
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair & Members of the Electoral Area Services Committee
Chair & Members of the Regional Board

From: Graham Daneluz, Manager of Forward Plans

Date: November 15, 2010

Subject: 2nd Reading & Delegation of Public Hearing
Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw No. 0999, 2010

File No.: 6480-20-600

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Regional Board give Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw No. 0999, 2010 second reading as amended

THAT the Regional Board consider Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw No. 0999, 2010 as amended in conjunction with the FVRD Five Year Financial Plan and Solid Waste Management Plan pursuant to Section 882 of the Local Government Act

THAT the Regional Board deem Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw No. 0999, 2010 as amended to be compatible with and consistent with the FVRD Five Year Financial Plan and Solid Waste Management Plan

THAT the Regional Board refer Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw No. 0999, 2010 as amended to a second public hearing;

THAT the Regional Board delegate holding of the second public hearing to Electoral Area "F" Director Dick Bogstie

AND THAT other members of the Regional Board may attend the public hearing in which case the director to whom the hearing is delegated will chair the public hearing

BACKGROUND

The Regional Board gave first reading to Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw No. 0999, 2010 in June 2010. An open house was held on September 20, 2010 and the public hearing was held on September 23, 2010. Both were at the McConnell Creek Farmers Institute Hall. The public hearing report was received by the Electoral Area Services Committee and Regional Board in October, 2010. A copy of the public hearing report has been placed in the Directors Room for review in conjunction with this item.

DISCUSSION

Bylaw 0999 has been amended to reflect the comments received at the public hearing. Significant amendments include:

- the LIMITED USE designation is amended to remove resource extraction use from the list of permitted uses;¹
- Section 11.2 Aggregate & Minerals is amended in a variety of ways to address public comments;
- Map 4 Cultural Resources is amended to mask the location of archaeological sites as requested by the Archaeology Branch;
- Map 5 Transportation Networks is amended to show a potential future road connection between Cascade Ridge Drive and Lundgren Road as requested by the Ministry of Transportation; and,
- Section 14 Temporary Use Permits is amended to reflect recent changes in provincial legislation.

A number of minor amendments were also made to improve wording and clarity.

Amendments since first reading / public hearing are detailed in the appendices attached to this memo. The appendices summarize comments received from:

- referral to agencies (Appendix 1);
- verbal comments provided at the public hearing (Appendix 2); and,
- written comments received at the public hearing (Appendix 3);

and identify how staff have amended draft Bylaw 0999 or otherwise recommend responding to the comment.

Second Public Hearing

Pursuant to Sections 882 and 894 of the Local Government Act, after the public hearing of an official community plan bylaw, any amendment that would alter a use from that originally specified will trigger the requirement for a new public hearing. As mentioned above, the LIMITED USE designation is amended to delete Resource Extraction from the list of permitted uses. This change means that a second public hearing must be held for Bylaw 0999.

Review of the OCP in Conjunction with other Plans (as required by s. 882 of the Local Gov't Act)

In June, 2010 – prior to first reading – the Regional Board considered Hatzic Valley OCP Bylaw 0999 in conjunction with the current 5-year Financial Plan and the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP). The Board resolved that Bylaw 0999 is compatible and consistent with these plans. This conclusion was informed in part by advice from staff (in a memo dated May 31, 2010) that the Directors of Finance and Engineering had reviewed Bylaw 0999 and had not found anything inconsistent with either the Financial Plan or the SWMP.

Amendments to Bylaw 0999 since first reading are relatively minor and do not relate to matters which could affect the Financial Plan or the SWMP. Accordingly, staff suggests that Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area “F” Bylaw No. 0999 as amended remains compatible with and consistent with both the Financial Plan and the Solid Waste Management Plan. Copies of these plans will be placed in the Directors Room for review in conjunction with Bylaw 0999.

Next Steps

1. 2nd reading
2. public hearing (second)
3. receive public hearing report and consider input received
4. third reading
5. submit to Province for approval
6. adopt bylaw

COSTS

Costs associated with the Plan update are included in the 2010 EA Planning budget.

¹ As EA Directors will know, the Regional District is not able to prohibit the extraction of gravel as a land use. Deleting reference to resource extraction in the permitted uses set out in the OCP will not prevent new aggregate operations from emerging. Nevertheless, FVRD can choose to be silent on the matter in the land use designations established in its official community plans as a way to express concerns with existing aggregate operations and to reflect community opposition to new ones.

COMMENTS

Chief Administrative Officer:

Deputy Director of Planning:

Director of Finance:

reviewed and supported

reviewed and supported

Graham Daneluz, Manager of Forward Plans

Agency Referral Comments received prior to Public Hearing (Set 23, 2010)
 Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley Bylaw No. 0999 2010

Agency	Comment	Response
Min. Transportation & Infrastructure	-5.8.7 What about Section 946 Local Government Act? What about smaller lots if community water and sewage show up? -6.1.8 What about showing the connections of roads, what the Ministry would like to see and highlighted on Map 1? -6.2.5 Should only be wells not open sources for water intakes. -6.3 Maybe the RD should be looking at taking on community systems that could be installed when new development takes place to accommodate new and old. The RD talks about clustering so this would fit in. -8.1.5 Should subdivision applications be added, rather than just development applications.	FVRD Bylaw 618 addresses "subdivision for a relative" under S. 946 of the Local Gov't Act. It states that: "Where an Official Settlement Plan, an Official Community Plan, or a Rural Land Use Bylaw exists and specifies a minimum parcel size, the minimum size of a parcel that may be subdivided shall be no less than 2.0 hectares or twice the minimum parcel size specified by the OSP, OCP or RLUB designation for that parcel, whichever is greater" If services are available in the future, the Board may consider smaller lots through redesignating RURAL lands to SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL. No amendments recommended. Staff will approach MoT to identify future road connections the Ministry would like to see.
District of Mission	-5.5.6 Properties within this proposed designation are located adjacent to the border of the District of Mission. If applications for redesignation (OCP amendments) for properties along this border will be referred to the District of Mission for comment we have not further comments/concerns regarding the draft OCP.	In most cases, yes. DARD Land Use & Subdivision Regulation Bylaw requires that subdivisions be served by either a well or a community water system. It may be possible for a community water system approved by the Fraser Health Authority to utilize water from a surface sources, though it is increasingly uncommon. It is possible for FVRD to take on a community sewage disposal system through a local service area. In some cases it may be desirable, in others it may not be desirable. FVRD is seeking to develop a comprehensive policy regarding sewage disposal systems. This questions will be addressed in more detail then. Yes. Development approvals includes subdivision although FVRD is not the approving authority for subdivision applications.
Sto:lo Research & Resource Mgmt Centre (Sto:lo Nation)	-Requested more time	Policy 1.7.4 is amended as follows: The District of Mission should be consulted about amendments to this Plan that may affect their interests, <i>particularly when land designations along the municipal boundary are under consideration</i> . The scope and form of consultation shall be determined by the Regional Board and informed by discussion with the municipality. Staff subsequently met with Sto:lo staff and agreed upon a new comment deadline. However, no further comments received. More recently, staff have again contacted Sto:lo Nation to solicit comments.

<p>Hatzic Prairie, Durieu, McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association</p>	<p>—Plan Objectives: stronger statement requested about sustainable agriculture.</p>	<p>The desire of the community to have sustainable agricultural practices is identified in several places within the Plan. Objective 4 of the Plan is to "enhance sustainable agriculture by reserving agricultural lands for farming, minimizing conflicts between farm and non-farm uses; and, supporting the viability and sustainability of the agricultural sector. In addition, section 4.4.4 of the Plan states, "The Regional Board particularly encourages soil-based agricultural uses that emphasize sustainable farm practices, do not impact ground and surface water quality, and implement environmental farm plans." Policy 5.1.15 addresses intensive agriculture. Impacts to water from livestock operations are addressed in Section 10. Staff believe that these statements sufficiently identify the desire for sustainable agriculture. No amendments recommended.</p>
	<p>—Riparian Habitats: In McConnell Creek we have tailed frogs, red legged frogs and Oregon snail.</p>	<p>Section 9.1 amended to include tailed frogs. Red-legged frogs and Oregon forestsnail already identified.</p>
	<p>—Upland Habitats: We have cougar and lynx.</p>	<p>Section 9.2 amended to identify cougar and lynx</p>
<p>Min. of Tourism, Culture & the Arts (Arch. Branch)</p>	<p>—Removal of archaeological site locations from Map 4 Cultural Resources.</p>	<p>Map 4 amended to address this concern.</p>
<p>Ministry of Forests & Range</p>	<p>—Recommended contacting 5 approved FSP's.</p> <p>—In order to be able to meet its obligations with the above licensees and others, the province may require granting access to gravel from the two quarries mentioned in page 27 of the proposed plan. Therefore, the province must have free access to aggregate material to meet their obligations with their clients.</p>	<p>The draft OCP will be brought to the attention of the 5 forest licensees.</p> <p>The two aggregate operations identified in the Plan are private quarries (Ekset and Stave Lk Quarries). It is difficult to understand how private quarries figure in to any obligations that the Ministry of Forests has to forest licensees, or how the Province could have free access to material from quarries on private land. Moreover, despite any reliance by the public or gov't agencies on material from private quarries, private quarries are under the jurisdiction of the Mines Act and are subject in various ways to local government bylaws. No Plan amendments recommended.</p>
	<p>—Aggregate material may also be needed to meet the provinces commitment to public safety. The MFR would like to maintain the right to extract these materials from these pits in coordination with the pits permit holders. Should the province need to use processed material, it would purchase it from the pits permit holder.</p>	<p>The Ministry seems to make the point that material from the two quarries in the Plan area is needed for forestry activities and emergency response. However, it is difficult to understand how the Ministry has any right to extract materials from these pits. No Plan amendments recommended.</p>

