



Electoral Area 'H' Official Community Plan Review Community Working Group Meeting

Tuesday, March 1, 2016 at 6:30 pm
Lighthouse Community Hall, Nordin Room

Members Present:

Tony Botica	Candace Cowan	Jim Crawford
Dianne Eddy	Nelson Eddy	Bill Friesen
Doug Harrison	Murray Hamilton	Margaret Healey
Ed Hughes	Bob Hunt	Lee Melnychuk
Don Milburn	Chief Michael Recalma	Keith Reid
Jeanette Runions	Ted Seaman	Dave Simpson
Mac Snobelen	Dick Stubbs	Greta Taylor
Lynette Twigge	Len Walker	Laurel Webster

Others Present: Courtney Simpson, RDN Senior Planner
Jamai Schile, RDN Planner
Bill Veenhof, Electoral Area 'H' Director

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Director Veenhof called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm.

Planner Simpson asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. REVIEW OF OBJECTIVES AND AGENDA

Planner Simpson presented the goals and timeline of the Official Community Plan Review project and objectives of the meeting.

Planner Simpson presented a revised agenda that included more detail than the agenda circulated prior to the meeting, and there was general consent to proceed with the agenda as revised.

3. MANDATE FOR WORKING GROUP AND GROUNDRULES

Planner Simpson presented the mandate for the Working Group and proposed a list of groundrules that were accepted by general consent.

4. PRESENTATION ON THE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Planner Simpson presented information about official community plans and how they can address objectives of a community related to the natural environment. She presented maps related to the natural environment and hazards in Electoral Area 'H', information about the anticipated impacts of climate change, and information about development permit areas.

Comments and discussion included the following points:

- Concern that watersheds cross regional district boundaries and there is a need for coordination.
- Shorelines need more protection, including for forage fish habitat.
- Archaeological sites including fish traps should be acknowledged in the Official Community Plan and protected, and there should be educational information about them.
- Improved wildfire hazard mapping is needed.
- A development permit area for wildfire interface areas should be considered.
- The rising cost of development is a concern, even at the small scale of constructing a single family residential home. While protecting the environment is important, when a large area is identified as potentially containing sensitive areas and the property owner bears the cost of a study to determine whether there is something that needs protection, the costs can become prohibitive for little benefit to the environment.

Break for refreshments from approximately 8:00-8:15

5. SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

The Working Group divided into five groups to discuss what needs to change and what can stay the same in the Official Community Plan regarding the natural environment. The pre-reading package, starting at page 6 was suggested as a framework for discussion.

6. PRESENTATION TO LARGE GROUP

A spokesperson from each group reported back to the larger group on their discussion. Flip chart comments are transcribed below.

- Tree removal on steep slopes
 - Stability issue
 - Refer to OCP 2.2 p.2 - not enforced, trees removed.
 - Need to change language regarding tree removal

- Need for professional? Arborist/forester
 - Review development permit (area)
- Coastal Douglas Fir Land Use Order
 - Recognition?
 - Is there a management plan?
 - Poaching issues (ie firewood)
 - Recreation activities? (ie build trails)
- Wildfire hazard
 - Update / new CWPP's
 - Firesmart
 - UBCM funding
- Precautionary principle – study first, build later
- Aquifer data
 - Area of protection?
 - Capacity?
- Trails
 - Need more?
 - Better info and signage / maps (trails)
 - Info on wildlife “alerts”
 - Tourism (mtn bikers, hikers, birders)
- ENFORCEMENT!
- Avoid further development on cliffs and beaches
- Be part of decision making process
 - Advocacy with other stakeholders working in our community
 - ie BC vegetation spraying, Island Corridor, MoTI, and spraying on the beach for *Spartina*
 - cooperating with community to give employment to maintenance in community
 - Use environmentally friendly alternative products
- Tidal jurisdiction? Waterfront
- Protect and document archaeological sites along waterfront of Area H.
- Ensure / right to inform the public
- Clarify and simplify DP process
 - Reminder to protect the environment but ensure legitimate applications are not too onerous
- Recognize low and high density as a planning tool
- Sewer
- Plan has created:
 - Rural integrity
 - Limited growth of village centres
- Water sources, well heads etc

- Environmentally sensitive areas
 - EDP area circles
- Simplicity – clarity in development permit process
- Are the “policy” are we serving the community
- OCP lot size is unrealistic ie 5 acres minimum
- Sewers are the key to future development: environment concerns
- On land treatment
- Directors of RDN should be directing staff not the reverse
- There are other areas other than Bowser Village for development ie Deep Bay Harbour
- Derelict vessels in Deep Bay
- Water quality
 - Development upslope of aquifer
 - Sewer or stage 3 septic
- The current policies and objectives are a hindrance to all development and not user friendly. Too many roadblocks.
- Site specific mapping of what needs to be protected
- Cost of development is making it unaffordable for young people to locate and work in the area
- The RDN act as an advocate for coordination and cooperation between neighbouring districts regarding watershed and shoreline management and all levels of government
- Principle 1: the quality and quantity of our water in our Aquifer needs proven water supplies. New developments which required water service would have to prove that a new water supply was available to meet their needs, not just ride on the back of the existing infrastructure.
- RDN needs to advocate for air quality management (wood burning stoves / heat)

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm