

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

ELECTORAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016

6:30 PM

(RDN Board Chambers)

A D D E N D U M

PAGES

COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

- 2 **Peggy Aikman**, re Request for Relaxation of the Minimum 10% Perimeter Frontage Requirement in relation to Subdivision Application No. PL2015-036 – 2320 Kaye Road, Electoral Area 'G'.
- 3 **Richard Hampton**, re Request for Relaxation of the Minimum 10% Perimeter Frontage Requirement in relation to Subdivision Application No. PL2015-036 – 2320 Kaye Road, Electoral Area 'G'.
- 4-5 **Don Reiffenstein and Jackie Rollans**, re Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2016-091 – Island Highway West, Electoral Area 'H'.
- 6-11 **Doug Dickson**, re Development Variance Permit Application No. PL2016-091 – Island Highway West, Electoral Area 'H'.

RECEIVED
JUN 10 2016
REGIONAL DISTRICT
of NANAIMO

[Darryl & Peggy Aikman]
2275 Peterson RD NANOOSE BC V9A 9L2
[]

Mr. Geoff Garbutt
General Manager of Strategic & Community Development
6300 Hammond Bay Road
Nanaimo, BC V9T 6N2

Re: Subdivision application File (Application No. PL2015-036 2320 Kaye Road, Electoral Area 'G')

Dear Sir: 2275 Peterson Road

We as residents of [] in River's Edge are **opposed** to the request for relief of the minimum frontage requirement to permit access to the proposed subdivision of Lot D.L. 178 through our community. Permitting such access would negatively impact our community as it has the potential to significantly increase vehicular traffic and noise pollution along Stone Fly Close and Peterson Road. Of paramount concern is the safety of residents who regularly walk and cycle on these residential side roads, and the safety of our children, who are often playing near and on these roads.

Lot D.L. 178 is zoned for Resource Management (RM1); whereas, our properties are within the residential Englishman River (Block 564) Comprehensive Development Zone (CD-14).

Permitting access through our community side roads would allow traffic from land uses for silviculture, agriculture, primary processing and extraction of soil, and multiple non-resident home based businesses on D.L. 178 to flow through our residential community rather than taking the direct, established access to Kaye Road. Furthermore, granting access to the proposed subdivision through Stone Fly Close may lead to further subdivision and developments on D.L. 178, should there be zoning changes of those parcels in the future.

Yours truly,
Aikman, We fully endorse this letter.

Further note: The roads in Block 564 have been covered with chip seal. A product that does not withstand the heavy traffic use, and especially heavy trucks. We note many patch work areas already done, any will continue to erode with increase of traffic.

2
Aikman

Richard Hampton
715 River's Edge DR.
Nanoose Bay, BC, V9P 9L5

7 June 2016

Mr. Geoff Garbutt
General Manager of Strategic & Community Development
6300 Hammond Bay Road
Nanaimo, BC V9T 6N2

Re: Subdivision application File 2015-00748 (Application No. PL2015-036 2320 Kaye Road, Electoral Area 'G')

Dear Sir:

We as residents in River's Edge are **opposed** to the request for relief of the minimum frontage requirement to permit access to the proposed subdivision of Lot D.L. 178 through our community. Permitting such access would negatively impact our community as it has the potential to significantly increase vehicular traffic and noise pollution along Stone Fly Close and Peterson Road. Of paramount concern is the safety of residents who regularly walk and cycle on these residential side roads, and the safety of our children, who are often playing near and on these roads.

Lot D.L. 178 is zoned for Resource Management (RM1); whereas, our properties are within the residential Englishman River (Block 564) Comprehensive Development Zone (CD-14). Permitting access through our community side roads would allow traffic from land uses for silvaculture, agriculture, primary processing and extraction of soil, and multiple non-resident home based businesses on D.L. 178 to flow through our residential community rather than taking the direct, established access to Kaye Road. Furthermore, granting access to the proposed subdivision through Stone Fly Close may lead to further subdivision and developments on D.L. 178, should there be zoning changes of those parcels in the future.

This situation is somewhat analogous to the recent issue of an attempt to establish an industrial marihuana facility in our residential neighbourhood. The properties in question have the potential to disrupt our residential area by situating non residential activities within our community.