	<p>—The MFR must be contacted for timber cut authorities, invasive plants management, forest health management and other resources uses.</p> <p>—Licensees can be contacted to request reviewing their specific development for the year.</p>	<p>New policy added: 11.1.10 The Regional District will liaise with the Ministry of Forests & Range regarding forestry uses, invasive plant management, forest health issues, and resource uses.</p> <p>Extng policy covers this. See 11.1.5: The Regional Board recommends that, where forestry activities are proposed upstream or upslope of settled areas, forest licensees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. hold community meetings to present forest stewardship plans and site-level plans to residents and receive community input; and, b. directly consult the owners of property in the vicinity of proposed forestry activities during the development of forest stewardship plans and also through operational phases to coordinate activities. No amendment recommended.
<p>Dewdney Area Improvement District</p>	<p>—1.7.1 Suggest changing the words "will meet and often exceed" for better readability.</p> <p>—3.1 Agriculture is an important employer in EA F; not mentioned.</p> <p>—4.4.6 Should identify who is responsible for ditch maintenance.</p> <p>—9.1.9(c) Consider allowing accommodation for seasonal farm labour to serve the local area, rather than just the farm unit on which it is located.</p>	<p>Sec. 1.7.1 amended to read "Consultation during the development, amendment or repeal of this official community plan will meet or exceed the requirements..."</p> <p>Sec 2.2 amended to identify agriculture as important employer.</p> <p>Sec 4.4 amended to identify responsibility for ditch maintenance</p> <p>Housing for seasonal farm workers engages some complex issues in rural areas. Accordingly, Sec 4.4.2 identifies the need for a plan or policy to guide the provision of housing for farm workers. Staff recommend that Sec. 6.1.9 remain as drafted until this broader plan or policy is in place.</p>
<p>Dewdney Area Improvement District</p>	<p>—5.1.13 Are there farm uses for which setbacks from intensive agricultural activities are not defined?</p>	<p>Sec 5.1.13 sets out a general principle that potential conflicts between intensive ag uses and other land uses should be avoided through minimum separation distances. This policy would be engaged during rezoning or OCP amendment applications. Separation distances would be established at that time. In addition, the zoning bylaw establishes some setback requirements for some intensive ag uses, including distance from a water supply, a water course, a lot line, and a dwelling unit. These setbacks are generally sufficient to minimize on-farm conflicts between intensive ag uses and other on-farm activities and features. No Plan amendment recommended.</p>

<p>—5.7 Consider identifying need to maintain or establish public access to water bodies in this section.</p>	<p>Sec 5.7.6 states that "Development in RESORT areas must avoid or mitigate environmental impacts, maintain access to riparian foreshore areas and avoid alienation of public amenities." This existing policy appears to substantially address the comment. It is acknowledged that the policy as it stands does not identify the need to <i>establish</i> access (as opposed to maintain access). Establishing new patterns of public access to water bodies within or adjacent to private property is legally complex and not desirable in all instances. In the context of new development proposals, the Board could seek to improve public access to water bodies. No amendments to the policy are recommended.</p>
<p>—5.9.7(c) This clause seems inconsistent with 5.9.5(c) - review.</p>	<p>Sec 9.5.7 is amended to address this.</p>
<p>—6.1.5 Suggest mentioning that landowners are encouraged to upgrade culverts on private property.</p>	<p>Sec. 6.1.5 states that: "Landowners are encouraged to: maintain culverts and other waterway crossings to preserve their capacity to pass high flows; and upgrade substandard culverts so that they can pass 1:200 year storm flows." The policy as drafted appears sufficient to encourage landowners to upgrade culverts on private property. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—8.2 In discussion of Fraser River floodplain, it states that floodplain extends to an elevation of 9.5 metres - review against most current information.</p>	<p>The 2006 Fraser River Hydraulic Model report by Northwest Hydraulic Consultants identifies a Fraser river 1:200 flood profile of about 9.4 m GSC at the confluence of Hatzic Slough and about 9.7 m GSC at the confluence with Nicomen Slough (at the west end of Nicomen Island). Freeboard of 0.6 m is usually added to the flood profile to arrive at the flood construction level. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—8.2.7 Suggest using "will" rather than "should".</p>	<p>8.2.7 states: "The Regional District should work with the Dewdney Area Improvement District on an ongoing basis to review and confirm flood level triggers for emergency response actions and communication protocols for reporting water levels and dyke conditions." Outcomes are not entirely within the control of FVRD, therefore is it appropriate that the policy express a value (what should happen) as opposed to an expected outcome (what will happen). No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—8.2.11 Suggest using "will" rather than "should".</p>	<p>Sec 8.2.11 advocates for upgrate of the pump station - a matter beyond the control of FVRD. Accordingly, "should" is appropriate terminology. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—9.1 White sturgeon are confirmed in Hatzic Lake.</p>	<p>Sec 9.1 amended to reflect white sturgeon as a confirmed species</p>
<p>—11.1.3 Suggest using "will" rather than "should".</p>	<p>Amended as suggested.</p>

<p>—11.2.6 No disturbance areas between aggregate operations and streams should be determined by on-site professional review, rather than prescribed standard of 30m.</p>	<p>Sec 11.2.6 is amended to read: "All mining activities should maintain a "no disturbance" riparian buffer from all watercourses and wetlands to protect water quality, hydrological functions and riparian habitat."</p>
<p>—13.1.16 Replace the word "might" so that the sentence is clearer and more direct.</p>	<p>The wording of this section has been improved to be more clear.</p>
<p>—13.1.17 Penalties should reflect the offence; some offences may warrant penalties greater than \$10,000.</p>	<p>The wording of this section is derived from the applicable clause in the Local Government Act. Under the Act, the maximum penalty is \$10,000. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—13.2 Area of application should be determined by site-specific professional review.</p>	<p>Section 13.2 implements the provincial Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR). Local Governments are required to implement RAR as it was enacted by the Province. No amendments are recommended.</p>

<p>Kwantlen First Nation</p>	<p>—The area of interest falls within the boundaries of Kwantlen First Nation traditional territory and represents a potential infringement of our aboriginal title and rights.</p> <p>—A \$300.00 referral application fee was requested for further review of the OCP.</p>	<p>Kwantlen FN has been offered further consultation opportunities to identify matters of concern.</p> <p>Not relevant to proposed OCP policies.</p>
<p>Ministry of Agriculture and Lands</p>	<p>—Table 4.1 The uses listed may be present on the ALR but are not necessarily compatible with agriculture. Caution needs to be taken when allowing these uses in the ALR.</p> <p>—Table 4.2 MAL does not recommend subdivision on farmland. Prefer no minimum parcel size be established for the agricultural designation and existing agricultural parcels be retained.</p>	<p>ALR lands within the Plan area are designated AGRICULTURAL. The Use Policies in this Designation (5.1.6 to 5.1.15) address this matter. No amendments recommended.</p> <p>Deletion of minimum parcel size policies would assist subdivision of AGRICULTURAL lands rather than avoid it. ALC regulations do not establish minimum parcel sizes. Staff feel that existing parcel size policies for AGRICULTURAL lands are appropriate. They are sixteen hectares for lands within the Fraser River and Stave Lake floodplains or otherwise subject to flood hazards; and, four hectares for lands outside the Fraser River and Stave Lake floodplains and not otherwise subject to flood hazards. In addition, the ALC, which must approve any subdivision in the ALR, provides an additional level of protection for agriculture during the subdivision application process. No amendment recommended.</p>
	<p>—4.2 The MAL suggests to achieve optimal productivity in the ALR it is not best to encourage more housing.</p> <p>—4.2.3 MAL is developing a Ministry standard on residential uses within the ALR.</p> <p>—4.3 It is important to keep the ALR and the viability of farming in mind when allowing associated rural residential uses.</p>	<p>Sec 3.2 set outs the objectives of the Plan. Two objectives are to: 1) enhance sustainable agriculture by reserving agricultural lands for farming, minimizing conflicts between farm and non-farm uses; and, supporting the viability and sustainability of the agricultural sector; and,</p> <p>2) accommodate modest growth at historic rates primarily through infill development on rural and residential lands. Plan policies do not encourage residential development of agricultural lands. No amendments recommended.</p> <p>Sec 4.2.3 states: "Under certain conditions, the Regional Board may establish zoning in areas designated AGRICULTURAL, LIMITED USE, RURAL, and SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL to permit second dwellings." Any standards developed by MAL will be considered in future Plan updates and any subsequent policy and zoning initiatives. No amendments recommended.</p> <p>Sec 5.1.1. states "Agricultural land shall be preserved by preventing the fragmentation of farm parcels, retaining large agricultural parcels, and avoiding the introduction of incompatible uses." No amendments recommended.</p>

