



## Fraser Valley Regional District

### PUBLIC HEARING REPORT

TO: Regional Board of Directors

FROM: Director Bogstie, Electoral Area F

HEARING DATE: March 8, 2011

RE: Third Public Hearing on Fraser Valley Regional District Official  
Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw 0999, 2010

---

The Public Hearing on Bylaw No. 0999, 2010 was held on March 8, at 4:50 p.m., in the Fraser Valley Regional District Board Room.

There were 5 members of the public present.

Members of the Regional Board present were:

Director Dick Bogstie, Area "F", Chairperson

Members of the Fraser Valley Regional District staff present were:

Graham Daneluz, Manager Forward Plans/Deputy Planner  
Lisa Grant, Planner I, FVRD

Chairperson Bogstie called the Public Hearing to order at 4:50 p.m. The hearing was convened pursuant to Section 892 of the Local Government Act in order to consider Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan for Hatzic Valley, Electoral Area "F" Bylaw 0999, 2010. In accordance with subsections 1 and 2 of Section 892, the time and place of the Public Hearing was advertised in the February 25 and March 1st, 2011 editions of the Abbotsford Mission Times newspaper.

Chairperson Bogstie stated that the purpose of Bylaw 0999 is to adopt a new Official Community Plan (OCP) for Hatzic Valley, FVRD Electoral Area "F" pursuant to Section 876 of the Local Government Act. The OCP is a broad statement of objectives and policies which guide planning and land use management decisions. In general terms it contains policies and map designations respecting various land uses, the environment, services, public facilities, parks, hazards, resources, water and other matters. Bylaw 0999 would also establish development permit areas for the protection of development from hazardous conditions and the protection of the environment.

Chairperson Bogstie advised that there was one written submission received. It will be incorporated into the public hearing record. It is available for review on the back table.

Chair Bogstie called a first time for briefs or comments from the floor.

Five individuals presented verbal submissions.

**Lynn Fry**  
**43946 Stave Lake Road**  
**13916 Stave Lake Road**

I would like to make a motion that under some circumstances, larger parcels like ten acre parcels might be possibly sub dividable than to for 4.4 and 4.5 acre parcels I realize they are in the ALR and the ALR has their rules but I think if we changed ours we would get a bigger population a few more people moving, maybe younger people and its only one hurdle instead of quite so many to have to go through. If not in the whole area maybe just in a small isolated area like the Stave Lake, Hartley till the end of Stave Lake Road Bennett Road, that sort of smaller area, to see how it works rather than maybe the whole valley.

**Cindy Dube**  
**35149 Bennett Road**

Put forth same motion as Lynn. Also enquiring about smaller sizes for what's in the ALR that you can subdivide down to asking for 4.5 there about size to encourage a little more growth, and the school is all ready closed. So just looking to bring a few more people in that area and if there was smaller lot sizes more people would be able to afford the five acres or 4.5 acres rather than ten acres. So, that's pretty much it.

**Ernie Neumann**  
**35149 Bennett Road**

I just have a question, am I reading this right, its got down here rural 2 hectares which is four acres is that what's being proposed now?

*[Response from Graham Daneluz: I would have to refer to the maps and see]*

Well, no its going like right on the first page its got agricultural and then you've got check mark on rural and a check mark on limited use and the next page you're showing rural two hectares which is four acres.

*[Comment from Graham Daneluz: you're referring to a table that summarizes on page 21, item 4.1 it summarizes uses of land which are permitted in different designations. So for example agricultural use is supported in the Agricultural land designation, Limited Use designation and the Rural designation. On the next page 22, table 4.2, that's a separate table and it summarizes parcel size*

*policies in the various designations that the plan would establish. It says that in the Rural designation the minimum parcel size is proposed to be two hectares.]*

That's what it's being changed to?

*[Response from Graham Daneluz: if you refer to schedule 2, which is a map and plan with all these various colours, this map shows the proposed land designations and which lands they are proposed to be applied to. So, if you look at this map and you see the tan colour, those are the lands that are proposed to be designated Rural where the two hectare minimum parcel size policy applies.]*

So, it doesn't apply to us? We're on Bennett Road, ALR.

*[Response from Graham Daneluz: The yellow is Agricultural and typically reflects land within the Agricultural Land Reserve.]*

So it doesn't apply to us is what you're saying?

