

# Memo

**To:** District of Sooke Committee of the Whole

**From:** Bev Suderman, Chris Hall & Michael Kelly  
Island Planning Services Consortium

**Date:** April 18, 2011

**Re:** Sooke Zoning Bylaw Project 2011: Public Consultation Process

---

## Consultant Report

The purpose of this report is to update the District of Sooke's Committee of the Whole as to:

1. The results of the public consultation process;
2. Recommended changes to the draft Zoning Bylaw as a result of the public consultation;
3. A list of policy areas and individual property requests that need Council direction; and
4. A recommendation for moving the draft Sooke Zoning Bylaw to the stage of formal agency review and legal review by Sooke legal counsel.

Please note that members of the consulting team will be present at the April 26 meeting of the Committee of the Whole, and will be able to elaborate on the key points of this memo at that time. Please note also that this report builds on the previous report.

## Public Consultation Process

The public consultation process launched on March 28 with an online survey, which was announced in newspapers and other media. The online survey ran for just over 2 weeks, closing on April 14, although it was scheduled to close on April 11. In total, 9 on-line responses were received.

A questionnaire, with questions very similar to the on-line survey questions, was also made available at the District of Sooke's counter, and at open houses. Although a significant number of questionnaires were picked up along with other handouts at the open houses, only one (1) completed questionnaire was returned to the District of Sooke. It was consolidated with the on-line survey responses to permit easy analysis and a consolidated set of responses.

The people who responded to the survey were homeowners (100%); male (60%) and female (40%); and from a diversity of age groups.<sup>1</sup> Most (70%) reside in the District of Sooke, but one was a business owner in Sooke, residing elsewhere, and two people identified as being from Otter Point. In terms of how they use the zoning bylaw, half of the people who responded identified themselves as residents who do home renovations or other improvements, and the other half identified as business owners or industrialists.

In total, there were three open houses:

- April 4, 11 am – 2 pm, a poster board session specifically for seniors with a presentation of the new Zoning Bylaw at 12:30 pm (Location: Sooke Municipal Hall, in the temporary seniors centre);
- April 4, 4 – 7 pm, a poster board session at SEAPARC, to catch parents as they drop off and pick up their children for recreation events;
- April 14, 4 – 8 pm, a poster board session as part of a larger District of Sooke Open House, showcasing various initiatives by the District (Location: Community Hall).

The Open Houses were supported by:

- A poster display highlighting features of the draft Zoning Bylaw, including the proposed map changes;
- Display copies of the printed draft Zoning Bylaw, public consultation version;
- Staff and consultant participation, to discuss concerns on an individual basis;
- Access to the District of Sooke's GIS mapping, to assist planning staff with quickly identifying participants' individual properties, to be able to discuss any proposed changes with them;
- A form enabling participants to report any "mistakes in zoning" to be corrected as part of the Zoning Bylaw process;
- A handout identifying Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's); and
- A questionnaire that could be completed at the event, or completed at home and returned to the District of Sooke.

It is estimated that 140-150 people participated in the Open Houses. Planners (both consulting and staff) answered a lot of questions during the Open Houses, and gathered a lot of comments. These comments, together with comments made as part of the survey/questionnaire, are documented in Appendix A, together with consultant responses. Those that result in recommended changes to the draft District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw are discussed in the next section.

## Recommended Changes to the draft Zoning Bylaw

### **Text Changes:**

A full list of comments received as part of the public consultation process, together with consultant responses to those comments, is attached to this report as Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ages 20-39 = 3; Ages 40-59 = 4; Aged 60 + = 3.

Based on the results of the public consultation, the following changes to the draft Zoning Bylaw are recommended:

<b>Zoning Bylaw Section</b>	<b>Original Text from Public Consultation version of the draft Zoning Bylaw</b>	<b>Recommended Revisions</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
Grade definition	<b>GRADE</b> means the elevation of the finished surface of the ground, paving, or sidewalk within the area between the building and the property lines, or when the property line is more than 3 m from the building, between the building and a line 3 m from the building. Localized depressions such as for vehicle or pedestrian entrances need not be considered in determining levels of finished ground. Alternatively, grade may be set by obtaining an approved grading plan from the District of Sooke;	<b>GRADE</b> means the elevation of the finished surface of the ground, paving, or sidewalk within the area between the building and the property lines, or when the property line is more than 3 m from the building, between the building and a line 3 m from the building. Localized depressions such as for vehicle or pedestrian entrances need not be considered in determining levels of finished ground. <del>Alternatively, grade may be set by obtaining an approved grading plan from the District of Sooke;</del>	The District of Sooke does not provide or approve grading plans.
20 a) Density Bonus Provisions	a) For each unit of affordable housing or special needs housing constructed, one additional residential unit may be constructed. Lot coverage may be increased up to 10% and/or building height up to one storey to accommodate these additional units.	<del>a) For each unit of affordable housing or special needs housing constructed, one additional residential unit may be constructed. Lot coverage may be increased up to 10% and/or building height up to one storey to accommodate these additional units.</del>	Part (a) complicates the application of the amenity contribution policy. Density bonusing provisions for affordable housing should be incorporated once a full affordable housing policy is developed by the District of Sooke
20 b) Density Bonus Provisions	b) Where 80% or more of the on-site parking spaces are provided underground or concealed within the building, lot coverage may be	b) Where 80% or more of the on-site parking spaces are provided underground or concealed within the building, <u>the maximum number of multiple family residential units may be</u>	Part (b) – inadvertent omission of the density increase by units.