<p>—4.4 Suggest creating an Agriculture Area Plan (AAP) to study property boundaries more closely.</p>	<p>This matter is dealt with in: 4.4.2 which states that: "The Regional Board should seek funding for the development of an Agriculture Plan for Hatzic Valley to establish a guiding vision for local agriculture and a series of strategies that will ensure its long-term viability; and, 4.4.8 which states "The Regional Board may consider the feasibility and desirability of a replotting scheme to rationalize property boundaries along Lagace Creek approximately between Stave Lake and Dale Roads, particularly if it is desired by affected landowners and if it would reduce flooding, manage sedimentation, improve the use of agricultural land, or provide community amenities"</p>
<p>—4.4.1 The MAL would like to take part in an AAP with the FVRD.</p>	<p>Policy 4.4.1 amended to state: "The Regional Board should seek funding and partnerships with the Ministry of Agriculture & Lands and others for the development of an Agriculture Plan for Hatzic Valley to establish a guiding vision for local agriculture and a series of strategies that will ensure its long-term viability."</p>
<p>—4.4.4 The language does not match the intent of provincial legislation regarding farming areas, which encourages a wide range of agricultural activities.</p>	<p>4.4.4 states: "The Regional Board particularly encourages soil-based agricultural uses that emphasize sustainable farm practices, do not impact ground and surface water quality, and implement environmental farm plans." This policy states that preferences of the local community. The Plan acknowledges the primacy of the ALC on matters of farm use within the ALR and also acknowledges the Right to Farm Act. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—5.1 MAL encourages local governments to only forward applications that meet the statements within their OCPs and other growth and development strategies.</p>	<p>This statement presumably refers to ALR applications. The OCP will set out the policies of the Board respecting land use. These policies will substantially inform the response of the Board to ALR applications. Presumably, the Board would not support an application that is contrary to the OCP. However, even in instances where the Board opposed an application, it may wish to forward the application to the ALC for decision. The Plan as drafted does not contain policies which specifically address that situation.</p>
<p>—5.1.1 Avoiding incompatible uses onto the ALR is important. An Agricultural Area Plan would best identify supplemental and ancillary uses.</p>	<p>Avoiding incompatible uses in the ALR is important. Also agree that an agricultural plan would be very useful for identifying new supplemental and ancillary uses that should be introduced to the area. Plan policies support the development of an agriculture plan. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—5.1.6 Farming should be the primary use in areas designated agriculture.</p>	<p>An objective of the Plan is to "enhance sustainable agriculture by reserving agricultural lands for farming, minimizing conflicts between farm and non-farm uses; and, supporting the viability and sustainability of the agricultural sector. 5.1.1 states: "Agricultural land shall be preserved by preventing the fragmentation of farm parcels, retaining large agricultural parcels, and avoiding the introduction of incompatible uses." 5.1.14 states: "Preservation and enhancement of existing agricultural operations in the AGRICULTURAL designation shall have priority over newly proposed non-farm uses." No amendments recommended.</p>

<p>—5.1.13 Minimum separation distances could inadvertently restrict the growth of agriculture. The ALC encourages edge planning.</p>	<p>Sec 5.1.13 is amended to read: "Potential conflicts between intensive agricultural operations and other land uses should be minimized by establishing minimum separation distances between conflicting uses and by edge planning to avoid land use conflicts."</p>
<p>—5.1.14 Non-farm use needs careful examination as many can inhibit agricultural activities.</p>	<p>Sec 5.1.14 states: "Preservation and enhancement of existing agricultural operations in the AGRICULTURAL designation shall have priority over newly proposed non-farm uses."</p>
<p>—5.1.15 We recommend this bullet be eliminated. The limitations in (a) and (b) are not possible without the development of a farm bylaw with the permission of the Minister of Agriculture and Lands. (c) is difficult to address on an individual parcel basis.</p>	<p>5.1.15 states: "While the matter of intensive agricultural uses within the Agricultural Land Reserve is not within the jurisdiction of the Regional District, the objectives of the Regional Board concerning intensive agricultural uses within AGRICULTURAL areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. intensive agricultural uses should not occur on parcels with less than four (4) hectares of arable land; b. intensive agricultural uses should be sited with consideration to adjoining properties, adjacent land uses and riparian areas; and, c. intensive agricultural uses should be proportionate to the capability of the land and the receiving environment to sustain the use." This policy recognized the primary of the ALC, but states the position of the Board on these matters. This is a longstanding Board policy for Hatzic Valley. This policy could support the development of a farm bylaw in the future. No amendments recommended.
<p>—5.1.16 & 5.1.17 MAL recommends that no minimum lot size be established for agricultural areas.</p>	<p>See comment above. No amendment recommended.</p>
<p>—5.2 Conservation areas on farmland can restrict agricultural uses, language amendment needed so new conservation areas cannot be established within the ALR.</p>	<p>Disagree. Subject to the limitation in the AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE USE, SUBDIVISION AND PROCEDURE REGULATION, conservation uses are permitted in the ALR unless prohibited by a local government. Nevertheless, the areas(near agricultural lands) that proposed in this Plan to be designated Conservation Use are Crown lands forming current or former stream channels. Plan policies support the maintenance of these channels to improve drainage, reduce flooding, etc to benefit agriculture. No amendment recommended.</p>
<p>—5.8 If farming is to be encouraged outside the ALR, then rural use and subdivision policies need to be revised to reflect the comments on the definition of Intensive Agriculture in section 15.0.</p>	<p>Plan policies direct the modest residential growth needed to meet historic rates of housing demand to rural areas outside the ALR. Plan policies do not support intensive agriculture in RURAL or LIMITED USE designation. No amendments recommended.</p>

<p>—5.9.5 Subdivision upslope from agricultural lands can have deleterious impacts on agriculture land. Take measures to ensure increased runoff does not occur or put infrastructure in place to accommodate increased runoff.</p> <p>—5.10 There are measures in place to protect water quality.</p> <p>—5.10.9 Confined livestock do not increase the risk of groundwater contamination if they have well-designed barn and manure storage structures. Placing excessive restrictions on this type of operation would hinder various objectives of this OCP.</p>	<p>Section 10.2 of the Plan contains several polices which address runoff. No amendments recommended.</p> <p>Sec 10 of the Plan addressed groundwater and surface water quality.</p>
<p>—5.10.10 If pesticide application is regulated outside the ALR then care should be taken to control noxious weeds.</p>	<p>Sec 5.10.9 states: "The Regional Board will not support intensive agriculture uses within the Community Watershed Protection Area in locations outside of the Agricultural Land Reserve." A priority of the OCP is to protect water quality, particularly the supply for the community water system. Intensive agricultural uses should take place in locations within the ALR. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—6.2.1 Policy should ensure existing agriculture use is not negatively impacted and should consider future agriculture needs.</p>	<p>Sec 5.10.10 states: "Except where required for agricultural uses, the application of pesticides should be avoided within the Community Watershed Protection Area. If the use of pesticides can not be avoided, it should be done with the utmost caution." The policy provided the needed flexibility to address this situation. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>—7.2 Recommends farmers be closely consulted regarding trail development due to potential problems that may occur.</p>	<p>Sec. 6.2.1 address expansion of the community water system. It is amended to state that "expansion of the system will not negatively impact farm uses within the Agricultural Land Reserve". The community water system provides for domestic needs. The system is not designed to provide for the needs of the agricultural sector.</p>
<p>—7.2.3 amended to state: "A network of roadside and off-road routes for pedestrian, cycle and equestrian use should be identified and developed over time with a priority on routes to community meeting spaces, school and commercial services. Residents and farmers should be consulted about any trail development so that potential conflicts and problems can be identified and addressed."</p>	<p>Sec 7.2.3 amended to state: "A network of roadside and off-road routes for pedestrian, cycle and equestrian use should be identified and developed over time with a priority on routes to community meeting spaces, school and commercial services. Residents and farmers should be consulted about any trail development so that potential conflicts and problems can be identified and addressed."</p>

—15.0 The MAL does not include a definition for "intensive agriculture" in the Guide to Bylaw Development. The LGA s.915 ensures that those types of agriculture listed in the "intensive agriculture" definition here are an outright use despite a zoning bylaw to the contrary. No scale is included. For areas outside the ALR you may wish to limit the scale of farm operations to address your concerns. We suggest possibly using the definition of "agriculture" that is stated in our Guide to Bylaw Development and then add density restrictions to a zoning bylaw.

