FW: public hearing input

-----Original Message-----

From: Pattie Whitehouse <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 12:23 PM
To: Mayor and. Council <mayorAndCouncil@metchosin.ca>
Subject: public hearing input

I oppose the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments proposed for 4499 Leefield Place and ask that Council deny the application.

I have sympathy for the proponents and their wish to help out members of their family. I am also aware of the potential benefits to a community of having generations of a family living in proximity.

However, other than under exceptional circumstances, Council's responsibility is to uphold the community vision rather than to accommodate individual residents.

I don't believe that the circumstances in this case are in any way exceptional, nor that the benefits to the proponent outweigh the potential consequences of weakening the community vision or eroding the community's trust that its council will defend that vision.

While approving the proposed amendments would not set a legal precedent, experience has shown clearly that doing so would set a "social" precedent that could be used to pressure Metchosin's councils to permit future amendments. In public participation on June 17, the proponent herself cited previous rezonings to support the application.

I believe that the proponents' intention is exactly what they say it is — to provide housing for family — but there is no way to guarantee that this intention will be fulfilled. Unexpected circumstances ranging from the offer of a dream job in another location to a horrible tragedy could prevent the proponents' family from ever moving in.

Even if plans play out as intended, there will be no way to guarantee that future generations of the family will continue to live on the properties, in which case the community would lose the benefits associated with the proposed purpose of the rezoning.

The proponents have responded to concerns about the potential quadrupling of the number of households on the land by offering a 25-year covenant preventing the building of secondary suites on the proposed properties. If such a covenant is even enforceable, it would only postpone the potential increase in density.

The proponent has pointed out that rezoning would create an additional property on which taxes would be paid. Property taxes are calculated to cover the costs of services. Additional homes mean additional taxes to collect, but also additional costs to service those homes. There would be no net financial benefit to the community.

Finally, and I mean no criticism of the proponents when I make this point; at a previous council meeting, the proponent said that the 90 sq.m. of an allowable secondary suite is "too small" to raise a family in.

Can I ask that we all try to be conscious of and appreciate our privileged position? There are hundreds of thousands of families around the world — hundreds of families in our own country — for whom a secure home of 90 sq.m. would seem a palace.

While it's not their preferred option, building a suite within the provisions of our bylaws would allow the proponents to help their family with housing until a better, long-term solution is available.

Pattie Whitehouse

Tina Hansen

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 15, 2024 11:52 AM
To: Mayor and Council; Marie-Térèse Little; Jay Shukin; Steve Gray; Shelly Donaldson; Sharie Epp
Cc: Bob Payette; Tina Hansen
Subject: Public Hearing on 4499 Leefield Road application for rezoning

**I WOULD LIKE THIS LETTER TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON 4499 LEEFIELD ROAD. THANK YOU.
BEV BACON**

Dear Mayor and Council,
Re: public hearing for rezoning of 4499 Leefield Road, July 15, 2024

I am strongly opposed to this bylaw change.

This is a quote from BC Government on Land Use Planning and Climate Change:
“Climate change mitigation and adaptation are closely connected to land use planning processes and are key to supporting community sustainability and resilience.”
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/local-governments/planning-land-use/land-use-regulation/zoning-bylaws>

When our Official Community Plan, bylaw 258, and our Land Use Plan, bylaw 259, were developed in 1995 we weren’t thinking about or planning for Climate Change.

Both bylaws were consolidated in 2020 to incorporate about 20 amendments to the OCP and about 30 amendments to the Land Use Bylaw. We have now documents put together with bits and pieces that various councils have approved. We haven’t yet done an overhaul with respect to mitigation and adaptation to climate change. This is urgent and necessary.

Uplands zoning isn’t arbitrary. It’s based on topography. This property is clearly Uplands as characterized by steep slopes, variable rocky terrain, rocky outcroppings and thin soil cover. The applicants and council can’t change topography. We need our Uplands properties to remain intact with low development to protect our forests, air, wildlife habitat, and water resources.

The environmental reports describes the land as dry forest subject to drought. The neighbours report water shortage in the area. This will only get worse with climate change and development at our borders that we can’t control. We should be protective of our aquifer and associated water courses and wetlands, and mindful of the value of the trees for cooling.

The challenge of fire suppression on a pan-handle lot at the end of an exceedingly long driveway in an area of no piped water is another consideration.

The “It’s not fair.” argument doesn’t fly. When neighbours were able to make panhandle lots, it was back in the Wild West before incorporation. That was then. This is now.

The planner's advice to council is that Metchosin's bylaws and policies do not support this application for rezoning. Accommodating family members is a very weak reason to subdivide.

The applicants are able to build secondary housing on their existing lot. There is no control that the new lot will remain in the family. People are free to move on. Then what? If bringing a grandbaby to a council meeting wins the day, I'll bring a baby lamb.

Sincerely,
Bev Bacon
Metchosin resident

Tina Hansen

From: Jim MacPherson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 15, 2024 9:14 AM
To: Mayor and. Council
Subject: 4499 Leefield Road

We have an OCP which does NOT permit subdivision at this site.

The owners of this property are well aware of this fact.