	increased by 10% and/or building height by one storey.	increased by <u>10 units per ha</u> . The height may be increased by one storey and the lot coverage by 5%.	
22 c) Maximum fence height	i. Front and flanking yard – 1.2 m ii. Rear and side yard – 2 m	i. Front and flanking yard – 1.2 m ii. Rear and side yard – 2 m iii. <u>Residential properties fronting Sooke Road – 2 m</u>	To address traffic noise issues along Sooke Road.
42 e) Minimum lot area requirement for subdivision	Notwithstanding the minimum lot area requirement specified in this bylaw, the Approving Officer may approve a subdivision with lot(s) smaller than the minimum in any zone, where: i. The lot area reduction is not more than 10% of the required minimum lot size or maximum dwelling unit density; and ii. A portion of the parent parcel is required for highway widening, a waterfront walkway, trail or parkland	Notwithstanding the minimum lot area requirement specified in this bylaw, the Approving Officer may approve a subdivision with lot(s) smaller than the minimum in any zone, where: i. The lot area reduction is not more than 10% of the required minimum lot size or maximum dwelling unit density; and ii. A portion of the parent parcel is required for highway widening, a waterfront walkway, trail or parkland <u>OR</u> ii. <u>The subdivision is a bareland stata application created under the Bare Land Strata Regulations pursuant to the Strata Property Act.</u>	To ensure that there is clarity around the creation of strata lots of a size less than that set out in the bylaw.
New section on Waterfront Uses, to go between Sections 46 & 47		On water leases abutting upland residential use, no commercial moorage is permitted.	To minimize conflicts between the water lot and adjacent land uses.
Schedule 104, Rural Residential (RU4)	Minimum lot size for subdivision purposes – 2 ha	Minimum lot size for subdivision purposes – <u>1</u> ha	To prevent negative impacts on the development rights of former RR1-B zoned properties. Subject to staff determination as to

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

			whether or not we are creating a problem for former RR1 and RR1-A zoned properties.
Schedule 201, Large Lot Residential (R1)	Minimum frontage for subdivision purposes – 30 m	Minimum frontage for subdivision purposes – <u>15 m</u>	The proposed minimum frontage was found to be too wide.
Schedule 301, Manufactured Home Park (RM1)	Minimum lot size for subdivision purposes – 2 ha	Minimum lot size for subdivision purposes – 2 ha <u>In the case of stratification of the Manufactured Home Park, the minimum lot size for individual manufactured home site lots is 275 m<sup>2</sup>.</u>	To permit better land tenure and home ownership relationship, should the MHP residents wish to own the land beneath their homes.
Schedules 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, & 406, Commercial zones (C1, C2, C3, C4, CTC1 & CTC2)	Minimum frontage for subdivision purposes – 60 m	Minimum frontage for subdivision purposes – <u>15 m</u>	To permit a wide variety of small scale commercial development.
Schedule 404, C4		Addition of certain permitted uses, formerly with the CM-1 zone Exception for lot coverage for BC Adventure College and related businesses at 5449 Sooke Road.	To prevent negative impacts on the development rights of former CM-1 zoned property.
Schedule 405 & 406, Commercial Town Centre zones		Addition of Apartment Buildings to permitted uses, together with statement that “Apartment buildings are subject to the provisions of the RM4 zone.”	To meet the intent of the Town Centre Plan re high density residential uses.

### Map Changes:

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

As part of the public consultation process, the consultants have heard from a number of property owners in the District of Sooke requesting changes to the proposed zoning of their property. The following changes to the draft Zoning Map have been requested. See also the map showing these parcels in Appendix B.

#	Address	PID	Former zoning (ZB 270)	Requested zone (proposed ZB 500)	Recommendation	Comments
1	CRD Parks lands, including Sooke Potholes & Camp Thunderbird	009-503-455 009-499-334 009-497-650 000-101-818 000-101-788 026-898-683 000-089-583 000-089-460 001-668-595 000-089-559 000-089-303 026-236-770 026-623-788 009-388-603 000-101-621 000-101-796 027-527-671 009-496-939	Varied	P1	Approve	Rezoning of the CRD parks and associated properties eliminates the need for the C5 zone.  Some of these parcels belong to The Land Conservancy, BC Transportation Financing Authority, Western Forest Products (scheduled for transfer to CRD Parks in 2012), as well as to CRD Parks.  The zoning changes are being checked individually with property owners, as part of an overall notification process.
2	BC Adventure College (Fuse Restaurant) 5449 Sooke Rd	000-101-702 (property adjacent to foreshore lease)	W-1	W-3	Not approve	Rezoning application not approved in 1998 due to public concerns about water quality in Coopers Cove. Dock is used incidentally for launching kayaks, therefore use is compatible with passive recreation.
3	1836 Tomlinny	027-850-617	R-1	RM3	Not approve	No rationale given for change, other than

	Road					that the property is now on sewer.
--	------	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------

Please note that several individual property owners have not yet been contacted as to the proposed mapping changes, so further map changes may be requested. If so, these will be documented in the next consultant report to Committee of the Whole.

Please note also that a number of requests have come forward from property owners where it was proposed to change the zoning on former RU-3 parcels of 10+ ha to RU-1, to maintain their RU-3 status. These are being evaluated. A full report is not ready at time of writing.

### **Council Direction Needed:**

There are some areas where policy direction is best provided by Council. These include:

- Living fences
- Recession plane
- Section 52.1 re excess parking prohibition in commercial areas

**Living fences:** In light of the concerns related to the use of vegetation as “living fences,” the public consultation process attempted to determine public views on the question. The response to the questionnaire/survey was limited, and it is difficult to draw conclusions about the results, other than to say that the public shares Council’s concerns about the potential negative impact of living fences that block access to the sun to neighbouring properties, while also recognizing the benefits to the community of this vegetation. The suggestion to permit higher fences along Sooke Road may assist with addressing the worst situations.

The draft Zoning Bylaw has been modified in a couple of places to limit impact of living fences on sight lights and visibility at intersections:

1. Section 37, Sight Triangle -- On a lot corner contiguous to a highway intersection, **hedging and other vegetation shall be 1 m or less in height**, and no building, structure, or fence, shall be constructed or erected within an area bounded by a line joining points on each lot line, a distance of 6 m from the corner of the lot, and the point of intersection of the highway.
2. Section 22, Fences – In addition to the provisions regarding fencing and fence height, a provision to address living fences has been added: **Where hedges are used as a living fence along the property line, the sight triangle rules apply.**

Living fences tend to be problematic in municipalities. The current practise of granting variances to the height of fences enables Council to be discretionary in its application of the bylaw without compromising by trying to define terms in a comprehensive manner.

**Recession plane:** In light of the concerns related to the recession plane rules (Section 31) in the Zoning Bylaw, the public consultation process attempted to determine public views on the question. The response to the questionnaire/survey was limited, and it is difficult to draw conclusions about the results, other than to say that the public seems to agree that the most important reason to have the recession plane rules is to protect public view corridors to the water. Half of the people who answered the survey thought that the recession plane rules should apply to all 3-storey plus buildings in Sooke, not just in the Town Centre. Nobody agreed that the recession plane rules should apply only to one side of the building.