Definitions used in the MAL guide are much broader than those used in FVRD plans and bylaws. The primacy of the ALC and senior government with respect to farm uses is recognized in the Plan. Nevertheless, the Plan (if adopted as drafted) states the views of the Regional Board with respect to intensive agricultural uses. The Board may wish to consider establishing animal density provisions in zoning bylaws in the future. Alternatively, MAL and the ALC could establish animal density thresholds to protect regional ground and surface water and improve overall farm sustainability. The policies of the Plan would support such efforts. No amendments recommended.

**Summary of Verbal Comment made at the Sept 23, 2010 Public Hearing
Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley Bylaw 0999, 2010**

Comment	Response
I was not available for the open house nor have high speed internet at home so I was unable to download the draft Plan. I put forth a motion that we have an additional public consultation, to address most of the concerns I have heard here tonight.	Plan amendments are recommended that will require that Bylaw 0999 be brought back for a second public hearing.
I only heard about the Public Hearing through a neighbour because I do not have a computer nor receive the Mission Record.	This comment does not relate to the substance of OCP Bylaw 0999. Rather, it pertains to the notification process for the public hearing. Notice for the hearing exceeded the requirements of the Local Government Act. Notice included newspaper ads, a bulk mail out to all residences in the area, notice to the Ratepayers Assoc, and emails to people who signed up for an email update list.
I request the revised draft of the OCP be brought back for public review before any final FVRD reading is done.	Plan amendments are recommended that will require that Bylaw 0999 be brought back for a second public hearing.
Can the process be described as to what will happen with the OCP next.	This question was addressed at the open house and public hearing. No amendments recommended.
I would like to see something in the plan that is complimentary to the DAID plans for the recreational use of Hatzic Lake.	Dewdney Area Improvement District has developed plans to remove sediments from Hatzic Lake and Hatzic Slough. They also proposed to improve fish passage and pump capacity at the Hatzic Pump Station. The Plan contains policies which support the removal of sediments from waterways to improve drainage and reduce flooding. (see 4.4.5, 5.2.7, 8.1.8-8.1.10). It also supports the infrastructure improvements desired by DAID (see 8.2.9 to 8.2.11). No amendments recommended.
There are no definitions for in-fill development in the Plan.	<i>Infill</i> is not a term that is defined in the Interpretation section of the Plan. However, it is described in Sec 4.2 as the construction of new dwellings on existing vacant parcels and subdivision under existing zoned densities. It is a descriptive term and not a precise one. Its use is limited to section 3.2 dealing with plan objectives and section 4.2 which considers housing needs over the life of the Plan. This term is not used in the sections of the plan that establish permitted uses, densities, or development review considerations; terms used in these sections require greater precision. Staff feel that the term is sufficiently defined for its use in the Plan. No amendments recommended.
Resource extraction should not be under the "limited use" designation as it is contrary to number six of your seven guiding principles.	The OCP is amended to remove Resource Extraction use. Plan policies continue to support watercourse maintenance activities.
Rural Residential is being changed to Limited Use which includes resource extraction, including mining. We ask that this be removed as a use.	

<p>Wherever resource extraction is mentioned there should be a clear clarification that this is not under the control of the Regional District and that it is under the control of the Province.</p>	<p>Sec 11.2 is revised to clarify the division of authority and that the Province is the principle authority for gravel.</p>
<p>Concerned with the large area set aside for "limited use".</p>	<p>According to Section 5.5, LIMITED USE areas are established to minimize development in remote, inaccessible, hazardous or environmentally sensitive areas with limited or no access to community services and to maintain low density development on suitable development sites. The Plan map designates lands with some or all of the following characteristics as LIMITED USE: geological hazard; flooding hazard; environmental sensitivity; no community and development services; poor road access; and/or best suited to low density rural uses and density. LIMITED USE areas may be reduced and re-designated if future studies show that an area can safely accommodate a broader range of uses without environmental damage, unacceptable public risk, or excessive public expenditure on access or other public works. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>The Soil Removal and Deposit Bylaw should be used as a way to repair roads damaged by trucks involved in resource extraction.</p>	<p>Policy 11.2.12 added to address this concern. It states: "The Regional District should amend its soil removal bylaw to enable the collection of production-based fees from aggregate producers. The fees should be used to fund mitigation of negative off-site impacts of the aggregate industry; regulation, administration and enforcement related to the aggregate industry; and, long-term planning for aggregate uses."</p>
<p>We should have a Plan Objective 8: To have no additional properties in the community plan for limited use designations.</p>	<p>The trend over time will likely be that properties are removed from the LIMITED USE designation based on studies that an area can safely accommodate a broader range of uses without environmental damage, unacceptable public risk, or excessive public expenditure on access or other public works. However, it is possible that new information about hazards could emerge, perhaps as a result of a hazard event, that indicates that the LIMITED USE designation should be expanded in some locations.</p>
<p>I think it's a mistake to mention in an OCP a lot about resource extraction without tying it hand in hand with waste disposal because waste disposal is often a part of land reclamation after extraction happens. The Plan needs to have a policy to regulate disposal from other places because it could harm the groundwater.</p>	<p>Disposal sites for refuse are not permitted in the Plan area.</p>
<p>Table 4-1 Under the category of resource extraction, forest and limited use is checked off. I would like that removed along with notes of past issues.</p>	<p>Table 4.1 is amended to eliminate resource extraction. However, forestry use is still identified within the FOREST designation. Issues associated with forestry uses, including hazards, water quality, etc are thoroughly documented in Sections 8 and 11 of the Plan.</p>

<p>Desire for "zero" growth not "modest".</p>	<p>Zero growth would involve preventing the construction of dwellings on vacant properties and denying subdivision applications even where permitted by zoning and no land constraints exist. Without major bylaw changes, this is not be possible. Moreover, staff believe that this comment does not reflect the balance of opinions presented through out the course of the OCP update process. Staff expect that polices aimed at achieving zero growth would not be supported by the community. No amendment recommended.</p>
<p>Plan Objective Number 5: Minimal (would be good for people that have subdivision requests) and no is another option for "modest".</p>	<p>The plan objective is revised as follows: " 5. accommodate housing needs primarily through infill development on rural and residential lands". Planned densities are set out in detail in Section 6 of the Plan which establishes land use designations. The designations proposed in this Plan would result in overall planned densities lower than the density provided in the current OCP and in the current zoning bylaw. This is largely because RURAL (5 ac parcel) areas are reduced due to geotechnical constraints and areas currently designated for smaller rural residential lots on the Pattison Creek alluvial fan are proposed to be eliminated due to flooding and debris hazards. The land designations that are proposed (in Section 5) are determined by the current understanding of the suitability of land for, and the capacity of iand to support, various land uses and development densities. They are also shaped by good planning practices such as avoiding land use conflicts and minimizing environmental impacts. They do not arise from a predetermined objective about growth rates, but they are informed by the desires for growth, or limiting growth as the case may be, expressed by residents and landowners. Generally, few comments were made at the public hearing about the proposed land designations and the density provisions of the plan designations.</p>
<p>Wording of principle five changed from "accommodating modest growth" to "accommodating minimal growth".</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>In terms of "modest" growth being changed to "zero" growth, there should be designations for areas that should accommodate zero growth and areas that could accommodate modest growth.</p>	<p>The proposed Plan would establish various land designations. A minimum parcel size is identified for each designations. This is the primary tool in the OCP for managing growth. For example, the SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL designation permits parcels as small as 0.2 hectares where community water and sewer systems are provided. The minimum parcel size in the LIMITED USE designation is 8 hectares. Modest growth can be expected in the SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL areas. Very little growth will be seen in LIMITED USE areas.</p>

