

Andrea Winkler

From: Judith Walker [jwalker@cumberlandbc.net]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2009 2:59 PM
To: Pino DiMascio; Andrea Winkler
Cc: rroycroft@comoxvalleyrd.ca
Subject: RGS Summary review

Hi Pino & Andrea,

Just a few, very few, comments

Under **Core Settlement Areas**- I think the % targets are high- I'd suggest 50% low, 30% medium and 20% high. The range of units/ha even for the low...are high! Our highest density is probably still in that range!

The municipal areas, the Village section needs rewording. The municipal engineer thought greatest "population yield" rather than "relative capacity" since "capacity" implies infrastructure. I think the word "relative" clarifies it but Bob Hoffstrom(engineer) didn't. The 4300 units is for proposed zoning- not existing zoning. I don't have the numbers for existing zoning, which would require looking at empty lots etc. Do you need that number so that comparison to the other municipalities is consistent?

Under **Core Settlement Areas – Settlement Nodes**, I believe that we included "residential" in the Saratoga Beach node- not just coastal tourism.

Under **Ecosystems, Natural Areas & Parks - Land Use Designation**, I thought that 'Greenway' would be included in that group as a conservation area designation. **Comox Valley Parks & Greenways Strategic Plan:**_ I think it is the CVRD Parks "Department" not "Services". Under **Policy Directions**, 2nd paragraph- I thought there is already a Regional Conservation Strategy??

Transportation: last paragraph under **Current Situation:** "would could"- which one? Suggest "would"!

Regional Services: Solid Waste: "Still many rural areas lack garbage pick-up"- this is not true- just a phone call away, unless you mean that outside of a municipal boundary one makes their own arrangement and pays for service as needed, rather than automatic pick up and charged on your taxes. Perhaps this refers to remote rural areas where there is no service provided by the private companies.

I share the concerns of others in TAC regarding the Settlement Expansion Areas. These areas will be under the most pressure for development- because it's "fringe" area (cheaper, unserviced land) and just because of the word "expansion"! How will applications be reviewed? Under what criteria? Or just a constant gnawing and nibbling? This would be a great focus of a discussion for TAC - may not be an issue right now with the RGS but this will surface with a vengeance and we need to be unanimous and committed to a political and staff approach to the best land use over time for these areas. Oh and just to be really scientifically correct- I understand that it is not a glacier but a "permanent snowfield" but how romantic is that – "Permanent Snowfield Drive" will never catch on!

I understand the CAO's are meeting on Friday so still more comments to come, I am sure!

Thanks!

And if I don't talk to you before- have a Merry Christmas and a good holiday before the RGS resumes in January!

Regards,

Judy

Judith Walker, Planner
Village of Cumberland
ph: 250-336-2291 fax: 250-336-2321
jwalker@cumberlandbc.net



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.