The recession plane rules have been clarified in the draft Zoning Bylaw to assist with understanding the purpose of the rules, and indicating that the rules apply on any side of a building fronting a road that leads to the waterfront. Development Permit provisions can be used to ensure that the intent of the recession pane rules is being achieved.

If Council wishes to make further changes to the Zoning Bylaw with regard to the recession plane rules, please provide direction to the consultants.

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

**Section 52.1 re excess parking prohibition in commercial areas:** The consultants wish to draw Council's attention to the specific provision in Section 52.1 (d):

Parking spaces in excess of the requirement are prohibited in commercial and multi-family areas. Site areas not used for buildings, permitted storage areas, and required landscaped areas shall be left in a natural condition or landscaped.

This is a very strong statement and change in direction from the previous Zoning Bylaw, section 17.3, which simply said that "If off-street parking spaces in excess of bylaw requirements are provided, the location, design and operation shall comply with the requirements of this bylaw."

The new regulation has been developed in response to the direction from the District of Sooke's Sustainability Strategy and Transportation Plan. The consultants request that Council confirm that it is comfortable with this regulation.

Next Steps:

Next steps in the District of Sooke's Zoning Bylaw development process are as follows:

1. Agency referral and legal review, anticipated to occur over a 3-week period from May 2 – May 24;
2. Report back to Committee of the Whole – date TBD (late May);
3. Formal adoption process in June, which will include a further community meeting/open house and public hearing.

Recommendations:

The consulting team recommends that:

1. The draft District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw be forwarded, as amended, for a three-week period of agency and legal review, to start no later than May 2, 2011 and end no later than May 24, 2011;
2. The Committee of the Whole meet to receive a report as to the results of the agency and legal review no later than May 31, 2011.

## Appendix A: Full list of comments with consultant responses

<b>Monday, April 4, 2011: Seniors Open House (10 am – 2 pm)</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Manufactured home parks are a good type of affordable housing	The Zoning Bylaw anticipates the possibility of more manufactured home parks being developed in Sooke. The new zone increases density for manufactured home parks and reduces the minimum pad size. These changes support this type of housing.
Permeable paving is hard on people in wheelchairs and people who are using walkers, as is the boardwalk with the gaps between the boards. The “bumpety-bump” hurts peoples’ arms.	This is important design information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw. The use of permeable pavers enables infiltration of moisture into the ground but is one of several options. Consideration should be given during the DP stage to what surface material is most suitable based on anticipated useage.
Where is the Technical Industrial Business Park supposed to go?	No location has yet been identified for the Technical Industrial Business Park, although the OCP suggested two areas.
The zoning for the Hospice property is OK.	Glad to hear it. No comment needed.
Overview of changes from RR1 to RU4.	Discussion re the need to apply for inclusion in the SSA to be able to subdivide.
Grant Road is the worst road in all of Vancouver Island. It needs to be upgraded.	This is important information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
Fences along Sooke Rd should be allowed to have a 6 foot fence along the road because it is loud and busy. Variances are permitted, so why not just change Section 22?	This idea will be considered as part of the Zoning Bylaw review. The consultants are recommending to Sooke’s Council that Section 22 be modified to permit residential properties on Sooke Rd for to build fences up to 6 m in height.
Objection to the Prestige development and (apparently) economic development incentives generally.	This comment is important for Council’s information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
Double-sewer costs for B&B’s	This comment is important for Council’s information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
Government Wharf should be public, not private.	The zoning is consistent with the use of the wharf and does not preclude public use. The federal government, as wharf owner, sets the terms for the users, and can make it available to private uses.
There should be more public access to the water.	This comment is important for Council’s information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
Is it possible, through the Zoning Bylaw process to pre-zone a particular property for seniors	Participant advised to put in a request by next Friday (April 15) so that it can be put forward for

affordable housing? –	Council consideration. Council will need to give consideration to whether it wishes to prezone properties during the Zoning Bylaw review process, or through the regular rezoning process.
<b>Monday, April 4, 2011: SEAPARC Open House (4 – 7 pm)</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Where will the Grant Road connector go?	Outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
Are properties given heritage protection in Sooke? What is the heritage status of Sooke properties?	The District of Sooke currently has no heritage designation policy.
Are mixed commercial/residential uses permitted?	Yes, they are permitted in the following commercial zones: C1, C2, CTC1 and CTC2.
Harbourview Park rezoning	CRD Parks has requested that their properties be appropriately zoned as part of the Zoning Bylaw review process.
Property is too small for the setbacks in the Zoning Bylaw. How can I build?	Participant advised that variances are possible and he should submit a variance application.
Parks need to stay as parks, i.e. Broomhill.	This comment is important for Council's information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
When will areas be hooked up to Sewer?	This question is important for Council's information, but is outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
What type of future development is going on 2105 Otter Point Road?	Planner described proposed development.
How is a Zoning Bylaw developed? What's the basis? How are ordinary people supposed to understand this stuff?	Brief description of the process used to develop the Zoning Bylaw, and how the Bylaw relates to the OCP and other plans.
Very important to make sure that houses go in the right place. (7 year old's response to the description of the purpose of the Zoning Bylaw. He then proceeded to bemoan a neighbouring development to their rural property that had cut off his access to a rural landscape.)	Thank you for your comment.
Blasting issues with some new development, resulting in cracked windows, cracked walls ... it's like mini-earthquakes.	This raises an important question about how development proceeds within the District of Sooke. The comment will be passed along to the Engineering Department.
Good linkages between the OCP and the Zoning Bylaw: technical industrial business park; access for farmers to land; adding abattoir to list of permitted uses in industrial zone; recognition of limits to growth imposed by sewer.	Thank you for your comment.
Animal section is good ... deals with the animals' need for space.	Thank you for your comment.
<b>Thursday, April 14, 2011: District of Sooke Open House (4 – 8 pm)</b>	