<p>Page 19 "As a result, growth in the Region..." I think there needs to be more clarification because of all the zones and marshes that are in the upland areas, it's not truly all ALR or should be promoted into greater expansion of tiny lots.</p>	<p>The proposed Plan identifies SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL areas where development at suburban densities (1 ha to 0.2 ha depending on servicing levels) is supported. There are areas anticipated to be generally free of hazards, easily accessible by public roads, not within the ALR, and anticipated to be suitable for on-site sewage disposal. A similar designation, called Rural Residential, exists in the current OCP.</p>
<p>There are four of us on the top of the hill (Timbercove Road) with 10 acre parcels and we want to subdivide.</p>	<p>An area around Timbercove Rd that is anticipated to be free of hazards is proposed to be designated RURAL which would support 2 hectare (5 acre) parcels. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>There are several developed hiking trails from Davis Lake to McKay Lake and up to the top of Mount St. Benedict that are not listed on your maps.</p>	<p>These, and other, trails are not identified on Map 5 because FVRD does not have accurate mapping for them.</p>
<p>Glad to see Davis Lake and surrounding conservation area incorporated into the plan.</p>	<p>No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>Our previous "recreational" designation is changing to "resort". Our property is privately owned and the definition of "resort" deems that we need to maintain public access to natural assets (which is not defined in the OCP) and we do not want uninvited people coming onto our property.</p>	<p>While the RESORT designation is proposed to be applied, at the current time, to only one property in the Plan area, its provisions are generic and similar to resort designation in other FVRD plans. Sec 5.7.7 states: "Development in RESORT areas must avoid or mitigate environmental impacts, maintain access to riparian foreshore areas and avoid alienation of public amenities." Common law establishes certain public rights to use riparian and foreshore areas in limited ways. It is this access that the policy seeks to maintain through the design of development. For example, development should avoid physically cutting off access rights that the public enjoy through Common Law. This policy is not intended to make a private report open to the public, it is only to recognize and protect any existing common law rights that may apply and the public interest manifest in them. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>Development Permit Area 2F, the riparian area development permit concept. I'd like to see a refinement of the language for activities requiring a permit so that large scale land clearing operations and commercial logging operations on private lands could be subject to some regulation, review and sort of professional assessment before proceeding, but not to burden land owners with costly and time consuming permitting processes and having to hire consultants any time they want to remove a tree from their property.</p>	<p>This comment relates Development Permit Area 2-F which implements the Provincial Riparian Areas Regulation. The Province has required local gov'ts to implement RAR. The wording of 13.2.1 draws on language from the Local Government Act and the Riparian Areas Regulation. Certainly, it would capture large scale land clearing and logging of private lands. However, the DPA includes many exemptions (see 13.2.2) to address "common sense" situations such as the routine maintenance of landscaping. Selective tree removal could be considered routine maintenance. There are also provisions for the removal of danger tree with guidance from an arborist. Ultimately, RAR is provincial legislation and FVRD must abide by its requirements. Also see similar comments below.</p>

<p>Page 106-109 It seems as though the OCP is promoting the idea of having more quarrying operations in this Valley and this is certainly not what the people want. These pages also tend to overlook the bigger problem with aggregates which is flooding.</p>	<p>Section 11.2 is revised to address this issues. The accumulation of sand/gravel in streams causing flooding is addressed in Sections 4.4, 8.1, and 11.1.</p>
<p>ALR properties over 10 acres should have a different designation colour than smaller properties.</p>	<p>All ALR properties are designated AGRICULTURAL. In keeping with the longstanding approach in Hatzic Valley, the AGRICULTURAL designation establishes a minimum parcel size of 16 ha in floodplain areas and 4 ha outside the floodplain. This distinction is not reflected on the coloured designation map. Aside from the minimum parcel size, policies are consistent across the AGRICULTURAL designation. It is desirable to limit the number of designations established in the Plan. It is the view of staff that minimum parcel size alone is not sufficient justification to create a second designation for agricultural lands that would be otherwise be exactly the same as the proposed AGRICULTURAL designation.</p>
<p>The institutional use that we have in this Valley is very insignificant for a sustainable community and I believe that we need some lands designated as potential future institutional properties.</p>	<p>Local government must be cautious in proactively designating private lands for public uses, particularly where no funding for property acquisition and development has been identified. Moreover, it appears that existing Institutional meet current demands. Accordingly, staff do not recommend the designation of additional INSTUTIONAL lands at this time. As needs change and funding sources are identified, additional lands can be designated for INSTITUTIONAL uses.</p>
<p>Map 2 Slave Lake Quarry's frontage to Belcharton Creek should be ALR.</p>	<p>This issue has been carefully reviewed and Planning and GIS staff. Up-to-date Agricultural Land Commissions maps have been examined. The OCP accurately reflects the ALR boundary. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>Redefine aggregate resource extraction and resource extraction to state only removal of aggregate material from creeks and watercourses.</p>	<p>The OCP is amended to remove Resource Extraction use. Plan policies continue to support watercourse maintenance activities.</p>
<p>There should be a limitation on forestry resource extraction due to the history of our slides and issues of hazard zones noted on Map 7.</p>	<p>Forestry on private lands would be subject to Geologic and Stream Hazard Development Permit Area 1-F and Riparian Areas Development Permit Area 2-F to ensure that hazards and stream habitat are addressed. Forestry on Crown lands is the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Forests & Range. Sec 11.1 contains a discussion and advocacy policies about forestry on Crown lands which make the connection between logging and hazards in the community. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>There is no notation made to water licenses.</p>	<p>Known water licenses, well locations and aquifers are shown on Map 10. Water licenses and related matters are</p>

<p>R1, R2, R3 should have new word designations.</p>	<p>Some proposed OCP designations are similar, but not the same, as some of the designations that exist in the current OCP. Similarities and differences between proposed and existing designation were discussed at the Open House and Public Hearing. Once a new plan is adopted, the former designations will not be relevant. Accordingly, it is not recommended that the new Plan include a table comparing the new and old designations.</p>
<p>Table 4-2 Limited use should be clarified because it is involving far more than just hazards with the inclusion of resource extraction.</p>	<p>The OCP is amended to remove Resource Extraction use in LIMITED USE areas.</p>
<p>Awkward phrasing in "So groundwater also has a"</p>	<p>Sec 10.1 is amended to correct this phrase and improve wording.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 (page 27) The OCP states "There are currently no lands zoned for industrial uses in the Plan area and the Plan does not proactively identify lands for future industrial development." It is apparent that the services that are necessary to support industrial development in Hatzic Valley are not present and I would like to see this statement right under our Mission Statement or wherever resource extraction is mentioned, or , if you have to have the Map, put it at the bottom of the map.</p>	<p>Sec 11.2 is revised to include this statement.</p>
<p>Section 5.57 (page 43) I strongly oppose seeing the resource extraction use in the limited use area.</p>	<p>The OCP is amended to remove Resource Extraction use in LIMITED USE areas.</p>

<p>Section 5.57 (page 43) Under our old zoning of "recreational" we were allowed assembly use, however under the new zoning "resort", assembly use is not included in the definition. We would like to see assembly use included in the definition of "resort".</p>	<p>The zoning of the property is not proposed to change. The proposed OCP would designated this property RESORT. ASSEMBLY USE means use providing for the assembly of persons for religious, charitable, philanthropic, cultural, private recreational or private educational purposes, and includes churches, auditoriums, youth centres, social halls, community halls, private and public schools, kindergartens, play schools, day nurseries, and day care schools. HOLIDAY PARK means any lot or parcel operated and maintained for the sole purpose of providing two or more recreational camping spaces or seasonal cabin sites together with all supporting common leisure and service facilities for the exclusive use of and occupancy for part of the year only by holiday-makers; may include a recreational camping club incorporated under the Society Act; but does not include a social club, shared interest developments, mobile home park, motel, campground, or a camp licensed under the Community Care Facility Act. Assembly use is not supported in the RESORT designation, Holiday Park is. Staff feel that the Holiday Park use better describes the uses occurring on the subject parcel. Introduction of Assembly Use into the RESORT designation would support the establishment of schools, youth centres, and a variety of other institutional uses not intended for RESORT areas. No amendment recommended.</p>
<p>Section 6.2.1 (page 62) The OCP mentions that the Regional Board may consider expansion of the water system under the following conditions....." but there is no statement about what will happen to those property owners that have the same underground water who might lose it if the system is expanded. There should be a compensation package or something available to people who are not even allowed to join the system.</p>	<p>Sec 6.2.1 states that "the Regional District may consider expansion of the Hatzic Prairie Water Supply and Distribution System under the following conditions ... (d) there will be no negative impacts to the water supply source. In addition, the Plan contains a variety of policies aimed at protection ground and surface water supplies. For example, see the various policies in Sections 6.2 and 10.1. . Plan policies aim to prevent the situation described - i.e. development on one property, or system, causing the water supply on a different property to be degraded. In the opinion of staff, the Plan contains a strong policy base for the protection of water supplies. If negative impacts do occur, questions of compensation would have to be addressed in the context of the facts of the situation. It is not known how FVRD could provide compensation ahead of any impacts or to assure compensation in the absence of the facts of a particular situation. Plan policies address circumstances under which the Board would consider expansion of the system to include properties not currently within the service area. No amendments recommended.</p>
<p>Section 9.3.8 (page 91) "Responsible authorities are encouraged to consider the upgrade of the Hatzic Pump Station to improve fish passage..." I would like to see "and fish ladder" added.</p>	<p>A fish ladder is one example of how fish passage could be improved at the Hatzic Pump Station. Other means of improving fish access may also be possible. A fish ladder appears to be favoured today. However, as technologies and costs change, other methods may be more attractive. Section 9.3.8 as currently drafted broadly supports improved fish passage, including a fish ladder, but leaves the door open to other methods of achieving it. No amendment recommended.</p>