Yours truly,

Richard Hampton

From: Don and Jackie
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 4:59 PM
To: Doug Dickson; Boogaards, Stephen; Bill Veenhof
Subject: Re: RDN ELECTORAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE JUNE 14, 2016 AGENDA: AREA H: DVP Application PL2016-091 (Setback & Retaining Wall)

Gentlemen

This is to confirm the agreement with, and support of, the presentation submitted by Doug Dickson relative to the application PL2016-091.

Jackie Rollans and I feel that the options suggested lay out a plan of action which is doable. The plan does not completely solve our concern caused by the flooding problem, it does mitigate it to a degree, and we feel allows the builder reasonable room to execute his plan.

Thank you for making it possible to be involved in a matter that directly affects us.

Jackie Rollans/Don Reiffenstein

To: Boogaards, Stephen ; Bill Veenhof
Subject: RDN ELECTORAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE JUNE 14, 2016 AGENDA: AREA H: DVP Application PL2016-091 (Setback & Retaining Wall)

Stephen Boogaards, Planner
Bill Veenhof, Director Area Hat w
Regional District of Nanaimo

CC: Neighbours: Don & Jackie, Doug & Colleen, Ann & Jan

Don and I have been in discussion over this past weekend reviewing the latest plan as published in the RDN agenda on Friday. I have captured most of our discussions in this note. In response to the revised application of the builder to reduce setback from 15M to 10M to place a retaining wall at the edge of the 10M line and taper the southern edge out to 15M we provide our comments to the RDN and ask that they reject the application currently before the Area Planning Committee.

As neighbours we cannot tell looking at the subject lot what exactly is planned. There are no survey makings to clearly identify the taper point to curve back to 15M. We have had no discussed with the builder or their agent -something that would have been easy to do and would have saved everyone time and energy. While the builder and builders agent have clearly read our previous notices of opposition and the recommended changes put forth in my previous note on the subject setback there has been no contact. In good faith we previously supported both the build height exemption, and footbridge application put forth by the builder and we sort of expected that there would be contact to discuss how a win/win outcome could be obtained. The current proposal by the builder if approved is a win for the builder at the expense of the local neighbours.

We bought our property 16 years ago, knowing the rules and following them. We have cleaned up and protected Nash Creek (both main creek and overflow area) and today it is flourishing. We bought knowing that two doors over there should be no building development on a major portion of the 0.268 hectare lot as it was protected space due to watercourse setback rules. We were disappointed that the previous builder who owned the subject property unlawfully filled in the overflow without being held to account and we are concerned that the new builder now wishes to have a raised yard in that same space that is secured by a 2.5M retaining wall. That yard extends past neighbouring properties.

I recognize that the actions of the previous builder/owner now creates a substantial benefit to the new builder/owner as the former riparian area has been filled and destroyed making the new measurement point for set back from the watercourse to be the middle of Nash Creek (out closer to the ocean) not the former overflow area. This needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating the requests of the new builder and the viewpoints of the impacted neighbours.

While we have had no contact with the builder or his agent (which would have been beneficial for all stakeholders) I am providing a potential solution in the hopes of sparking dialogue. While our best outcome to be happy would be to hold the builder to the 15M setback requirement and either change the house sighting &/or put in a package treatment plant to optimize yard space, there is another solution. Please see the attached plan where I have marked in a simple change to the curve of the wall that generates an outcome that could be acceptable.

Protecting privacy and views are important as is protecting the Nash Creek overflow area in our adjacent properties to the south. Don has provided three (3) photos to show how water now backs up in his property due to the unlawful filling of the overflow on the subject property. The water also backs up in our property and to an extent backs up at the Buffie's property next to us. We are concerned that the proposed placement of the wall and associated fill will cause increased pressure by diverting water into our properties. This needs to be managed by the builder and we feel strongly that part of the solution is found in the placement of the wall so that it reduces the ability to block or tunnel water back at our properties. Our proposed placement takes that into account.

The attached diagram shows a moderate change to what the builder/developer put forth. Hopefully it yields a solution we can all find acceptable. I would like to think that everyone is indeed working to find a good outcome for all. It would be nice to talk face to face (builder to neighbours) to really make it happen. We would be happy to participate as we would like to see the property developed and be in a spot where we can welcome the new folks to the beach. Thanks.