Comment	Response
Concern that property valuations are being done by BC Assessment in light of the base density provisions of the OCP, rather than on zoning or on actual use of the property.	Thank you for the comment. Several people commented on this. The issue may exist more for larger undeveloped properties than for a built-out site. Council may wish to seek further information from staff. Situation is beyond the scope of the Zoning Bylaw exercise.
What does the Zoning Bylaw do?	The Zoning Bylaw provides zoning system that supports the implementation of the District of Sooke's Official Community Plan. It also establishes regulations for the use of land and buildings in the District of Sooke, and regulates the type, location and intensity of development.
Living fences – concern re sunlight. Access to sunlight should be maintained. However, deer might be kept out with a thick hedge.	<p>Living fences are very difficult to regulate, in part because there are many possible benefits to them. At the same time, there can be problems. The District of Sooke may wish to develop a “good neighbour” policy to assist neighbours with addressing their conflicts.</p> <p>The current draft Zoning Bylaw, Section 22, proposes that a living fence is not a fence, except when it is located in the sight triangle, and becomes a hazard to visibility. Then it is subject to fence height limitations.</p>
Interest in Jane Lunsen's farm re Cooperative and cluster housing (co-housing)	The proposed zoning bylaw does not anticipate co-housing situations because zoning is more about the use of land, and less about the ownership of it. A cooperative may be possible where there are multiple residences permitted under the zoning for the property. Depending on how the concept evolves, and as long as it is in conformance with the OCP and other Sooke plans, it may be possible to develop a zone, or modify an existing zone like RU2, to accommodate the needs of the project. A rezoning process will likely be required. If the farm is in the ALR, the approval of the Agricultural Land Commission will also be required.
Dislike 4 on 10's (RU2 zone) – messy.	Thank you for your comment.
Why can't chickens be in the front yard in residential areas?	Chicken coops are an accessory structure/building on the yard. Accessory structures are not permitted in front yards in the District of Sooke.
Why not more than 3 poultry on one property? Maybe 6 hens would be OK?	Thank you for the comment. Several people commented on this. Council may wish to seek further information from staff.
Hens don't lay forever. Transition of 2 or 3 more. We are more rural than Victoria.	See above response.

Like that slaughterhouses have been added to the list of permitted uses in M3.	Thank you for your comment.
Important to provide space for each bird.	Thank you for your comment.
Taller bird structure (garden shed size) to allow for roosting.	The minimum size specified on a per chicken basis does not preclude building a taller structure (and it can be easier to retrieve eggs, if you can actually get inside).
Is it an option to develop an Ecological Reserve zone? Could be put under General regulations for "Conservation Uses."	<p>A specific CD zone was developed for the Charters Creek Stewardship Centre, the principal use of which Ecosystem preservation. Other areas could have similar zones developed for them, to meet the specific conservation issues, the purposes of the designation (education, restoration, and so on), and the group stewarding the land/water.</p> <p>Alternatively, the proposed Zoning Bylaw permits conservation uses in any zone, which would avoid having to go through a rezoning process. The landowner could put a conservation covenant on the land, or other such protective measure, to accomplish a similar objective.</p>
Remove piggeries, doves, pigeons – what is the definition of piggeries (provincially)?	Piggeries, doves, and pigeons are only mentioned in the Zoning Bylaw in the context of intensive agriculture, which is like factory farming. These rules only come into effect if there are more than 100 birds, or 10,000 lbs of live pigs, confined to a barn. The zoning bylaw is now more explicit regarding the definition of intensive agriculture as being more than 10 agricultural units requiring a minimum of 2 ha of land.
Why is Potholes commercially zoned? A hotel can't locate there, can it?	The zoning is proposed to be changed to P1, as a park, to remove the potential for commercial development taking place on these lands. The commercial zoning at the Potholes is leftover from the days before these lands were acquired by CRD Parks. There may eventually be some temporary accommodations in addition to campgrounds in the area, but no hotels.
Lot coverage concern in RM4, RM4A. Not enough coverage.	The 50% lot coverage of the proposed RM4 zone is consistent with the lot coverage of the former RM4 zone. The lot coverage in the RM4A zone is higher than any previous multi-family zoning, at 70%.
Can the ZB include detached townhouses?	Detached townhouses are small single-family dwellings. An appropriate zone for these would be in a CD zone or in the proposed R3 zone (Small Lot Residential) or (possibly) a new zone will need to

	be developed, in consultation with the District of Sooke.
Section 50 – New home-based business for child daycare not to accommodate more than 8 children.	This duplicates the provisions of Section 14, and will be removed. The limitation to 8 children is consistent with provincial legislation.
RU4 – Changing minimum lot size for subdivision from 1 ha to 2 ha – downzoning.	There might have been an impact on a number of formerly zoned RR1-B properties, so the minimum lot size has been changed to 1 ha for RU4 zoned properties in the proposed Zoning Bylaw.
R1 – Minimum lot size to subdivide is 1000 m <sup>2</sup> but lot frontage is 30 m (hardly any 30 m lots)	The proposed lot frontage was too wide. Has been changed to 15 m.
Maximum heights reduced from 13 m to 12 m	13 m was a very generous height for single family dwellings, and it was leading to confusion, because 13 m is enough height for 4-storeys. However, the Building Code does not anticipate single family residential dwellings being higher than 3-storeys. For higher buildings, a different development standard is applied. The purpose is to reduce confusion.
Side yards should be 1.5 m or 3 m only – too much variation in side yards.	The proposed zoning framework anticipates a wide variety of lot sizes within the Community Residential areas of Sooke, together with a variety of uses on those lots, including accessory structures that may or may not include suites. The variety in side yards attempts to recognize these differences, while respecting the privacy of neighbours.
R3 – no 3 stories allowed	Small lot sizes require smaller, shorter houses to prevent blocking sunlight and protect privacy on neighbouring lots.
Cannot have bylaws that do not conform with the OCP. Community plans want suites and duplexes in all zones.	Suites and duplexes are permitted in all rural and single-family residential zones.
What is the reason for the minimum lot frontage of 85 m in RU2?	This type of minimum lot frontage is consistent with rural zones in other parts of Vancouver Island.
Changes in CD zones should not be allowed as they specifically are contractual with the District of Sooke. Noted changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CD1 – adding 30m frontage of 350 m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot sizes</li> <li>• CD3 – Special use regulation (h) added</li> <li>• CD7 – Increased density part of line (b) has been removed.</li> </ul>	Agreed. In response to specific concerns: CD1 – This was an error. Frontage has been changed to 11 m, to conform to R3 zone. CD3 – Special Use Regulations (section h) reflects the contents of the former 14.3.2 Special Use Regulations in Bylaw 270, as amended. No changes. CD7 – Section has been re-arranged to be easier to understand, so that the clause which was alleged to be deleted, actually starts the section. Compare proposed Zone CD7 section 9 to Zone CD7 14.7.6
RM1 – Minimum lot size for subdivision purposes	Manufactured home parks (RM1) generally do not