<p>Section 11.1.7 "Coastal Watershed Assessment..." this statement is fine although I would like to include for elsewhere in the Valley we need to have some watershed assessment procedures.</p>	<p>Sec 11.1.8 states: "The Regional Board will recommend that any new forestry activities in the Cascade and Carratt Creek watersheds be preceded by a comprehensive watershed assessment which considers cumulative impacts on sediment transport, flooding, and peak flows and broadly addresses risk to development and infrastructure on the fan." Sec 11.1.9 states: "The Regional District will advocate for the development of a Strategic Land and Resource Plan for Hatzic Valley to address long-standing land use conflicts relating to geotechnical and hydrological issues on the crown/community interface lands. The Regional District will assist the Responsible Authorities in developing such a plan." Other Plan policies speak to the need for groundwater plans and studies (10.1), storm water management (10.2), hazard assessments (8.1, 13.1).</p>
<p>Section 11.2 (page 106) "Aggregates are critical for the infrastructure..." is a logical sentence however needs to be re-worded so it doesn't seem like we're promoting more aggregate usage.</p>	<p>Section 11.2 is revised as follows, "It is recognized that aggregates are needed for the infrastructure and economy of our Region..."</p>
<p>Section 12.0 is blank.</p>	<p>This section is left blank to accommodate a future update to address Greenhouse Gas emissions. FVRD is working on a strategy to address GHGs in the electoral areas as a whole. Once the Board has approved an EA-wide strategy, the Hatzic Valley OCP will be amended to reflect it. Provincial legislation requires that OCPs address GHG emissions.</p>
<p>Section 13.1.2 (page 113) It says there are no development permits needed for forestry and I think there shouldn't be different rules for different players.</p>	<p>This comment relates to Development Permit Area 1-F which addressed geotechnical hazards. DPA 1-F would apply to forestry activities on private lands. The approval of forestry activities on Crown forest land is the jurisdiction of the Province. DPA 1-F would not apply to forestry on Crown land.</p>
<p>Section 13.2.1 (page 118) "A development permit must be obtained prior to the disturbance of soil or vegetation." This could be interpreted as I need a development permit to cut my grass, therefore further clarification is needed.</p>	<p>This comment relates Development Permit Area 2-F which implements the Provincial Riparian Areas Regulation. The Province has required local gov'ts to implement RAR. The wording of 13.2.1 draws on language from the Local Government Act and the Riparian Areas Regulation. The Electoral Area Services Committee and staff looked very hard at RAR and how to best structure a DPA that meets the requirements imposed by the Province, but also address "common sense" situations such as lawn maintenance. Sec 13.2.2 provides a list of activities exempted from the need for a Dev't Permit, including: routine maintenance of existing landscaping or lawn and garden areas. This exemption list pushes the boundaries established by RAR.</p>
<p>Section 13.2.2 There needs to be some exception for BC Hydro and for land owners who are quite capable of managing riparian zones safely without hiring a professional forester or arborist.</p>	<p>Development Permit Area 2-F implements the provincial Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR) as is required of local governments under the Fish Protection Act and the RAR. The Province has not given local governments discretion to exempt capable landowners from the need to comply with the Regulation, particularly the requirement to obtain a Riparian Assessment before undertaking "Development" in the riparian zone. Also, see comment above.</p>

Definitions: Remove gravel sorting from the definition of Resource Industrial Use.	Resource Industrial Use is not a permitted use in any of the OCP designations. However, staff recommend that the definition of resource industrial use be retained. It demonstrates that the Board considered this use and purposefully did not include in in any of the Plan designations. No amendments recommended.
--	--

Summary of Written Submissions from Sept 23, 2010 Public Hearing
 Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley Bylaw 0999, 2010

	Comments	Response
17 residents made similar statements	In Guiding Principles (5), replace "Accommodating modest growth...." with "Accommodating minimal growth".	This section is amended to clarify the intent.
	Use the term "zero" to describe potential growth.	Zero growth would involve preventing the construction of dwellings on vacant properties and denying subdivision applications even where permitted by zoning and no land constraints exist. Without major bylaw changes, this is not be possible. Moreover, staff believe that this comment does not reflect the balance of opinion presented throughout the course of the OCP update process. Staff expect that policies aimed at achieving zero growth would not be supported by the community. No amendment recommended.
22 residents made similar statements	I want the OCP to state this clearly wherever "Resource Extraction" is mentioned, so it isn't blamed for mining, quarrying and logging over which it has no control, and further, that Area "F" residents strongly object to resource extraction without community participation in the decision making process. The same stringent geotechnical and environmental assessments should be required of resource extraction proponents as are required of residents who want to build a shed, a garage or to renovate their houses.	Section 11.2 is amended to better outline jurisdiction for aggregates and to better reflect the need for local involvement in decision-making. Section 11.2.9 states: "The Regional Board recommends that mining proposals and associated technical information be presented to residents at a public meeting prior to the issuance of any permit or approval under the Mines Act." Section 11.2.8 recommends geotechnical and environmental assessment.
11499 Stave Lake	Page 118: relating to activities requiring permits, primarily relating to tree removal. I believe improving the language to address environmental needs without unduly restricting residents from managing their lands would result in a better bylaw.	This comment relates Development Permit Area 2-F which implements the Provincial Riparian Areas Regulation. The Province has required local gov'ts to implement RAR. The wording of 13.2 draws on language from the Local Government Act and the Riparian Areas Regulation. However, the DPA includes many exemptions (see 13.2.2) to address "common sense" situations such as the routine maintenance of landscaping. Selective tree removal can fall under routine maintenance. There are also provisions for the removal of danger tree with guidance from an arborist.
	Size of blasts at quarries need to be limited	This matter is within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Natural Resource Operations.

	<p>The OCP states: Community Plan Vision & Objectives: The OCP is a future plan for this valley. 3.1 Quiet & Peace of rural life. Where does resource extraction, the trucks and possible environmental damage that go with it fit into the peace and quiet?? The OCP seems to favour resource extraction. Take resource extraction out of the OCP. We want community participation in new projects. Companies planning to work in our valley must go through extensive geotechnical and environmental assessments before starting. Public meetings should also be held to get community input.</p>	<p>Various sections of the Plan dealing with aggregate are amended. Public process and professional assessment are addressed in the amended policies of Section 11.2.</p>
34637 Timbercove	<p>I suggest to make a zone called resource extraction and only apply that zone to the 2 existing properties that presently (August 2010) have resource extraction.</p>	<p>This comment engages complex issues. Such a zone could be applied on a site-specific basis in response to applications. FVRD can not prohibit extraction. However, the proposed plan does not identify aggregate extraction as a supported use in any designation. Forestry uses are supported in the FOREST designation.</p>
	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed inclusion of resource extraction in all of the "limited use" designated areas. This will just lead to proliferation, against the wishes of majority of the residents of Electoral Area "F". A desire needs to be shown to contain this use to only the two properties (August 2010)</p>	<p>Resource extraction use is deleted from the LIMITED USE designation. Policies related to aggregate in section 11.2 are also amended.</p>
12699 Stave Lake	<p>We want the "Limited Use" zone in the OCP to not allow "resource extraction use" anymore and ensure that this in particular applies to any rock quarry/gravel pits and logging operations that might have an impact on the peaceful quire enjoyment by residents of their property including an impact on their groundwater and other water flows and resources.</p>	<p>Resource extraction use is deleted from the LIMITED USE designation.</p>
	<p>Re: Tree Removal: taking out the add tree, for firewood, overcrowding, letting sunlight onto orchard or garden, etc., should not need geotechnical surveys or permits.</p>	<p>This comment relates Development Permit Area 2-F which implements the Provincial Riparian Areas Regulation. The Province has required local gov'ts to implement RAR. The wording of 13.2 draws on language from the Local Government Act and the Riparian Areas Regulation. However, the DPA includes many exemptions (see 13.2.2) to address "common sense" situations such as the routine maintenance of landscaping. Selective tree removal can fall under routine maintenance. There are also provisions for the removal of danger tree with guidance from an arborist.</p>

