



Fraser Valley Regional District

45950 Cheam Avenue, Chilliwack, B.C. V2P 1N6

Tel: 604 702-5000 Toll Free: 1 800 528 0061

Fax: 604 792 9684

Electoral Area "F" Advisory Planning Commission

April 1, 2010 - 7:00 PM

McConnell Creek Farmers Institute Hall

MEETING NOTES (12)

Present: APC: Bruce Edwards, Heather Morlacci, Jack Wilfert, Sharie Conroy, Lynn Fry, Ken Webb

FVRD: Dick Bogstie, Director, EA "F"; Graham Daneluz, Manager of Forward Plans

1. Greetings & 'Housekeeping'

The meeting began at 7:10 PM.

The agenda was adopted with the addition of "Water Act Update" under Item 4.

The March 25, 2010 meeting notes were adopted as drafted.

2. Review and Discussion of Drafts

APC members reviewed draft OCP maps and land designations. Graham Daneluz began by outlining the process used to develop the draft designations, which involved:

- review of existing zoning and OCP designations;
- ALR boundaries and policies;
- Provincial legislation and policy;
- geohazards information including overview studies and site-specific reports;
- examination of many folio (property) files;
- review of subdivision and rezoning files;
- title searches and review of covenants, etc.;
- review of APC meeting notes and presentations; and,
- designations, approaches and terminology used in other FVRD bylaws and plans.

Mr. Daneluz commented that land designations are probably the most complex part of the OCP process. Every attempt was made to consistently apply the draft designations. He provided an overview of the all the draft designations and pointed out places of interest on the map.

An extensive discussion ensued. Comments are summarized as follows.

- Parcel size policies for agricultural lands outside the floodplain were discussed at length. APC members felt that the draft parcel size policy in the AGRICULTURAL designation was too large. An APC member felt that land owners in this area would support 2 ha (5 ac) lot sizes and encouraged consideration of this. Others felt that the status quo of 4 ha (10 ac) was thoroughly researched when it was adopted and is still appropriate. Questions arose about the quality of the soils in the McConnell Creek area, requirements for farm tax status, and boundary of the ALR. It was noted the Agricultural Land Commission must approve any subdivision within the ALR. The ALC typically wants to retain large agricultural parcels, but has in the past supported subdivision where a parcel is practically divided by a stream, ravine or other barrier. The Ministry of Agriculture has recommended to the APC that large parcel sizes be retained for viable farm operations; hobby farms are not as productive as other farms. Concern was raised with the potential for pollution on small farm parcels, including pollution from septic fields, animal wastes, fertilizers, etc.. Overall, APC members supported the status quo parcel sizes in the AG designation, but requested more information on soil quality and tax implications.
- For the most part, the AG designation follows the ALR boundary, but it does deviate in some places which were pointed out on the map. Notable locations include the Pattison Creek fan and an area along the ALR boundary north of Allan Lake.
- An APC member felt that the Pattison Creek fan is not agricultural and should be designated Limited Use. Another commented that aggregate extraction from the fan and the application of nutrients and fertilizers in this area could impact the nearby community well. It was noted that the existing OCP designates this area as Rural Residential. All felt that this designation is inappropriate given the hazards associated with Pattison Creek. There are existing agricultural uses on some fan properties, including nursery plant production and an equestrian facility.
- The need for a designation or 'overlay' to identify well head protection areas was identified.
- The Resource Industrial use should be removed from the Use Policies in all designations.
- The range of uses supported in the LIMITED USE designation was noted. It was felt that the name is ironic given that a wide range of uses is supported. Graham Daneluz mentioned that this terminology is used because it is common in FVRD OCPs and zoning bylaws; where possible, terminology was used in the draft that is consistent with other plans and bylaws in use in the Region.
- It was suggested that the boundary of the plan area be extended up to the height of land (HOL) so that it captures the entire watershed area that drains to the valley. The FOREST designation should be extended to the HOL. Discussion ensued about the pros and cons. It was agreed to try it.
- The FOREST designation should include a statement regarding the protection of water quality.
- Two small parcels on Hartley and Durieu should be designated to reflect residential use (rather than INSTITUTIONAL as proposed in the draft)
- Low Density Commercial Recreation should exclude rifle ranges; remove outdoor recreation from LDCR
- There was discussion about suitable designation for the mobile home park on Durieu Road. The draft plan contains provisions about rezoning and re-designating lawfully non-

conforming uses. These policies would enable rezoning to reflect the MHP use. Accordingly, APC members were comfortable with the proposed RURAL designation being applied to the property. It was suggested that a "note to file" outlining this be placed in the folio for this property.

- 6.1.15 revise to reflect 16 ha minimum parcel size in floodplain areas and 4 ha outside the floodplain
- 6.2.6 remove reference to resource industrial use
- 6.2.8 delete
- 6.5.7 remove reference to resource industrial use
- 6.5.9 remove reference to outdoor recreation use
- 6.6 amend discussion to read, "...This designation *may* include..."
- 6.6.4 amend last bullet to read, "crown slough channels..."
- 6.6.6 delete reference to semi-public

3. Meeting Schedule

The next meeting is scheduled for April 15, 2010.

4. Items Carried Over

There was a brief discussion about the Ministry of Environment efforts to update the Water Act, and specifically about water use plans and allocations.

Other items carried over from previous meetings were not discussed.

5. Close of Meeting

The Meeting ended at about 10:30 PM.