*[Response from Graham Daneluz: The Rural designation does not apply to you...correct.]*

Why not?

*[Response from Graham Daneluz: You're in the Agricultural Land Reserve, primarily.]*

Can we not put some motion forward to have that changed? I don't see any reason for that, we're not farmable land, nobody is out there, nobody farms that I know of, why are we so restricted?

*[Response from Graham Daneluz: our purpose tonight is not to debate the merits of the plan, but to take your comments for the Board to consider them when they're thinking what to do about Bylaw 0999. So, your comments will be recorded and the Board will consider them. You might consider making a statement on this and making it very clear for the Board.]*

*[Chair Bogstie: Okay, we can think about that and come back a bit later.]*

**Norm Tapp representing James Wong Seux Road  
25469 – 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue Langley**

They want to change going down to half acre lots and they want to up zone that to approximately 50,000 sq foot lots. Just in the...I talked to my sewage engineer and he had said to me if you want to go down to a one acre lots without a sewer system you need 36 inches of top soil. We were on that site with the excavator did the tests on it, it has about two feet of top soil on it so to get down to that one acre lot we would have to put in a community sewer system or sewer system that or strata sewer system for the property. And I notice that some of the zoning below...it would be very difficult for those people to subdivide their property, supply sewer system for that. We've looked at the site under, we would

prefer if they wanted to slow the growth in that area to stay with the half acre zoning but allow a certain threshold of lot sales after. Probably allow thirty on at the beginning and allow smaller amount from that point on, but we've done some research on the site and we've come up with a sewer system that would benefit the community called the constructive wetland system. It's basically they develop ponds and your effluent is basically turned into potable water once it goes through your pond system, and to make sense on this area if the right size ponds if we are going to stay with the half acre zoning we could encompass that whole development and put it into a green a real green type development where you're not putting in the ground and allow for a significant amount of homes in that area. Over probably the next ten years that would entice maybe the school to reopen again and looking we had some conversations with Tareq and they are looking at putting a water system up in that area. We would like to ask the Board if they could include these areas in that water system and maybe there has to be additional wells in the ground supplying the water system for that area. I think if we could put these homes on a water system and a community sewer system that maybe the Boards takes over and operates after, it is a positive cash flow to the Board and to the residents community sewer system and a community water system. Thank you.

**Earl Babich**  
**10990 Sylvester Road**

Listening to the comments here today, I'm in support of Lynn Fry that some of the agricultural properties should be allowed have lower densities down to two hectares and this is not referring to like taking forty acres parcels and zoning them down, we're talking about properties that are all ready ten acres or near ten acres that are not being used for agricultural purposes. That to zone them down to five acres or two hectares lots is reasonable, and so I would support that. I actually am in favour of the suburban residential density staying higher than the .2 that was in the old community plan. I guess that's the effect of change that brought about this meeting today. I would be in favour of basing calculations of having a suburban residential density of .4 hectares opposed to .5 hectares and I believe that based on the community and how we would like the community to look which I've talked about in other meetings which would be more or less estate type properties. I would be...I believe is 4 hectares would be a new number that would work for this plan and for the community. Dealing with the school closure issue which I've been involved with a great deal, I'm very disturbed at the density of a lot of properties not being low enough to support the growth in the community although in suburban half acres lots, which I think is just too small one acre lots or near there. So the .4 is reasonable considering the rules of clustering and so forth I believe that developers have a lot of flexibility to accomplish high density on lands based on their needs or what the land can accommodate. More specifically to my area and residences on my street, I brought this up at both previous meetings that I think I referred to changing the name of limited use, clearly that hasn't had any amendments recognized by the Board, so this time I will have to approach this in two different ways. One, I would expect that any property that is currently R1 property that is in limited use based on this community plan, I expect that those R1 properties will actually be colour coded rural properties because that's exactly what they are and they are