13079 Stave Lake Road	The zoning of our property is proposed to change without any knowledge on our side. The zoning should be: Intensive Agricultural Land Use.	A portion of this property is within the ALR. The property is currently zoned A-2 and R-3. The boundary line between the zones generally follows the ALR boundary. No changes to zoning are contemplated. The current OCP designates the property A / R-3. The proposed OCP would designate the property A / LU, which is very similar to the current OCP designation. No amendment recommended.
11811 Sylvester	If "Agricultural" zoning implies something other than potential to subdivide to 2.5 acres we believe this change will have severe potential financial impact on our property and future.	This property is currently zoned RS-2. No change in zoning is contemplated; the property owner could proceed with a subdivision application based on the zoning. The current OCP designates the property RURAL RESIDENTIAL. The proposed OCP would designate the property AGRICULTURAL. The property is located on the Pattison Creek alluvial fan and is subject to flooding, debris flow and potential avulsion hazards. Under Ministry of Environment policy, subdivision of this property would require significant flood protection works maintained by the Regional District. Costs for construction and maintenance of such works are anticipated to be significant and no such works are planned. These hazards are anticipated to pose significant challenges to subdivision of the property. Staff recommend that rural residential-type development be directed to areas in the community not subject to hazards where such works are not necessary. For these reasons, staff do not support the current rural residential designation. As the property is currently used for an equestrian facility and is in part classified as a farm by BC Assessment for property tax purposes, staff have recommended that the AGRICULTURAL designation be applied. Any OCP designation can be changed through a site-specific application. No amendment recommended.
15160 Sylvester	Previously zoned rural residential and now limited use. We would like resource extraction removed as a limited use.	Resource extraction use is deleted from the LIMITED USE designation.
34640 Timbercove	Support the proposed change to the zoning from R2 to R1 for Timbercove Road.	No amendment recommended.
11610 Sylvester	Our property is proposed to change to the "Agricultural" zone which would not permit subdivision to parcels less than 4 hectares. We believe our property should be considered Suburban Residential.	The subject property is proposed to be designated SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL in Bylaw 0999. No amendment recommended.
9750 Farms	Please consider the designation of Lot REM 2 of Plan 22265 to Suburban residential from Agricultural as this lot is not suitable for farming as its too small and too wet.	The subject property is within the Agricultural Land Reserve and with the Fraser River floodplain. The property owners may wish to make application to the ALC to exclude the property. On the basis on an exclusion, the Regional Board could consider rezoning and redesignating the parcel for non-agricultural uses, though factors such as floodplain, services, general land use, etc should also be considered by the Board.

17 Residents signed a petition	Owners of Miracle valley would like the OCP to allow subdivision of 4.5 acre parcels in their area.	Much of Miracle Valley is within the ALR. It is the objective of the ALR to maintain the viability for farming. ALC approval for subdivision is not likely. Moreover, the OCP supports the objective of enhancing agriculture and reserving lands for farming. No amendment recommended.
	Owners of Miracle Valley properties would like to be allowed the option of add a second home to our properties. This should be available to any property over 4 acres.	This idea was explored through the APC and the Agricultural Land Commission. ALC regulations only allow the construction of a second dwelling under limited circumstances.
	A few developed hiking trails from Davis Lake to Mackay Lake and the top of Mt.St. Benedict that are currently not listed on your map.	It is recognized that the trails on Map 4 are not exhaustive. Some trails are not mapped because accurate trail alignments are not mapped or are not available to FVRD. This map can be updated in the future as more data becomes available.
Sons of Norway	Public as defined on page 132 does not fit with our property. Our property is used by members and invited guests only and we do not believe there is a need to "maintain public access to natural assets" as indicated in the description. Natural assets is not defined in the OCP and we question the relevance of this clause as it pertains to our property.	While the RESORT designation is proposed to be applied, at the current time, to only one property in the Plan area, its provisions are generic and similar to resort designation is other FVRD plans. Sec 5.7.7 states: "Development in RESORT areas must avoid or mitigate environmental impacts, maintain access to riparian foreshore areas and avoid alienation of public amenities." Common law establishes certain public rights to use riparian and foreshore areas in limited ways. It is this access that the policy seeks to maintain though the design of development. For example, development should avoid physically cutting off access rights that the public enjoy through Common Law. This policy is not intended to make a private report open to the public, it is only to recognize and protect any existing common law rights that may apply and the public interest manifest in them. This clause may have only limited relevance to the Sons of Norway property. No amendments recommended.
	"Resort" brings visions of ski resort, resort spa, etc., areas frequented by the public. We would like to see the designation shown as private to not encourage unsolicited inquiries.	While the RESORT designation is proposed to be applied, at the current time, to only one property in the Plan area, its provisions are generic and similar to resort designation is other FVRD plans. The term "resort" does not imply a public facility. It is recognized that the SON property is a private recreational facility. No amendments recommended.

<p>In reviewing Bylaw a0454,1987 we note that our zoning allowed for "assembly use", but that is not contemplated under the new "Resort" definition. We request this be an additional definition.</p>	<p>The zoning of the property is not proposed to change. The proposed OCP would designated this property RESORT: ASSEMBLY USE means use providing for the assembly of persons for religious, charitable, philanthropic, cultural, private recreational or private educational purposes, and includes churches, auditoriums, youth centres, social halls, community halls, private and public schools, kindergartens, play schools, day nurseries, and day care schools. HOLIDAY PARK means any lot or parcel operated and maintained for the sole purpose of providing two or more recreational camping spaces or seasonal cabin sites together with all supporting common leisure and service facilities for the exclusive use of and occupancy for part of the year only by holiday-makers; may include a recreational camping club incorporated under the Society Act; but does not include a social club, shared interest developments, mobile home park, motel, campground, or a camp licensed under the Community Care Facility Act. Assembly use is not supported in the RESORT designation, Holiday Park is. Staff feel that the Holiday Park use better describes the uses occurring on the subject parcel. Introduction of Assembly Use into the RESORT designation would support the establishment of schools, youth centres, and a variety of other institutional uses not intended for RESORT areas. No amendment recommended.</p>
<p>13372 Stave Lake</p> <p>Page Numbers should be written beside Schedules and Maps.</p> <p>1.1.a.iii. Add: intent is for removal of creek watercourse rock debris.</p> <p>2.1 Where are the references for 2.1 Community History?</p> <p>2.4 Add: "To July 2010 after a rehabilitation fac</p> <p>3.2 Delete: "modest change" to "minimal/no".</p> <p>3.3 Change "As a result, growth...." because upland areas are in mainly ALR with surrounding valley steep slopes which cuttail and limit new development as per hazardous map documentation.</p> <p>4.0 Clarity of R1 and R3 from past bylaws have now disappeared need to have reference to past.</p> <p>4.0 Delete: "Designations also....." because it conflicts with a minimal/no growth strategy for Hatzic valley.</p>	<p>Schedules and Maps do not have page numbers. Rather, they are identified with sequential map or schedule numbers. No amendment recommended.</p> <p>The community history text is pulled from the existing OCP which does not contain references.</p> <p>Sec 2.4 is amended to delete reference to a rehab facility.</p> <p>See discussion above.</p> <p>Sec 3.3 states, "... growth in the Region will generally be accommodated by redeveloping urban centres at higher densities and by new development in upland areas within the Urban Growth Boundaries established in the RGS." This statement is referring to overall development patterns in the region and specifically to locations within Urban Growth Boundaries. Hatzic Valley is outside of the UGB. This purpose of this section is to place the specific policies for Hatzic Valley within a regional context. No amendment recommended.</p> <p>If Bylaw 0999 is adopted, the R-1 and R-3 OCP designation will become obsolete and further reference to these old plan designation won't be useful.</p> <p>Sec 4.1 states: "Designations also establish minimum parcel size policies for subdivision (which are summarized for convenience in Table 4-2)." This is an accurate statement of fact. No amendment recommended.</p>

