



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

**January 21, 2010 - 7:00 PM
McConnell Creek Farmers Institute Hall**

MEETING NOTES (9)

Present: APC: Sharie Conroy, Lynne Fry, Bruce Edwards, Jack Heptonstall, Heather Morlacci, Jack Wilfert, Ken Webb
FVRD: Dick Bogstie, Director, EA "F"; Graham Daneluz, Manager of Forward Plans

1. Greetings & 'Housekeeping'

The meeting began at about 7:05 PM with greetings and adoption of the agenda and the meeting notes of September 24/09 and October 22/09 meeting notes.

A discussion about development permit area ensued. Director Bogstie expressed some discomfort with the geotechnical hazard development permit area reviewed at the previous meeting but felt no suitable alternative exists to protect the community. It was recognized that the community must address hazards. There is no other way to deal with slope alterations and logging on private land and protect development from hazardous conditions. Concern with costs for geotechnical reports was discussed.

The riparian areas development permit area was also discussed. APC members supported riparian protection, but felt that the DPA might prevent landowners from maintaining landscaping, gardens and yard areas or planting beneficial trees in the riparian zone. Graham Daneluz mentioned that the Regional Board is compelled by provincial law to implement the Riparian Areas Regulation and is reviewing a development permit area template to do this uniformly in all the electoral area official community plans. It is anticipated that the issues of landscaping and tree planting will be favourable resolved through this review.

APC members agreed that efforts to educate the community about DPAs will be necessary if they are adopted.

2. Overview comments and first impressions

Graham Daneluz outlined his first impressions about the draft being reviewed:

- the drafts tend toward comprehensiveness at the expense of brevity and accessibility
- concerned about use of jargon, possibly too much detail – what can be removed? footnotes?
- want to ensure the plan is readable and understandable

- concerned that the drafts tend to emphasize problems and do not adequately celebrate the community and its assets
- want to find balance between policies that value, conserve and protect the environment with policies to support community liveability and needs; policies need to be realistic and pragmatic

APC members felt that the plan should be comprehensive and wanted to retain footnotes. Some incidences of jargon and difficult language were identified, but overall the drafts appear readable and understandable. It was agreed that positive features of the community should be emphasized more so that they are recognized and valued, and also to balance the 'tone' of the plan. However, it is also important to identify the constraints that the Valley faces. Other suggestions included:

- provide a policy summary for people who don't want to read the whole plan but need to understand the policies
- the Plan should include a policy stating that the Regional District will assist residents and other in understanding Plan policies and guidance for meeting requirements
- the Plan should always be clear about jurisdiction – particularly about what is a provincial requirement and what is a Regional District policy

3. Review and Discussion of Drafts

Ground & Surface Water

APC comments regarding **groundwater** are summarized as follows:

- rename Miracle Valley Aquifer to McConnell Creek Aquifer
- 11.1.1 replace "central" with "primary"
- 11.1.2 replace "developments" with "activities"
- 11.1.5 what does "responsible authorities" mean? Can this be expressed more clearly?

APC comments regarding stormwater are summarized as follows:

- policies should prevent flow off properties and encourage pervious paving, etc.
- should identify potential methods for dealing with stormwater (i.e. swales, pervious paving, etc)
- be clear that this section doesn't apply to agriculture
- 11.2.1 is unclear; don't know what it means. Should refer directly to diversion and flow volumes
- 11.2.2 french drains are another example that could be sited
- 11.2.5 be more specific about what is meant by "development" ; perhaps refer to subdivision and commercial developments
- 11.2.6 replace "forest cover" with "forest cover or native vegetation"
- 11.2.7 delete "where possible"; provide examples of how impervious surfaces can be limited, i.e. through the use of pervious pavers, etc.

Resources Uses

- This section should be renamed to Resource Stewardship

APC comments regarding **forestry** are summarized below:

- Delete "productive" in sentence that references MoFR dialogue with residents
- 12.1.3 replace "wishes" with "requests"
- 12.1.4 identify values such as recreation, community, etc.

- 12.1.7 be specific about what is meant by "Durieu Ridge" – means the east side of the Valley. Use long form of CWAP; find a better word for "scrutinize"

APC comments regarding **aggregate** are summarized below:

- 12.2 retitle to "Aggregate and Minerals" to capture extraction of minerals other than aggregate
- Trucking though the community is a major concern
- The Mines Act is antiquated
- Find a way to prevent aggregate operations that pretend to be subdivisions; limit removal as a by-product of subdivision
- Be clear that policies apply to aggregate and other mineral uses
- 12.2.6 refer to "aggregate and mineral uses"
- 12.2.9 amend to say, "cumulative hydro-geological impacts including effect on groundwater *and surface water*"
- 12.2.11 delete "as a baseline"

Biological Diversity

- include a policy advocating for the use of native plants in landscaping
- emphasize positives more

4. Meeting Schedule

The next meeting is 7:00 pm February 18/10 at the McConnell Creek Farmers Institute Hall. It will focus review of draft sections regarding hazards, services, parks and cultural resources.

5. Close of Meeting

The Meeting ended at about 10:00 PM.