all properties under 8 hectares which is what the density is for limited use in our area. The specific addresses that I have dealt with for this issue is that 11210 Sylvester Road, it is a 6 acre parcel even though it is not R1 is A2 and RE and should be colour coded for rural, address 11094 Sylvester road is an R3 property that is 8 acres it should be also be colour coded rural since it is under the 8 hectares which would be the minimum size in this plan and so forth. 11082 Sylvester Road similarly is a property I don't have the address here its 10932 its a 22 acres parcel zoned R1 it should be colour coded rural since its all ready an R1 zoning...similarly the plan BCP 45868 is R1 it should be colour coded rural, in fact the property since its newly subdivided those two sites actually are recently subdivided are not on the community plan I would expect them to be colour coded rural and be part of this plan. Property at...73 acre parcel just around the 1000, I don't actually have the physical address because it's a bare piece of property its R1, 73.75 acre parcel it should be colour coded rural if its zoned R1, similarly addresses 9766 Sylvester Road and 9750 Sylvester Road 9710 Sylvester Road, 9660 Sylvester Road all those are R1 properties. And I believe it should be colour coded rural with the map we are talking about. And Schedule 2 and I guess in section 11.2 in aggregates and minerals in the initial paragraph it talks about many issues that are issues of the community and it doesn't mention road safety or road maintenance, walking and biking pathways and possible truck route designations that are issues that should be there and in fact those issues are more stated in section 11.2.9E and I just thought it should also be written in that initial paragraph as issues even though it is dealt with in 11.2.9E. I also wanted to put forth a motion in 11.2.4 that it sets aside I guess parameters, is the way I would read it, in which gravel pits could be brought into the community into District F and I do not, I think we should write a clause in here that would allow the Regional Director, yourself Dick, that for negotiating power or for even control of the community that if you are not in support or if a Regional Director is not in support of a gravel pit to the area that it would give the Regional Director power to negotiate fees for the community and not just for what's written in here of I think it's written in the last page 11.2.13 talks about mitigation to offset negative offsite impacts but I also think that any fee should be used to increase the infrastructures of a community. There's a lot of other services that we've talked about in this document such as high speed internet that not everybody in the community has equal access to. I believe that any new business model moving into our region has to be charged fees so that the community can be up to what I would consider municipal standards such as high speed internet, potential water improvements for low income families, you know those sorts of things. So I'm not sure if the Regional Director would wish to have control or negotiating power but I think as a community no business model for any future gravel pit should realize that their business model has to be giving back to District F and I think that we should write it in a way I've mentioned it before as a formula based models but I think we have to give the power to the community not just to what we call representing authorities or there has to be somebody within the District that has some power to control the business models in the future.

*[Director Bogstie – I should be the dictator?]*

No, but if a gravel pit doesn't have the support of the Director then I don't think it should be approved. It should not just have regional representation, people who

are on a Board who don't live in our community I believe it should actually have a community member who whether it's veto power or something like that I believe that something like that should be written in the plan, again it's just my opinion.

*[Director Bogstie – I'm a little bit facetious because my wife tells me what to do Earl...Graham you were going to make a statement?]*

I have one more issue, if for some reason that the rural mapping designation colouration doesn't occur and I've only looked at specific properties around my neighbourhood, but I expect any R1 properties that are in a limited use should actually be colour coded as rural, and if this is something that isn't looked upon then I would actually want to change the density of limited use down to again 2 hectare or 4 hectare density. 4 hectare is probably more reasonable with the consistency of the plan but naturally some more density which would be in support of the school and a growing community. Thank you.

**Ernie Neumann**  
**35149 Bennett Road**

I'm in support of changing it I believe we're on 5 hectares right now right in that area, changing it down to 2 hectare parcels. There is quite a few smaller parcels around when they were changing it. I have no idea... but boarding our property there are 2.2, 3 acres and 2.977 acres, there's a 1.9 acres quite a few smaller parcels, if we went down to 4 acre lots, were not trying to turn it into a city by any stretch, if we just have the option to do it I don't think all the people are going to jump on that anyway, but it sure would be nice if we had the option to do that.

**Earl Babich**  
**10990 Sylvester Road**

Just considering the school closure I didn't know how section 6.5, I don't know how that would be re-written now that the school has been voted for closure. The other thing is I believe as community members of District F, I believe that we should write in the document that especially following the history of the schools in the area, I believe there has been a school since 1895, I can't find it in here I know it's in here and I would actually like a statement to whereby we in District F as a community believe that a school is an essential service to our community. And we seem to say the argument says that is in the control of the Mission School Board, but I believe that it's a community issue. Having that a nucleus like a school in the community and not just an elementary school but possibly day care institutions and other things and I believe that is should be an essential service. Of course I'll keep advocating for it with every other level of government but I believe that the Regional District should write it in this document as an essential service in that section.