Table 4-1: Recommend deleting the check marks for resource extraction under forest and limited use.	Resource extraction use is deleted from the LIMITED USE designation. Table 4-1 is amended to reflect this.
Table 4-2: Add: Hazard area mostly beside limited use. Should say no for any subdivision in forest crown land.	Section 5.2.8 states: "Land in CONSERVATION AREAS shall only be subdivided under circumstances where subdivision is required in the interests of responsible park or environmental management." Section 5.3.10 states: "Land within the FOREST designation shall be subdivided only when subdivision is required in the interests of responsible forest management, in which case no parcel smaller than thirty-five (35) hectares shall be created." These policies oppose subdivision of crown lands in these designation except where subdivision is in the interest of responsible forest, park or environmental management. No amendment recommended.
4.2 Put acreage equivalent for 'ha'.	The plan consistently uses metric units.
4.6 Should clearly state the community is not in favour of industrial aggregate.	Sec 11.2 is amended to reflect community opposition to industrial gravel operations.
5.0 Clarify: R1, R2, R3 to new word designation of OCP.	If Bylaw 0999 is adopted, the R-1 and R-3 OCP designation will become obsolete and further reference to these old plan designation won't be useful.
5.5.7 Similar to R3. Resource extraction: problem -don't include or state this is only for watercourse rock removal.	Sec 5.5.7 is amended to delete reference to resource extraction.
5.7.5.a. Either change the word "minor" to "no" or define specifically because it is too open ended.	This policy pertains to the redesignation of lands to RESORT through specific applications. The approval of OCP amendment applications is at the discretion of the Board. Section 5.5.7 provides the Board guidance. Site specific geotechnical assessments would be needed for new resort developments on lands subject to hazards. These assessments will consider whether the hazard can be mitigated on-site. Under these circumstances, it is the opinion of staff that the policy does not need to be comprehensive or overly prescriptive. No amendment recommended.
6.2.4 Add a comment for: Future community watershed designation and other protection which will be reinforced by FVRD and will be encouraged for designation by other government agencies.	Sec 6.2.4 states: "The protection of water supplies will be a consideration in all zoning and community plan amendments and in subdivision referrals." No amendment recommended. Other plan policies address the designation of community watersheds.
6.2.5 Add: Cougars, bobcats and owls.	Sec 9 is amended to identify these species.
10.1 "So, groundwater..." Problem sentence with the word so.	This sentence is amended.
10.1 (Page 97) Groundwater Quantity: Add: "quality" after quantity in the first sentence.	This section addresses groundwater quantity. Other paragraphs in this section address groundwater quality. No amendments recommended.

10.1 (Page 99) "In wet...." Problem with validation add in seismic records to show ground vibration from SLQ travelling to UBC and Bowen Island from SLQ blasting to effect or change words but document that there is scientific data.	No amendment recommended.
10.1.3 Delete the word "should" and put in a plan for being.	The OCP policy is the first step in achieving a groundwater protection plan for Hatzic Valley. The importance of such a plan is reflected in the comprehensive treatment of groundwater and water issues in the Plan. This policy is appropriately worded because the Board will have to identify resources, make grant applications, etc which introduces a degree of uncertainty. No amendments recommended.
10.2.5 Delete the word "large" should say "low impact small".	Sec 10.2.5 states: "Where appropriate, mountain side subdivisions and large commercial developments should be placed within a development permit area to ensure that best management practices for storm water are identified and implemented." The intent is that significant developments should be subject to a higher degree of regulation and assessment to ensure no negative impacts to groundwater. Minor, low impact developments, by their nature, shouldn't require this expanded regulation and assessment. No amendments recommended.
11.1 "The continued presence of forestry...." should say in "living forestry trees". In 3rd paragraph add : "which limit forestry activities in Hatzic Valley" to the last sentence.	Sec 11.1 amended to reflect limitations.
11.1 "The policies..." the last policy should refer to hazard map and note for forest sensitive issues to limit forest resource activity.	Sec 11.1 identifies a variety of constraints to forestry activities.
11.1.5 Add: c. Recommend forestry certification ie CFS or FSC with public participation.	Sec 11.1.5 is amended to recommend that forestry licensees "obtain reputable third-party certification of sustainable forest practices."
11.1.7 4th point Add: "include for elsewhere in the Valley".	11.1.7 references the recommendations of the report, Preliminary Debris Flow Hazard Assessment of Field, Carratt, Eng, McNab and Dale Creeks, Hatzic Valley by BGC Engineering. The Plan should accurately reference these recommendations. 11.1.6, 11.1.8, 11.1.9 address the issue of assessments in other watersheds. No amendment recommended.
11.1.8 Add: "and consideration of past flood impacts to local rural residents".	11.1.8 is amended to include reference to impacts to residents.
11.2 Delete "critical" change to "useful". Also add intent for creek rock gravel build up removal.	11.2 is amended.

11.2 "The policies in this...." change wording or put in "for the intent of gravel removal from creeks".	No amendment recommended.
11.2.1 Add: "For Electoral Are "F" no further aggregate or mineral extraction to be limited to the 2 quarries on Sylvester Rd and Stave Lake Road due to current aggregate issues.	11.2 is amended.
11.2.3 Add: No screening ie. grizzly use or rock crushers on site.	Resource processing is not supported in any of the OCP designations.
Add "qualified" in front of professional in various sections.	Various sections amended to add "qualified" in front of professional engineer.
12.0 Page is blank	It is left blank to accommodate the addition of a section of greenhouse gasses in the future.
13.0 Refer to Schedule 4 Map.	Sec 13 states: "Development Permit Area 1-F encompasses the lands identified on Schedule 4 - Development Permit Area 1-F".
13.2.2 Landowners should be allowed at their discretion to remove trees knocked down by natural factors. Also, hydro clearing of trees near stream/watercourse for electrical power safety to a persons home.	This comment relates Development Permit Area 2-F which implements the Provincial Riparian Areas Regulation. The Province has required local gov'ts to implement RAR. The wording of 13.2 draws on language from the Local Government Act and the Riparian Areas Regulation. However, the DPA includes many exemptions (see 13.2.2) to address "common sense" situations such as the routine maintenance of landscaping. Selective tree removal can fall under routine maintenance. There are also provisions for the removal of danger tree with guidance from an arborist. Ultimately, RAR is provincial legislation and FVRD must abide by its requirements.
15.0 Aggregate Extraction Use: Add: specifically for the Hatzic Valley the intent of aggregate extraction is for removal of aggregate materials form watercourses no the hazard zone mountains.	Section 15 provides definitions of some terms used in the Plan. It is not an appropriate place to repeat or reflect plan policies and directions. No amendment recommended.
15.0 Resource Extraction: State in reference for Hatzic Valley watercourse rock removal. Add: "usually" before "means". Also state that due to hazardous slopes documented by qualified professional experts no forest or aggregate extraction is advised. Refer to slide documents and experts reports to validate the limitation of resource extraction in the Valley. Refer to Map 7 and 10.	Section 15 provides definitions of some terms used in the Plan. It is not an appropriate place to repeat or reflect plan policies and directions. No amendment recommended.
15.0 Resource Industrial Use: Delete gravel sorting and screening plants as these are obvious gravel/quarry and we have had enough with the 2 quarries in the valley. They are also a noise issue.	Resource Industrial use is not supported in the Plan area.

All Maps: Words are too small to easily read.	Maps are intended for display in large format and will be less effective in smaller formats. This is an issue with all maps when shrunk to smaller sizes. No amendment recommended.
Schedule 2 Designations: Major problem in front of Stave Lake Quarry was never for Resource 3 or R3 only R3 from past Belcharton Creek - front area is ALR from all the maps I saw in the past from DARD time.	ALR boundaries thoroughly checked by planning and GIS staff. The proposed plan accurately reflects the ALR boundary. No amendment recommended.
Map 1: Missed out SLQ front was always in ALR and still should be ALR.	ALR boundaries thoroughly checked by planning and GIS staff. The proposed plan accurately reflects the ALR boundary. No amendment recommended.
Map 2: Wrong status for SLQ, where the yellow is was never all limited use, on past maps is ALR.	ALR boundaries thoroughly checked by planning and GIS staff. The proposed plan accurately reflects the ALR boundary. No amendment recommended.
Map 4: For big trees all of the MOE old growth management information is missing. As well as the other big trees hikers have seen. Big trees needs to be clearly defined.	This map contains data from the Province regarding big trees. It is intended to identify their cultural value to the community, not precisely locate and define the trees. It is further recognized that in some cases big trees reside on private property. It is beyond the resources of FVRD to inventory all big trees or to maintain a database of big trees hikers have seen. No amendment recommended.
Map 5: There are more forest service roads not present on the map.	This map includes all mapped forestry roads for which FVRD has data. It is reasonably up-to-date but not current. As well, other forestry roads may exist. For most up-to-date mapping for forestry roads, users should contact the Ministry of Natural Resource Operations. No amendments recommended.
Map 9: Make a notation that there is likely more wildlife in trees but not noted on this map.	Map 9 utilizes existing map data from the Conservation Data Centre and other sources. It is not exhaustive. The source of the data and the limitations of the mapping are identified on the map. No amendments recommended.
Make a statement that protection is needed for landowners for speciality permits birds ie. homing pigeons.	This issue has not come up in any OCP meetings or feedback forms. No amendment recommended.