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

Appendix A: Comments List

Page A - 5 -

changed from 1 ha to 2 ha. Downzone.	subdivide, unless they are being stratified.  While the provision of minimum lot size will not affect any existing manufactured home parks, a larger RM1 lot size provides a better opportunity for community within the Manufactured Home Park, and permits better landscaping, amenity areas, and buffering of neighbouring uses. It will be useful as new manufactured home parks get established.
RM2, RM3, & RM4 – Minimum frontage of 60 m makes existing lots non-conforming.	The minimum frontage has been reduced to 30 m. Existing multi-family developments, that will have RM2, RM3, and RM4 zoning under the new bylaw, will not be non-conforming because their uses conform, as do the setbacks, etc. These properties will not be able to subdivide. Redevelopment will still be permissible.
RM2 – Should include a comment to see Density Bonus.	The density bonus provisions found in Section 20 of the draft Zoning Bylaw apply to all residential zones, and not just RM2.
RM3 – Row house is not listed as a permitted use.	The definition of town house includes row houses.
RM4 – Concern that high density housing is only allowed in the sewered area.	This is in accordance with the Town Centre Plan, and is supported by the OCP and liquid waste management plans.
What is subzone RM4A? RM4 reduces dwelling units from 90 to 70, and heights from 25 m to 15 m. Downzoning.	The zoning on the RM4 properties will be changed to RM4A, to ensure no loss of development rights.
M1 – by including the word principal use to office or retail accessory it omits industrial warehousing.	Both light industrial uses and warehousing are still permitted principal uses in the M1 zone. List of permitted uses has been separated into principal and accessory uses, so as to make uses in the zone clearer.
M1 – Minimum lot size has been increased from 600 m <sup>2</sup> to 1500 m <sup>2</sup> .	Thanks for catching that error. It has been corrected.
Minimum frontage requirements makes for non-conforming lots in industrial areas.	A site does not become non conforming by virtue of lot frontage. This provision is only a consideration when lots are being created by subdivision.
Maximum lot coverages in industrial zones have been changed from 80% to 70%. Downzone.	Industrial lot coverages in Sooke were very high in comparison with other BC jurisdictions, and are still very high at 70%. A reduced lot coverage will assist with stormwater management, and provide space for landscaping, to better buffer industrial uses from roads and neighbouring land uses.
Accessory dwelling should be permitted above or behind the principal use, not just behind.	The provision requiring the accessory dwelling unit to be behind the principal use only applies if the accessory dwelling unit is a detached single family

	dwelling. The proposed Zoning bylaw does not specify where other types of staff housing could be permitted. They could be contained anywhere within the structure.
M2 – Bulk fuel sales has been removed as a permitted use.	Due to the dangers associated with the storage of bulk fuel, it is better to restrict this use to the Heavy Industrial zone.
M2 -- by including the word principal use to office or retail accessory it omits industrial warehousing.	All industrial uses permitted in M1 are permitted in M2. Warehousing is permitted in M1, as are light industrial uses.
M3 – Much more site specific for principal uses.	Heavy industrial uses have special requirements, and are not compatible with other types of industrial uses or other types of development. There has been some re-arranging of industrial uses between zones, to reduce the risk of conflict between Heavy Industry and other types of development in Sooke.
M5 – All new zone. Anyone who wishes to do an industrial park must rezone.	The OCP called for the development of a new zone for Technical Industrial Parks. No lands were pre-zoned for industrial development as part of the Zoning Bylaw process.
C1 – Conditions of use restricts the buildings sizes beyond what the zone lot coverage is. Certain uses are restricted to size.	Building sizes are governed by the maximum lot coverage, required parking and other considerations. Size restrictions are placed on specific types of commercial uses to respect the purpose of the zone which is “small-scale commercial uses in local neighbourhoods.” The intent of the zone is to allow a range of uses on a site. Uses are intended to appeal to a neighbourhood market only. Large facilities should locate within the town centre area.
C2 – Conditions of use restrict floor areas of uses.	The restriction allows for single use buildings larger than currently exist but will discourage big box developments in accordance with OCP policy.
C2 – One dwelling unit per lot omits rental housing above first floor. Contradiction to having a live-work community.	The limitation of one dwelling unit per lot only applies in the case of staff housing as an accessory use on the property. Residential above the first floor is a permitted principal use. The idea is to have ground floor commercial, with residential uses above.
C3 – Conditions of use restricts certain uses from previous.	The former CS1 Service Commercial zone has been focused to those uses which are automotive dependent. The only deleted use is “Household Equipment Repair Services” which may be more appropriate in a General Commercial zone, which is where that use is currently permitted. Car wash, parking lot/parkade and restaurant have been

	added as permitted uses to the Service Commercial zone.
C4 – Formerly CR1, CS1 and W4. Set back increased for old CS1 zone.	The proposed C4 zone amalgamates the former CR1 (Commercial Recreation), CM1 (Marine Commercial), and W4 (Marine Pub) zones.
C4 – Conditions of use – 7.5 to water added.	The 7.5 setback requirement was found to be contradictory to the provisions of Section 36, the general regulation related to water setbacks, so it was deleted.
C4 – Many land uses have been omitted.	Based on a request by a property owner, this has been fixed.
CTC1 (North) – Height reduced from 6 stories to 4 stories. DOWNZONE.	The change has been made to be in accordance with the provisions of the Town Centre Plan. It is not anticipated that this change will affect any existing developments or developments in progress.
CTC1 (North) – Multi-level parkades not allowed.	Specification that parkade height is not to exceed 6 m has been removed.
Side and rear setbacks in the downtown should be zero, and should be 4.5 if against the border of downtown and residential	In CTC1 & CTC2, all lot line setbacks are 0m, unless adjacent to residential zones (including CD zones), in which case they are 4.5 m on the side and rear.
Lowered parking requirements for downtown have been removed.	Section 52.5 outlining parking standards and requirements, states that “The following parking standards shall apply, except where a property is located within the Town Centre area, in which case the standards below are reduced by 50%.” This is in accordance with the Sooke Sustainability Strategy, and consistent with the 2006 Sooke Zoning Bylaw.
CTC1 (North) – Live-work dwellings restricts residential use, i.e. Townsend Road with only one access.	The residential opportunities in the CTC1 (North) zone include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Live-work</li> <li>• Residential above the first floor</li> <li>• Staff housing, as an accessory use.</li> </ul> In response to concerns, Apartment Buildings have been added as a permitted use as well.
CTC2 (South) – Lot coverage reduced from 85% to 50%. Downzone.	This change was consistent with the provisions of the existing zoning bylaw, where there was a relationship between height and lot coverage. To provide better flexibility within CTC2, lot coverage was increased to 85%.
<b>Survey Comments</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Q1 comment: the wording on extensive agriculture needs changing. I think you are meaning factory farming, but pigeons, rabbits and pigs are not extensive agriculture and you could include a	Agriculture is a permitted use in the RU1, RU2, RU3, and RU4 zones, although the keeping of animals is governed by Section 17 of the bylaw, so

