

## **Britannia Village Flood Control Project – Working Group Meeting March 23, 2011**

Intro by Councillor Taylor– Thank you's, background, objectives of working group (bring consensus to the community)

Councillor Taylor: Want to get to a point where we are in agreement of how to proceed and how to communicate our findings to the community. Referred to past “Surveys of Interest” and committed to having the City officially respond in writing. Tie off loose ends and put the past to rest and move forward with a fresh start.

### Bruce Reid (RVCA): Overview of Summary

In the 2 years since last spoke to community about design approach there were some miscommunications in the community about the project objectives.

RVCA prepared a “Summary of Background Information” to set the record straight with up to date information – it was distributed prior to the meeting; Bruce provided a brief verbal overview of its content.

### Questions from Group:

- Could we see a plan sketch of the original conceptual drawing? RVCA: Design would have to be re-visited - old plans outdated. Need to have site visits to progress
- EA process – how long? what does it take? Next steps etc. RVCA: Similar to what was discussed in Feb 2009 – stake out design for individual meeting with land owners to gather their feedback. Open to options on how design is made. Is there a design that ties into and blends into existing properties. Nova Tech design is only a starting point of the design Dell Can is to take all factors / designs into account in coming up with a plan. Late April before site visits can happen.
- Time line seems to be longer than originally implied? RVCA: there are processes that have to be followed so we can not control the time line. Tender could happen realistically in 2012 (providing a relatively smooth process)
- How will this project affect zoning for re-building / renovations etc? RVCA: If flood control works are built, the zoning could be adjusted to formally recognize a designated Flood Fringe area., whereas it is currently designated floodway. Currently, additions are restricted to 20% of existing floor area or 20 square metres, whichever is less, wherever flood depth on roadway in front of property is greater than 30 cm. Essentially, any rebuilds have to remain in their same footprint same building size, unless there is safe access to the building under 1;100 year flood conditions. In Flood Fringe, additions and rebuilds can go beyond 20% up to whatever is allowed by the current zoning provisions under the flood plain overlay, but new construction will need to be flood-proofed. RVCA will continue to oppose new lot creation or zoning amendments to establish more residential units in the area of reduced flood risk (remedial flood protection works are intended to protect existing homes not increased # of households in an area where there are inherent risks, i.e. they do not invite intensification)

The group did not request any changes or additions to the Summary of Background Information document dated February 2011

### Objectives to be Met:

- Councillor Taylor: Everyone has to agree on what objectives are (bring consensus)
- Question on point 1 (1:100 flood risk). Debate on what underlying issue is: building restrictions or community safety risk
- Councillor Taylor highlighted need to clarify and dispell misinformation (Website to address this with impartial information by RVCA)
- Debate in group as to what the level of risk actually is and how it's measured (e.g. reasonable response times, reasonable access, safety also determined by amount/depth and velocity of water on roadway)
- Question on how city has improved the EMS services – was this factored in? (does it appropriately address the risk?). RVCA: there are no Provincial standards for response times etc. Comment from member of group: Want highest level of community safety with an authority in control).
- 1979 Flood (in historical context) described more as extremely stressful & inconvenient than actual emergency. Councillor Taylor: What are safety markers to be hit? RVCA: Approach from risk management view – are we safe enough? There will never be a fool proof plan – always some risk (1:200 flood risk etc.)
- Debate on actual level of support within the community. RVCA: Unleash the creative forces to solve our objectives
- Councillor Taylor: look at points broader context and leave minute details for future meetings
- Designate Britannia a separate “village” similar to Embrun etc? May not be effective
- Concern with time limit on \$670k budget – wants to move quickly. Councillor Taylor clarified budget concern – although we have to be time cautious there is still opportunity to meet our objectives
- Could we be designated as 2 zones to achieve both community safety and building restriction concerns. (without berm)
- Debates on merit of Gabian Basket / Cobblestone or Removable Barriers. RVCA: measures are temporary or do not fulfill all requirements for 1:100 flood risk
- Point 7 – everyone agreement to keep costs to \$670k
- Point 6 – Comment shail flood proofing would this worsen ground water seeping into basements. RVCA: no study, only anecdotal info to imply that water would be flooded. Added a point to ensure the project does not worsen basement flooding
- Point 5 – Concern with vague wording of point and that this is an RVCA desire not a community concern. Community would like re-wording. RVCA echoes points made that we need to have a long term vision of what we want the flood proofing to look like
- Bruce will reword to marry points 4 and 5.
- Point 4: Further debate on removable barrier (RVCA: not within the scope of current project. We would need to cease this study and start another more expensive study
- Mutually satisfactory - wording implies that everyone has to be satisfied

RVCA: If Nova Tech option is not preferred we can go back to the drawing board and do new design

- Point 3: Re-word – Objective -> provide drainage -> remove “passing over the barrier”
- Points 1 and 2 cont'd: Combine points 1&2 as point 2 is a regulatory requirement

Concern with discussions moving away from focused path to building a Berm and the RVCA managing it on an ongoing basis