To permit spot zoning and subsequent subdivision obviously opens Metchosin to future applications for development and the gradual loss of our rural character.

Mayor and Council have an inherent responsibility to act in a professional manner to uphold the terms of the OCP

Mayor and Council could not reject future similar applications for subdivision as a precedent would have been set if this application is approved.

Under the law, Councils cannot discriminate or treat residents differently when applying rules and regulations. To do so, would open Mayor and Council up to potential legal action and the need to be spending yet more money on legal costs. May I remind Council that there are already several lawsuits against the District.

Lastly, what is the point of having an OCP if Mayor and Council are going to "cherry pick" what parts they will ignore or apply?

Please think carefully what your decision may lead to for our community before you vote.

On another matter, why was this Open House not publicized in the July issue of the Muse?

And why is this Open House being held during the summer months when residents are generally not available?

This is poor planning.

Kathleen MacPherson

Tina Hansen

From: Heidi Tonn [REDACTED]
Sent: July 14, 2024 10:59 PM
To: Mayor and Council; Marie-Térèse Little; Shelly Donaldson; Sharie Epp; Steve Gray; Jay Shukin
Cc: Bob Payette; Rod Mitchell
Subject: Fwd: PUBLIC HEARING - July 15th - 4499 Leefield Road - Rezoning and Subdivision Application

To Metchosin Mayor and Council
and Bob Payette, CAO

The above captioned matter is not just a rezoning and subdivision matter. It is actually a matter involving an amendment to our OCP. We cannot express our opinion on this matter better than Avril Yoachim, in her letter to you as copied below, and we wholeheartedly agree with her. While we sympathize with our lovely neighbours who are bringing this application, we cannot condone chipping away at our OCP in this manner and setting a precedent for future OCP amendments for other Metchosin residents. Council's duty here is to consider implications for the broader community and not get micro focussed on the needs of one single family. Please do not ignore our OCP and our Planner's good advice in this matter. Please do not move forward with this OCP amendment.

Thank you
Heidi Tonn and Rodney Mitchell
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2024 7:41 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@metchosin.ca; 'Marie-Térèse Little' <mtlittle@metchosin.ca>; 'Shelly Donaldson' <sdonaldson@metchosin.ca>; Sharie Epp <sepp@metchosin.ca>; 'Steve Gray' <sgray@metchosin.ca>; 'Jay Shukin' <jshukin@metchosin.ca>
Cc: 'Bob Payette' <bpayette@metchosin.ca>
Subject: PUBLIC HEARING - July 15th - 4499 Leefield Road - Rezoning and Subdivision Application

Mayor and Council
Bob Payette, CAO

The Planner has given Council excellent input and cautionary advice. We pay the Planner for her expertise and experience, please allow her to do her job and support her on this. I understand the position the property owners are in and I appreciate that some council members may wish

to accommodate them but the job of Council as a whole is to 'consider' and vote what is best for the **entire municipality**.

This isn't a simple matter of rezoning and subdividing. I've attached a portion of the Zoning Map of a 'before' and 'after' view of 4499 Leefield Road and surrounding area showing what is current and what is proposed. This will show that while the property currently has split zoning the owners propose a zoning (RR2 dark green) that does not exist anywhere in the larger area. This in itself creates far more problems, commonly described as 'spot zoning'.

Further, it appears to me that the steps necessary to accomplish a RU/RR2 zoning would be to first rezone the UP portion to RU and then further rezone the desired portion to RR2. I didn't think you could leap-frog from UP straight to RR2.

SUMMARY of Planner's report (in part)

Pg 14 – “**careful consideration** needs to be made to the land uses proposed in the context of the OCP ie. The broader community picture”

Pg 15 – “the designation cautions that 'it is not intended that the extent of existing 0.8ha residential development be substantially expanded.' “Council is encouraged to carefully consider this policy in deciding on what '**substantial expansion**' might mean in the context of this and future/additional applications to rezone and amend the OCP”

Pg 15 – “panhandle lots adjoining had to meet the zoning requirements of the day”

Pg 15 – “Rezoning of Kangaroo Road complied with the OCP”

Pg. 16 – **CONCLUSION (IN PART)** – “While every application to rezone is discretionary and considered on a case-by-case basis, an increased volume of rezoning applications **and OCP amendments may occur with approval.**”

Please heed the advice of our Planner and make the necessary and correct decisions for the **broader community**.

Thank you
Avril Yoachim

Tina Hansen

From: Owen Clarke [REDACTED]
Sent: July 14, 2024 4:12 PM
To: Mayor and. Council
Subject: Leefield

I voted for all of you believing and trusting you would Uphold our OCP. You swore to that. I moved to Metchosin in 1987 based on the OCP. My children thanked me for the privilege of growing up here. Every one here knows the rules. A tacit covenant. See royal bay for a disaster where the OCP was simply bypassed.

I strongly oppose any proposed subdivision. I more strongly oppose any change to the OCP or spot zoning... You should know better.