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

Appendix A: Comments List

Page A - 8 -

<p>discription regarding factory farming, ie' enclosed chicken farms, feed lots for cattle, nos in here as well as piggeries, with nos. over 3 per acre enclosed. for example</p>	<p>if a lot is smaller than 0.2 ha, the keeping of animals is limited. Intensive agriculture is only permitted in RU1 and RU2 zones.</p> <p>The definition of intensive agriculture has been clarified from ZB 270 (2006) to include a threshold for intensity, i.e. 10 animal units in a confined area. Pigeons, rabbits and pigs can be factory farmed, just like other animals. The definition of "intensive agriculture" does not apply to agriculture that involves smaller numbers of animals that are not confined.</p>
<p>Q2 comment: Only if the environment is the number one priority.</p>	<p>One way that the Zoning Bylaw can protect the environment from development is by preventing subdivision, and the development that goes with it.</p>
<p>Q2 comment: I would have to see each individual case. Do the owners of the land object or will they be comensated if it means a lower use for the land.</p>	<p>The land owners will be consulted to see if they object. Most of the affected parcels are in the ALR or owned by CRD Parks.</p>
<p>Q2 comment: in theory - it depends on what each bylaw allowed and doesn't allow in addition to the protection from subdivision.</p>	<p>The major difference between RU1 and RU3 zones is the minimum lot size for subdivision purposes. Smaller lots may have restrictions on the types of agriculture that can be done, based on ability to meet setbacks, and animal regulations.</p>
<p>Q2 comment: Five acres is large enough. we need to look at hay fields to have hay produced, but that needs to be something the farmer can afford so we cannot legislate something which is totally not viable and not likely to happen. The Agricultural plan should be put together with the farmers trying to eek out a living.</p>	<p>The proposed Agricultural Area Plan for Sooke should be able to identify ways to help support Sooke's farmers and local agriculture.</p>
<p>Q3 comment: The majority of people moviing to Sooke are looking for single family dwellings. there should not be suites in the small lots. Duplexes are too , not the answer. 1400 square foot houses on lots which can accomodate a garden if wanted and a place for children and families to grow. this is not about building for developers, this is about building for healthy families which in turn build healthy communities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The proposed Zoning Bylaw helps to ensure that there is a broad range of housing choices for people, to meet varied needs.</p>
<p>Q3 comment: in theory - what is the third zoning</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The RU3 zone is called "Small Scale Agriculture." It permits all the same uses as the RU1, but the minimum lot size for subdivision purposes in RU3 is 4 ha, instead of 10 ha, as is the case with RU1.</p>
<p>Q4 comment: But only if the residential zones that have a certain range are required to keep that range and not ask for variance or changes after the fact.</p>	<p>By making the differences between zones clearer, it is hoped that fewer requests for variances will be required.</p>
<p>Q4 comment: Small lot is too small. Encourage</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. In addition to the</p>

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

Appendix A: Comments List

condominium style living with community gardens instead.	small lot residential zone, there are also a variety of multi-family zones that can allow condominiums (apartment or townhouse style).
Q4 comment: 350 m2 is too small	Thank you for your comment. This lot size is consistent with the 2006 Zoning Bylaw. There seems to be a demand for small lots for more affordable housing.
Q4 comment: Don't have a context to base this one on.	The 2006 Zoning Bylaw had single family residential minimum lot sizes ranging from 350 m <sup>2</sup> to 1 ha in size. There was some overlap between the zones in terms of minimum lot sizes.
Q5 comment: Hopefully this will kick start the town center to have residences above retail and restaurants.	Thank you for your comment. The commercial zones in the Town Centre permit Residential above the first floor, to encourage retail and restaurants on the ground level.
Q5 comment: Height should be increased to 8 storeys, then higher if density bonus achieved.	Thank you for your comment. At some point, Sooke's town centre may be developed to the point where it makes sense to increase the maximum height restrictions.
Q5 comment: We need less density in the town core and only 4 storeys going down water view st. . Mariner's village will use up all the density and there will be nothing left for any other developer so the land will lay foul. I support smaller lots in the town center with smaller houses, 2 storey with a limit on height so as not to destroy the water view and smaller owner operated shops operated as home based businesses with a split commercial/residential tax to make it more affordable for businesses and to encourage people to work and live in Sooke. No more building higher density , ie townhouses, outside the town core. Infill the town core first.	Thank you for your comment. You are right to point out that market forces are a key influence on how quickly development proceeds. The Zoning Bylaw only provides the rules about how the development unfolds. The Town Centre Plan calls for Sooke's highest densities to occur in the Town Centre. The OCP supports this, with lower densities around the Town Centre, and rural areas surrounding these.
Q5 comment: but only if such a development is reviewed....	The community will want to be kept informed as to how development is proceeding. The rezoning process provides such an opportunity.
Q6 comment: There needs to be options and the more options we offer the more people we will entice to open businesses and/or live here.	Thank you for your comment. Manufactured home parks can be a viable affordable housing option for people.
Q6 comment: Said parks have only resulted in evictions to members of our community who suffer extreme financial hardship, due to slumlords managing the parks. District should focus on sustainable attainable housing instead.	Development pressures due to a hot real estate market have caused problems for residents of manufactured home parks that were not protected by zoning. Having appropriate zoning on manufactured home parks provides a lot of security for residents, because any proposed change in land use would require rezoning, which the District could refuse. Further security can be provided if manufactured home parks are stratified, so that manufactured home owners