The Chairperson called the second time for comments and reminded those in attendance that the written submission received is available on the back table for review and comment.

The Chairperson called for the third and final time for comments; hearing none, declared the Public Hearing for Bylaw 0999, 2010 concluded.

The Chair Bogstie thanked everyone for coming out.

The Chair Bogstie declared the Public Hearing for Bylaw 0999 concluded at 5:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Dick Bogstie, Chairperson

cc

**ATTACHMENT 1 – Written Submissions**  
Public Hearing Report for Bylaw No. 0999  
March 8, 2011

One written submission was received.

Hi Graham:

A couple of things that are incorrect in the OCP are as follows:

**11.2 Aggregate & Minerals**

Inability or unwillingness to adequately mitigate off-site impacts.

I regularly get calls regarding noise that is thought to be coming from the Quarry and when ever I get a call I will check the quarry or the neighbourhood in search of the noise and when the noise is coming from the Quarry we do all we can to either stop the sound or quieten the sound in a timely matter or immediately if it is too loud. I quite often find the noise being complained about are noise coming from off site such as well drilling rigs, or excavators or other equipment working elsewhere in the neighbourhood. I keep a record of all complaints, where the noise originated, what the outcome was and how it was dealt with.

The quarry can do nothing if the neighbours hire equipment or are causing the noise.

Wakefield Acoustics did a Sound Monitoring Assessment at the quarry as well as 5 Stave Lake Rd residences; we were below the threshold of 55dBA.

I monitor the sound level at the quarry every day from the time they open to the time we close, as we are required not to exceed 55db on a 3 minute LEQ at property line.

The Stave Lake Quarry has had for many years a large berm as a barrier between the quarry and the neighbours. For noise reduction and dust control.

Our gravel piles are watered down during the summer for dust control.

All of Stave Lake Quarries blasts are monitored for sound, overpressure, and vibration. We have very strict levels to abide by and they are well below the damage level.

Impacts to ground and surface water supplies.

A qualified Hydrogeologist (Pacific Hydrology) did an impact evaluation of Stave lake quarry before it opened, as well as a hydrogeologist does continual tests, and if the operation caused any water or well problems we would have to correct those problems before we continued operations.

Loss of property value associated with the quarry. The property assessments are only lowered if you apply to have them lowered. They don't automatically lower them. Most of the people with property closer to the Quarry have no drop in property assessment. You must request it in order to have your assessment lowered.

So the people are actually lowering their values themselves by requesting it.

The majority of the neighbours don't have any problem living next to or near a quarry.

Majority of the aggregate taken from Stave Lake Quarry is used in Maple Ridge, Abbotsford, or Mission.

Rarely is it taken to Metro Vancouver or Vancouver from the Stave Lake Quarry.

The Stave Lake Quarry had several public meetings before opening to address issues of concern. And many changes were made to address the neighborhoods complaints. The pit was located 9/10ths of a kilometer [at the back off the property rather than at the front of the property at the cost of hundreds of thousands to the company, to satisfy the community.](#) The Quarry pit is not visible from the road or neighboring properties.

[The neighbors are encouraged to call the Quarry whenever there are truck issues in the neighborhood. I do my very best to settle any trucking problems. I live in this community too, my family drives on these roads as well, so I do all I can to assure everyones safety.](#)

Inadequate enforcement

We can expect a mine inspector to arrive at any moment of any day for an inspection.

Insufficient regulatory rules.

We are required to abide by many rules. As required by our permit and mining code. You can go to the Ministry of Forest, Mines, and Lands website. Click on Aggregate, click on Guide to preparing mine permit applications for Aggregate pits and Quarries in BC. Not as easy or unregulated as you make it sound. Please check the BC Mines Act.

If you like I can I send you a copy of Health, Safety and Reclamation Code for Mines in BC 2008. Another set of rules t o adhere to.

The Ministry of Mines can verify these regulations that we are required to abide by and even more that I have not mentioned.

The FVRD should be less critical of the current Quarries as we also pay taxes and create employment for the community just as any other business in the community does.

Please correct your miss guided information and replace it with the real facts.

Thank you,  
Lynne Fry  
Stave Lake Quarries Inc.  
13361 Stave Lake Rd,  
Mission, BC  
V2V 4J1  
604-814-6666  
stavelk@telus.net