



2022 Election Questionnaire

Candidate Name: Phillip DiBattista

1. Do you support waterfront owners having the legal right to protect their properties from erosion, as long as the requirements of the Development Permit Area (DPA1) are met?

Yes No

Comments: I believe there is a balance that has to be found between government mandates and property owners being able to do what they want/ need to do on their property. I believe it is the owners right to do what they need / want on their property provided that high level regulations are met like DPA1. So yes

2. During the OCP process, there has been discussion of the “Green Shores” approach to prevent erosion of the waterfront. While Green Shores may have value in certain favourable conditions, it is not technically or economically feasible on most waterfront properties in North Saanich. If Green Shores is included in the new OCP, will you commit to seeing it is presented as an option, rather than a requirement?

Yes No

Comments: The OCP is a high level guiding document and is about options not mandates. Once we get into bylaws and policies that's where the details start to come in. I suspect Green Shores will stay in the OCP but again it is about options and from my understanding most of the topography in north Saanich doesn't actually support a green shore option.

3. Currently almost all the residential properties on the waterfront in North Saanich are blanket zoned to a very restrictive M6, which we feel is unwarranted for certain properties in view of recent studies and mapping. Would you consider rezoning from M6 to a less restrictive M5 for waterfront properties which have moderate, low, or very low overall ecological rating as identified by up-to-date mapping?

Yes No



Property Responsibility On the Waterfront

Comments: *The M6 zone for waterfront properties is very much like the R2 designation for general residential properties. Generally speaking, I believe the DNS has a long and needlessly arduous rezoning process which I would like to see streamlined to help make work for our staff more efficient. When it comes to specific rezone applications I am certainly open to owners bringing forward applications for consideration. From the research I have done (which isn't hugely extensive yet) there does seem to be a fare amount of properties that could support an M5 designation.*

4. Waterfront owners feel the current OCP contains language that discourages development of any kind within the DPA1 15-meter setback. In keeping with the 2008 Marine Task Force Report recommendations, would you support more flexible language in the new OCP to allow for structures such as decks, docks, and seawalls, as long as such development would not cause environmental harm?

Yes No

Comments: *I always come from a starting point of yes rather than no. When an application is brought forward to me (I sit on the CPC) I start with why is the applicant doing it and does it make sense. When there are red flags they tend to be obvious. If there are flags to suggest we don't proceed its about the balance of saying yes versus no. But as mentioned above there are a lot of properties where docks / seawalls can be built while having almost in impact or harm to our marine life and the district "Go To" initial Response has historically been no which cause huge and needless expenses for home owners. I believe there is a better approach.*

5. Waterfront owners are concerned that DPA1 contains restrictions that are not only unfair but result in unintended consequences. For example, restrictions in the 15-meter setback lead to neglect and a buildup of combustible material creating a "wildfire fuse" along the waterfront. Would you support a change in OCP, zoning and bylaw language which allows for flexibility and supports the waterfront owner as wanting to be part of the solution of waterfront protection and not treated as part of the problem?

Yes No

Comments: *Again I always start with a yes response and then start a conversation. When we talk about the OCP, Bylaws, zoning, its about engaging with the people affected by those rules and regulations to work towards positive outcomes and guidelines that are balanced*



Property Responsibility On the Waterfront

and easy to understand. The bylaw review is next on council's agenda after the OCP review is finished.

6. For nearly a decade, waterfront owners have been acutely aware of the potential impacts of sea level rise. Studies conducted by the District of North Saanich led to the development of two draft bylaws that would have negatively affected waterfront properties. Would you support having a higher order of government take the lead on this issue?

Yes No

Comments: I will say yes to this but haven't been able to research the two referenced bylaws or the impact they have on owners. Typically the district has responsibility for the 1st 100meters of shoreline before it passes to the next level so this might have to stay with the district but if/ when it comes to council, If I am on council it will certainly be something to discuss.

7. If over the course of your term, Council considers adopting bylaws or changing any regulations or zoning requirements affecting waterfront properties, will you commit to ensuring that every waterfront owner is notified – individually – with a letter outlining the proposed changes and inviting participation in a true consultation process?

Yes No

Comments: YES absolutely YES. This is a huge part of who I am and what I believe responsible government looks like. Communication open, honest transparent and fulsome communication. If we are talking about changes to policy that effects a specific group of residences, we have a duty to ensure everyone is aware and a couple of signs and an update on the webpage doesn't cut it!!!