	within parks can also own the land underneath their homes.
Q6 comment: Home parks are affordable housing and with creativity can be quite attractive. One could include a space for a community park garden, and ditch the park acquisition or money in lieu. in favor of garden plots	Thank you for your comment. The residents' committee of the Manufactured Home Park can certainly choose to make part of their amenity areas into community gardens. The manufactured home park sites are also generous enough to permit small gardens.
Q6 comment: Possibly. It depends on how they are done. Woodside's extension has roadways that are too narrow to allow visitor parking along the sides, very little if any other visitor parking nor much motorhome/boat parking.	The Zoning Bylaw specifies parking requirements for a variety of types of development. Usually some of this required parking is set aside for visitor parking.
Q7 comment: What ever happened to the downtown revitalization plan and the form and design plan? there was a lot of money spent on consultants and a lot of input. Where are those plans? Why are we not using them.?	The plans are being used. The District of Sooke is in the process of negotiating rights-of-way for the new road network in the Town Centre. The new Zoning Bylaw has been developed to make sure that the Town Centre Plan can be implemented.
Q8 comment: Only if the rainwater infiltration mentioned above is included as a mandatory item and/or the proponent obtains a sliver LEED or equivalent building standard.	These are very good goals. The change to a reduced lot coverage for industrial uses is to help with rainwater infiltration, perhaps as a first step towards improved design overall.
Q8 comment: allowing more green areas for natural runoff and for healthy living is what we need to be aware of always. don't pave it all over. be creative with parking material and use of plantings.	Thank you for your comment. It is hoped that reduced lot coverage will provide opportunities for better landscaping, which will reduce runoff. It may take awhile for the changes to be seen on the landscape.
Q9 comment: Live/work opportunities should be considered. Also, food services, laundry, exercise facilities. If you are trying to attract 'high tech' to Sooke – Software developers etc. Employees expect these types of services at their place of employment.	Live-work is a permitted use in the new Technical Industrial Business Park (M5) zone. Food related uses that are permitted include: bakery, commercial kitchen, micro brewery, and restaurant. Commercial laundries are permitted, as are Fitness facilities. It is hoped that when a developer comes along who wants to build a Technical Industrial Business Park, the zone will meet the need.
Q9 comment: big trucks/wide loads on Otter Point Rd going too fast	Thank you for your comment. These kind of traffic concerns are outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.
Q9 comment: Will there be customers for this as many techy people work from their homes as a home based business? How big a park are we talking here and what kind of technology and would it be owned and operated by one technical institutie/	That is a good question ... for which there is no easy answer. Only market forces can decide that. At some point a developer may come along who wants to develop such a park ... As part of that process, market studies will be undertaken to determine the answers to the kinds of questions that you have raised.
Q10 comment: Float homes are not necessarily a health hazard. with all the technology we have now	While it is true that float homes are not necessarily an environmental health hazard, special

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

Appendix A: Comments List

Page A - 11 -

and with a sewer system, it may be attractive to have some float houses	requirements are needed to address environmental considerations. As part of attempts to clean up the Sooke Harbour and Basin, it is felt that floathomes should be discouraged for now.
Q10 comment: I think that if we want to encourage more of a water/seashore focus, float homes are an interesting an diverse addition.	Thank you for your comment. Floathomes can be a very interesting addition to a waterfront, but they also have special needs. If there is a demand for them, a new zone could be developed, or an existing water zone modified.
Q11 comment: Only if the 'living fence' becomes hazardous or dangerous to neighbouring properties.	Thank you for your comment. This issue seems to be controversial in Sooke, and it touches on many different values.
Q11 comment: the three answers provided do not give adequate relief to this question. Living fences along the highway should not be limited. this is for not only the property owner but also for the travelor, ie the highway thru Saseenos. On side yards , it depends what is going on the other side on your neighbors side. if a commercial and a residential use are in conflict then high , green fences, do good neighbors make. If living fences are impacting neighboring property , there can always be dialogue re light in the garden or branches over fence. we all know we can cut anything which comes over our fence. what if living fences are on highways or district property and negatively impact neighbors?	Thank you for your comment. There are many different values and variables at play regarding living fences, and the reasons they are planted in the first place.
Q11 comment: Hard to enforce but makes sence if a green house is on the other side.	Thank you for your comment. Any rule regarding height restrictions on living fences would be very hard to enforce.
Q12 comment: 30 days seems fine, though extended recreational visitors should be permitted to stay longer if they have permission from those running the campground. Council has been pushing for 'legalized suites' in all zones, so that people building houses have a place to live. What more do they require? If you can afford to build a house out here, how can it be hardship if you can't afford somewhere to live in the interim? Maybe some 'money management tips' would be more useful. Seriously! Hardship is being used too frequently lately, if you can't afford to build a house or maintain a mortgage, maybe home ownership isn't the right option for you.	Thank you for your comment.
Q12 comment: Why have a limit on campground stay? If that is how someone wants to live, and they are in a camp ground, what difference is it if someone is there 2 nights, or 100 nights?	Thank you for your comment. Campgrounds are designed for temporary accommodations, and not as primary accommodations. There can be social issues that develop if campground stays are not regulated.
Q12 comment: Why limit campground stays at all? If someone chooses to live in a campground all	See above response.

<p>year long or for a few short days , it shouldn't matter. You could have a campground full all year round with different campers and still have the same affect as having campers live year round on the campground. I think this is a nonsense bylaw and should be scrapped.</p>	
<p>Q13 comment: corridor views to the water need to be protected and also buildings should not raise straight up from sidewalks but slope in gradually so as to allow sunlight and daylight on the street. Building should be built into the hillsides , especially on the water side of the downtown core. they should not stick up straight in front of us and block our views and sunlight nor cause shadow affects on our neighbors, such as the hotel is affecting it's neighbors. no one wants to live , work and play in a dark,cold, wind tunnel. Build for the healthy community</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>Q14 comment: However, can the home sustain 5 vehicles for those 5 unrelated persons? Its tacky how residents are tearing up lawn/flower beds to make room for parking, or just parking on the grass. Boarding homes may be a solution for 'affordable housing', or those here on contract, vacationers, such may be a good fit for 'temporary housing'. May also be good for social housing? Not necessary to delete it, the issue is PARKING, or lack thereof.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Parking can be a big issue, particularly in communities that are very reliant on their cars.</p>
<p>Q17 comment: To a point, there is still nothing that stops a developer from implying a style and price range in a subdivision to entice buyers with false promises who then changes to lower priced, lower quality homes. Where does the conserving of property values work here? I own a \$650,000 house and my neighbors are now \$299,000. ?????</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The issue that you raise is an important one, but outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw to address.</p>
<p>Q17 comment: sooke's rural charachter is already destroyed because of Mariner;s village and also the too small lots and townhouses in the rural areas. definintions need redefining</p>	<p>You raise an important point. How should Sooke's rural character be defined? It seems that the plans that have been adopted identify Sooke's rural character as applying to those areas outside of the Town Centre and sewer specified area. Perhaps the Town Centre and surrounding residential areas should be called "small town" and "walkable community" rather than rural.</p>
<p>Q18 comment: Because 'green', sustainable developements have not been considered. Geo thermal, solar energy etc. Langford INSISTED that Westhills be Green, and look at how successful that development is now!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. It is likely that Langford developed a Comprehensive Development Zone to achieve the successes of the Westhills project. This option is available in Sooke as well.</p>
<p>Q18 comment: Too much emphasis is placed on the SSA. When the sewers expand to Kaltasin and beyond, every property owner along the way will want to develop. There needs to be measures</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Sewers are a factor in determining where density should go, both because septic systems take up a lot of land, and because sewers are expensive and require a</p>