Regards, Doug
Doug Dickson
6297 Island Highway W
Qualicum Beach BC V9K2E4
250-240-2858 (cell)

From: Doug Dickson
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Boogaards, Stephen; Bill Veenhof
Subject: Re: RDN ELECTORAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE JUNE 14, 2016 AGENDA: AREA H: DVP Application PL2016-091 (Setback & Retaining Wall)

Should have added that the small blue glove shown in the pictures was a reference mark Don put in to show the approx 15M setback mark. Water all around this spot in winter on the subject property...

Regards, Doug

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 1:08 PM, Doug Dickson wrote:
Stephen Boogaards, Planner
Bill Veenhof, Director Area H
Regional District of Nanaimo

CC: Neighbours: Don & Jackie, Doug & Colleen, Ann & Jan

Don and I have been in discussion over this past weekend reviewing the latest plan as published in the RDN agenda on Friday. I have captured most of our discussions in this note. In response to the revised application of the builder to reduce setback from 15M to 10M to place a retaining wall at the edge of the 10M line and taper the southern edge out to 15M we provide our comments to the RDN and ask that they reject the application currently before the Area Planning Committee.

As neighbours we cannot tell looking at the subject lot what exactly is planned. There are no survey makings to clearly identify the taper point to curve back to 15M. We have had no discussed with the builder or their agent -something that would have been easy to do and would have saved everyone time and energy. While the builder and builders agent have clearly read our previous notices of opposition and the recommended changes put forth in my previous note on the subject setback there has been no contact. In good faith we previously supported both the build height exemption, and footbridge application put forth by the builder and we sort of expected that there would be contact to discuss how a win/win outcome could be obtained. The current proposal by the builder if approved is a win for the builder at the expense of the local neighbours.

We bought our property 16 years ago, knowing the rules and following them. We have cleaned up and protected Nash Creek (both main creek and overflow area) and today it is flourishing. We bought knowing that two doors over there should be no building development on a major portion of the 0.268 hectare lot as it was protected space due to watercourse setback rules. We were disappointed that the previous builder who owned the subject property unlawfully filled in the overflow without being held to account and we are concerned that the new builder now wishes to have a raised yard in that same space that is secured by a 2.5M retaining wall. That yard extends past neighbouring properties.

I recognize that the actions of the previous builder/owner now creates a substantial benefit to the new builder/owner as the former riparian area has been filled and destroyed making the new measurement point for set back from the watercourse to be the middle of Nash Creek (out closer to the ocean) not the former overflow area. This needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating the requests of the new builder and the viewpoints of the impacted neighbours.

While we have had no contact with the builder or his agent (which would have been beneficial for all stakeholders) I am providing a potential solution in the hopes of sparking dialogue. While our best outcome to be happy would be to hold the builder to the 15M setback requirement and either change the house sighting &/or put in a package treatment plant to optimize yard space, there is another solution. Please see the attached plan where I have marked in a simple change to the curve of the wall that generates an outcome that could be acceptable.

Protecting privacy and views are important as is protecting the Nash Creek overflow area in our adjacent properties to the south. Don has provided three (3) photos to show how water now backs up in his property due to the unlawful filling of the overflow on the subject property. The water also backs up in our property and to an extent backs up at the Buffie's property next to us. We are concerned that the proposed placement of the wall and associated fill will cause increased pressure by diverting water into our properties. This needs to be managed by the builder and we feel strongly that part of the solution is found in the placement of the wall so that it reduces the ability to block or tunnel water back at our properties. Our proposed placement takes that into account.

The attached diagram shows a moderate change to what the builder/developer put forth. Hopefully it yields a solution we can all find acceptable. I would like to think that everyone is indeed working to find a good outcome for all. It would be nice to talk face to face (builder to neighbours) to really make it happen. We would be happy to participate as we would like to see the property developed and be in a spot where we can welcome the new folks to the beach. Thanks.

Regards, Doug
Doug Dickson
6297 Island Highway W
Qualicum Beach BC V9K2E4
250-240-2858 (cell)





