



12 August 2009

Jordan Fisher  
 Jordan Fisher & Associates  
 201 – 25 Government St  
 Victoria, BC V8V 2K4

**RE: Green Shores Review of Essencia Development Submittal**

---

Jordan,

The Green Shores Technical Advisory Group (GSTAG) has reviewed the assessors report of the Essencia Development Proposal and I am attaching that report for your review. The submittal that you provided, which was largely based on a conceptual plan, met prerequisite credits and would qualify as Green Shores certified (Table 1). However, at this stage many of the credits were “provisionally awarded” based on data still needed and would be re-assessed once the design had been finalized and missing data provided.

***The objective of the Pilot Projects is not to determine certification*** but rather to test the certification process. Here are a few of the items that we learned about the process from the Essencia Pilot.

1. In general the Essencia application was very clear and complete. The use of a checklist to indicate which credits were being claimed was especially helpful, and it is a tool that we will incorporate into future assessments.

2. It will probably be necessary to have two phases of review:

**Design Phase Review** – at this stage, design drawings are submitted and these are supported by professionally-certified documents (e.g., signatures by professional engineers or other professional accreditation). Credits would still be *provisionally granted*.

**As-Built Phase Review** – this would be at the completion of the project and would make sure that the actual construction is consistent with design drawings and with the submittals used in the Design Phase Review.

**Table 1 Score Summary**

	Assessor	GSTAG
Credits	Award	Award
PBS1	1	1
PBS2	2	2
PBS3	1	1
PBS4	1	0
SHCP1	1	1
SHCP2	1	1
SHCP3	1	1
SHCP4	1	0
SHCP5	?	0
SHCP6		4
SHCP7	1	1
SHCP8	1	0.2
SM1	3	3
PDP1	1	1
PDP2	2	2
PDP3	1	1
Totals:	18	19.2

■ pre-requisite credit

**Fisher/Page 2 of 3**

The GSTAG team thought that the *Conceptual Submittal*, as was submitted for Essencia, is likely appropriate as an internal review document for the proponent team; a draft assessment/ submission at this stage can still influence design as, in theory, design is not hardened.

At some point in the future, a performance review might be required but for the present Green Shores Credit Rating system, the certification will be provided for the project as constructed.

3. Specific Credit Claimed

See notes summarized in Table 2.

Should you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact us. We are hoping that the Essencia developers will allow the results of the assessment to be posted in the “pilot” sections of our website.

With regards,

John R. Harper, Ph.D., P.Geol.  
Pilot Project Coordinator  
Green Shores Technical Advisory Group

**Table 2 Summary of Issues Related to Green Shores Credit Rating for Essencia**

Number	Credit	Explanation
PBS1	Siting of New Permanent Structures	This credit emphasizes the importance of “establishing” the natural boundary early in the project so that setbacks and elevations can then be referenced. For this project especially, where the elevation criteria is likely the issue, fixing the natural boundary and overlaying a detailed topographic survey will be critical. State that a figure showing the surveyed natural boundary, 2m contour and proposed/constructed buildings would be required to receive this credit at the “as built” stage
PBS2	Optional Siting Credit	Significant setback proposed
PBS3	Conservation Area Designated	GS needs to reword this to indicate areas “will be conserved” – not necessarily a designated conservation area.
PBS4	Remediation of Contaminated Sites	Contamination not officially designated; need to determine a minimum area of contamination to acquire this point (e.g., 5 m <sup>3</sup> of soil removal not large enough for credit)
SHCP1	Conservation of Critical and Sensitive habitat	no issues
SHCP2	Riparian Zone	no issues
SHCP3	Conservation of Coastal Sediment Processes	no issues but see SHCP8 comment
SHCP4	Rehabilitation of Sensitive Coastal Habitat	GSTAG felt award of this credit amounts to double-counting with SHCP6. The double-count issue is one that has arisen several times in the pilots and it will be revised in the next version of the GS credit document.
SHCP5	Rehabilitation of Degraded Habitat	As claimed this is a double count of the contaminated site credit and the SHCP4 and should not be granted. given the small contamination area (<<1% of the alongshore length of the property, this credit should not be granted.
SHCP6	Enhanced Riparian Zone	Credits SHCP2, SHCP4 and SHCP6 are all claimed for riparian-related enhancement. The credits for the enhanced riparian are probably most appropriately awarded in this credit, as opposed to SHCP4 but should not be awarded in both credits. From the conceptual plan it is clear that 1.5 points will be awarded for lineal extent of riparian (to 90% of shoreline, but without further detail we don’t know the planned extent of the width of functional riparian (certainly 10m but as much as 30m?? Therefore we anticipate that 2-3 (10-20m of width) would likely be granted.
SHCP7	Light Pollution Reduction	GSTAG felt that this credit should be awarded if NO lighting of foreshore/riparian area is proposed so we don’t actually encourage lighting to be installed just to get a credit (i.e., “credit mining”). Credits will be updated to reflect this change.
SHCP8	Remediation of coastal Processes	GSTAG modified the assessors award. In credit SHCP3, it was indicated that the existing structure has no impact on coastal processes so a full credit award is not appropriate. However, GS wants to encourage property owners to “improve” so some recognition is appropriate. GSTAG decided that this is an example where a partial credit may be appropriate. GSTAG will develop guidelines for partial credit award.
SM1	Storm-water credit	no issues
PDP1	Environmental Management Plan	no issues
PDP2	Innovation	The credit claim for a charrette was awarded by the assessors but GSTAG thought that the charrette alone was not especially innovative. BUT the extensive community consultation and the subsequent significant modification of design based on the consultation should be the basis for the award of an innovation credit. The other credit claim – for the protection of 100% foreshore and the extensive set back raised some issues about how innovative a design feature is to be claimed. Bird friendly buildings were not considered to be clearly Green Shore related and not awarded.
PDP3	Education and Outreach	no issues