District of Sooke Zoning Bylaw Review:

Public Consultation Report to Committee of the Whole, April 26, 2011.

Appendix A: Comments List

<p>taken to ensure that just because you are now on sewers, does not mean you will be granted rezoning. Those areas should not be looked at for development (except Kaltasin/Idlemore) until the Town Centre has reached maximum density for zones.</p>	<p>certain amount of density to pay for them. No properties are being rezoned to give them development rights, so that the community can determine when increased development should be permitted. The Town Centre plan, and OCP, required that the Town Centre be given priority for density.</p>
<p>Q18 comment: Any change to "Uses permitted in any zone" is a significant change. "Park" and "Conservation Use" have been slipped into the section with no consideration of the consequences. Large scale land acquisitions have recently been made by the TLC and CRD Parks. Summarily inserting "Park" as a use permitted in any zone relieves the CRD of having to rezone the 933ha Harbourview properties currently zoned residential, and deprives the District of roughly \$187,000 in m2 rezoning fees, on top of the loss of tax base and recreational use of the area. Conservation vs. Use is a sensitive and complex balance that should not be summarily weighted on one side. To do so creates conflict. "Park" is an abstraction – it is not a "use." Green space and parks should be planned like any other land designation. Because it can potentially occupy an unlimited footprint, a park should not be defined as a "permitted use" but as a zone (P-1), within which there are permitted uses. Parks are not exclusively an asset, nor do they occupy any particular moral high ground. They create liabilities and externalize costs, and they should not be given a blanket zoning exemption in the planning process. To do so simply removes control of land from the planning process. Costs • Reduction of taxable land base and economic benefit from productive lands • Displacement of density necessary to support services on adjoining settlement areas • Tree-fall on adjoining property, wildfire and animal encroachment into human space • Pre-emption of other permitted uses • Preemption of planned green space – there is such a thing as too much park space • Reduction of buildable land base with corresponding supply pressure on affordability • Consumer of protective services and by-law enforcement • Political liability in resource dependent communities • Displacement of recreational activity • Over-supply of park space results in under-utilization and stress on operation logistics</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Because the District of Sooke, like other municipalities, often acquires parkland as part of the subdivision process, this provision prevents having to undergo a rezone every time the District acquires a small parcel for park use. This permits some administrative streamlining, otherwise known as "cutting red tape" and is generally seen as a good thing.</p> <p>There are a wide variety of parks. For example: tot lots in residential zones, waterfront parks in downtown areas, trails that connect neighbourhoods together without having to use roads, wilderness parks in rural areas, conservation parks in areas with great natural or scenic values. Parks in every zone are generally seen as a good thing by people living in communities because they give them destinations to go to for recreational purposes, both near and far.</p> <p>With regard to your specific concerns about the CRD's park land in Sooke, these lands were acquired as part of an overall regional land use strategy to connect green space throughout the CRD. Like all plans of this type, they were developed using public consultation processes, and involved the District of Sooke's government. Like any landowner, the CRD had to acquire the land to be able to implement the plan.</p> <p>The particular uses permitted in parks, are determined both by the zoning bylaw, which specifies the parameters for uses, and by the owner of the park, so that the uses do not interfere with the purposes of the park.</p>
<p>Q18 comment: not sure that all is covered need to look closer at the bylaw and also the agriculture uses and intensive agriculture uses need to be redefined</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. There will be further opportunities to comment on the proposed Zoning Bylaw.</p>
<p>Q19 comment: Environment needs to be a priority.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. To the extent</p>

Prospective buyers are expecting sustainable living in their homes, perhaps this is why some product in Sooke is not selling. You can lower lot size, coverage, build cheap duplexes, small lots, etc. It will not attract modern buyers.	possible, and based on the District's plans, the proposed Zoning Bylaw has integrated environmentally friendly technologies, and ideas associated with sustainability.
Q19 comment: Increase density in Town Centre. Increase height restrictions in Town Centre.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Bylaw has upgraded zones and integrated heights according to the District's plans.
Q19 comment: I own a MHP in Sooke and the majority of the sites are 4000 to 6000 sq ft in size with single wide homes and the typical size would be 12 X 60 or 720 sq ft. The new bylaw would only allow the owner a 144 sq ft addition in that case. Those that have upgraded will usually expand or add a bedroom and enlarge the living area and only allowing 144 sq ft would be very restrictive. Perhaps they would be better served if any additions could be restricted by the maximum lot coverage and not the floor area of the unit as the smaller units are the ones that need to expand more.	Thank you for your comment. We will take your comment into consideration, and modify the RM1 zone to accommodate your concerns.
Q19 comment: I am concerned that the influence of UN Agenda 21 have weakened our power of the local people to run their our affairs.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Bylaw has been modified based on plans made in Sooke, and subsequently adopted by the District of Sooke.
<b>Other Comments (received via e-mail)</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
I own a business in Sooke, and have been a resident of Sooke, and the western communities all my life. Please remove the word "Park" from your draft land use proposal as this will affect my way of life and hundreds of other people I network with. This is not a good tactic and only increases public dissent, and disobedience, by law abiding citizens who vote! Take it off! Thanks	Thank you for your comment.
I am writing to object to Parks and Horse Trails being permitted in any Zone in the new Zoning Bylaw.	Thank you for your comment. Permitting parks in every zone is a new addition to the Zoning Bylaw. See response to earlier comment on this issue. Horse trails have been permitted in every zone since 2006, and have not caused an issue.

Appendix B: Map Changes