Owen

Owen Clarke
[REDACTED]

Tina Hansen

From: Aneita Strauss [REDACTED]
Sent: July 14, 2024 12:39 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: 4499 Leefield Road Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to submit my opposition to the rezoning of 4499 Leefield Road. Metchosin policies and OCP, as well as the recommendation of the Metchosin planner all emphasize that spot rezoning is not a good governance choice. Although the proponents have made a sympathetic rationale for their request, this is not about individual compassion but about the greater good.

The information packages indicate that our OCP should be reviewed in 2025 and various changes could be made as a result of full and extensive public input at that time. I strongly advise that this re-zoning request be denied at this time. If changes to the OCP and housing policies are determined during the 2025 OCP review, then the proponents are free to re-apply if they feel that any changes provide additional support for their application.

Sincerely,

Aneita Strauss

Metchosin Resident

[REDACTED]

Open House, Council meet July 15,2024

Opposed to subdivide 4499 Leefield Road

First, I want to stress my opposition to the proposal to subdivide 4499 Leefield Road. To subdivide establishes a practice of spot zoning, something which is antithetical to the OCP and any serious planning program. Most, if not all of you, pledged adherence to the OCP as part of your election campaigns. This is a test of your commitment to that principle.

Old School Revenues

I also want to express my concern about the use of the old school for the Metchosin Preschool. I am very concerned that space in the old school available at commercial rates is being whittled away, and frittering away serious chances of ever reducing the District's financial involvement. Other than much talk and wishful thinking about increasing commercial-rated revenue at the old school, I do not see any signs that Council has taken any effective steps to increase revenues at the old school.

Village Square costs to the District

On the same theme, I wonder about continuing exposure to and involvement in costs associated with the Village Square proposal. Much depends upon fundraising and I remain to be convinced that at some point Council will not be asked to contribute yet more to this proposal, and yet even more to the support of the old school.

District Need for More Revenue

All of this raises a much broader issue for the District, and that is a serious mismatch between proposed programming, municipal tax levels and sources of revenue to the District. Proposed and budgeted expenditures for the next 5 years will involve yet more increases in municipal taxes. I do not, however, see any signs that Council is beginning to address the prospect of revenue shortfalls without cutting back on programming. Increasing revenues takes time, sometimes a long time. Changes to the OCP may be required; there may be strong public opposition and yet I see no signs that addressing revenues is even on the District's agenda.

Jim MacPherson

Amber Ward

From: Joyce Schnetzler [REDACTED]
Sent: July 12, 2024 9:40 PM
To: Info
Subject: Applicants Dan and Jo-Anne Cote

Dear Bob,

It has come to our attention that a public hearing will take place on July 15th regarding Dan and Jo-Anne Cote's application for a subdivision to create one new parcel that is approximately 1.2 hectares.

We are in favor of this application.

We appreciate you taking the time to consider their request.

Sincerely,

Walter and Joyce Schnetzler

Amber Ward

From: Richard Jessen [REDACTED]
Sent: July 12, 2024 4:15 PM
To: Info
Subject: 4499 Leefield Subdivision

Richard Jessen 4495 Leefield

I am opposed to the subdivision application of 4499 Leefield road .

The proposed building site will require a well to be drilled less than 150 meters (500') away from my well. The side of this hilly uplands area does not produce a lot of water and our well has a long recovery time. My concern is that a new well drilled so close to mine at a lower elevation could compromise my water supply.

Who would be responsible should my well go dry ; The district of Metchosin ,the Cote's or is it just a case of too bad so sad you lost your water.

There are five ten acre parcels of upland zoning adjacent to, or near the proposed subdivision. So the 10 acres of 4499 Leefield road is not an outlying orphan.

Should this application be successful there may be others with similar stories that would like to subdivide.

Councillor Donaldson alluded to a case during the March fourth council meeting where she had come across the 2006 rezoning application from Kangaroo road and pondered whether it may be applicable in this situation, suggesting that these decisions may establish precedent.

There are only four panhandle lots on Leefield Rd. These four lots are serviced by one driveway and the houses are grouped quite close together leaving a large part of the uplands forested area natural.

It was suggested that the building site would be left natural in the forest, but building a house , a shop and a septic field, would necessitate a rather large clearing.

Future tree removal to attain more sunshine would further diminish this wildlife corridor situated in a valley bottom with a nearby creek.

Thanks for your consideration: Richard Jessen.

Amber Ward

From: Wendy Schmelz [REDACTED]
Sent: July 12, 2024 3:15 PM
To: Mayor and Council; Info
Subject: 4499 Leefield Rd rezoning application

To Mayor and Council,

Re: Opposition to the proposed 10 acre lot being subdivided into a 2 acre and 8 acre lot at 4499 Leefield Rd.

As a follow up to my email from November 2023 I would like to again stress my concern over the consideration of the proposed subdivision and oppose the rezoning application. In the documents a reference to a successful rezoning from 2006 was mentioned. Regardless of the details; it was almost 20 years ago and should not be part of the council's decision. It would be quite a stretch. I would hope the council listens to the advice of the planner and considers the multiple letters received citing concern over the rezoning of this property and the many reasons Metchosin residents took the time to write to the Mayor and Council to have their detailed views heard.

Thanks,

Wendy Schmelz
[REDACTED]