

**Fraser Valley Regional District**

45950 Cheam Avenue, Chilliwack, BC V2P 1N6  
Phone: 1-800-528-0061 or (604) 702-5000  
Fax: (604) 792-9684



---

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Chair and members of the Regional Board of Director  
From: Lisa Grant, Planner 1  
Date: February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2011  
Subject: OCP Amendment Bylaw 0994, 2010  
Zoning Bylaw Amendment 0993, 2010  
File No.: 3360-22-2009-01  
6480-30-039

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Regional Board consider Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 0994, 2010 and Fraser Valley Regional District Zoning Amendment Bylaw 0993, 2010 as amended in conjunction with the Public Hearing Report for the January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011 public hearing of bylaw 0993, 2010 and bylaw 0994, 2010.

**THAT** the bylaw cited as “Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 0994, 2010” be given third reading.

**THAT** the Regional Board submit Fraser Valley Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 0994, 2010 to the Minister of Community, Sport and Cultural Development for approval under section 882 of the Local Government Act, if required.

**AND THAT** the bylaw cited as “Fraser Valley Regional District Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 0993, 2010” be given third reading as amended.

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE(S):**

The application of land use regulations to un-zoned areas of Hemlock Valley and the updating of snow avalanche hazard policies

**BACKGROUND:**

---

*Summary of actions to date*

---

September 2009	Regional Board endorsed project to apply zoning regulations to Hemlock Valley
December 7 <sup>th</sup> 2009	Introductory meeting with community members and property owners
February 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010	1 <sup>st</sup> reading Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment bylaw 0994, 2010
March 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010	2 <sup>nd</sup> reading OCP amendment bylaw 0994, 2010
March 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010	1 <sup>st</sup> reading zoning amendment bylaw 0993, 2010
April 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2010	Public information meeting
November 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010	Finalized snow avalanche report received by Regional Board
November 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010	2 <sup>nd</sup> reading of OCP amendment bylaw 0994, 2010 rescinded and amended bylaw 0994, 2010 given 2 <sup>nd</sup> reading
November 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010	2 <sup>nd</sup> reading zoning amendment bylaw 0993, 2010
January 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2011	Public hearing for OCP amendment bylaw 0994, 2010 & zoning amendment bylaw 0993,2010

---

A public hearing for bylaw 0994, 2010 (Official Community Plan amendment) and bylaw 0993, 2010 (zoning bylaw) was held on January 20, 2011. Ten members of the public were present and two people provided comments on the bylaws. One in favour of adoption of the bylaws and another opposed to the bylaws. 17 letters were received and incorporated into the public hearing record.

The letters and comments are summarized in appendix A-D.

**DISCUSSION:**

The zoning bylaw follows expired building schemes in approximately 92% of instances, and addresses issues such as snow storage, parking and other problems the expired building schemes did not contemplate. Additionally, snow avalanche hazard information was updated. This information reduced the number of properties located in the snow avalanche hazard area from 78 to 19. The Official Community Plan and proposed zoning bylaws were amended to reflect this new information.

The proposed bylaws will streamline development approvals by not requiring a development permit and snow avalanche report for white zone properties.

Unfortunately, 19 properties are in the 'blue' area, a hazard category where it is uncertain whether the properties are safe for residential use. In the 'blue' area, properties already developed would be zoned to reflect the current use. Temporary tourist accommodation use is not permitted in this area as recommended in the updated snow avalanche report.

Vacant properties will be zoned for duplex in several cases. This represents a decrease from the expired building scheme density. Staff feels this is an appropriate approach to reduce exposure to avalanche risks, provides flexibility in the site development, and foster appropriate market expectations. Site specific studies are still required for development approvals.

Certainly owners can apply to re-zone for greater densities in the cases where a site specific study demonstrates the suitability of the lands for the use. The OCP will support such applications. This approach is particularly relevant for a lot on Edelweiss Drive which amalgamated four lots into one lot in the early 1980's. The size of this lot may present opportunities for more intensive development but a site specific hazard study is critical.

Resolution of the uncertainty facing the 19 'blue' properties will require the resources and efforts of the province and in-depth hazard investigation. Potential outcomes may include: implementing protective works or strategies for land swaps or whatever the case may be.

This process was started with an initial meeting of agency staff, Regional District planning staff, local area director, a homeowner's association representative and the resort owner and utility representative. A follow up meeting is anticipated in the coming months.

In light of the updated snow avalanche information and on-going discussions with provincial agencies, staff recommends third reading to bylaw 0994, 2010 (OCP amendment) and bylaw 0993, 2010 (zoning bylaw) as amended.

**COST:**

Budgeted for in the 2010 budget as a priority project.

**COMMENT BY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER:**

Reviewed and supported.

**COMMENT BY GENERAL MANAGER OF COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SERVICES**

Reviewed and supported.

**COMMENT BY GENERAL MANAGER OF REGIONAL AND CORPORATE SERVICES**

Reviewed and supported.

Appendix A

Agency Referral Comments received prior to Public Hearing (January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011)  
 Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 0994, 2010 &  
 Zoning Bylaw Amendment No. 0993, 2010

Agency	Comments	FVRD Response
Ministry of Natural Resources (formerly Ministry of Forests and Range)	Advised that two forest licensee holders have forest related interests in the area. As a result, some forest activities may be visible on the landscape. Licensee holders should be contacted.	Copies of the bylaws were referred to forest licensee holders for comments. No comments were received.
Resort Development Branch- Ministry of Natural Resource Operations	<p>Bylaw 0993, 2010:                      Supports the Regional District’s efforts to apply land use regulations. Advises that if the proposed Master Plan is approved further zoning amendments may be required.</p> <p>Bylaw 0994, 2010:                      Recognizes the need to amend the OCP to reflect snow avalanche report’s recommendations. The report has been provided to resort planners for information concerning the Master Plan’s design and expansion concepts. The Resort Development Branch will continue to work with the Regional District to address snow avalanche risk areas in Hemlock Valley.</p>	<p>Bylaw 0994, 2010:                      OCP Amendment Part II, Schedule “A” Section 6.1 D provides policy support for a comprehensive snow avalanche hazard management plan in partnership with other agencies, local community and the resort owner. Regional District staff has already engaged the Province concerning additional snow avalanche hazard evaluation.</p>
Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure	MoTI does not regulate or have any jurisdiction over property use in this area. Therefore, MoTI’s interest are unaffected by the proposed bylaws.	
Hemlock Valley Homeowners Association	<p>Bylaw 0993, 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to rental restrictions on Edelweiss Drive.</li> <li>• RST-4 and RST-5 should provide more than 1.5 parking spaces per unit</li> </ul> <p>Bylaw 0994, 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to amended OCP policy stating zoning ‘should’ follow building schemes</li> </ul>	<p>Bylaw 0993, 2010:                      Rental restriction- The Regional District is proposing to prohibit temporary tourist accommodation in the ‘blue’ snow avalanche area. The snow avalanche report advises that rentals should not be permitted in ‘blue’ snow avalanche hazard areas.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw is amended to provide two (2) parking stalls per dwelling units in the RST-4 (medium) and RST-5 (high density) zones.</p> <p>Bylaw 0994, 2010:                      In approximately 92% of cases the proposed zoning bylaw reflects building schemes. Density is</p>

		proposed to be reduced for lots in the 'blue' hazard area to reduce risk.
Berezan Management	Opposed to Bylaws	

Appendix B

Summary of verbal comment made at the January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Public Hearing  
Official Community Plan Bylaw Amendment No. 0994, 2010

Comment	Response
I would strongly urge that you do not change the wording of Part 2, Zoning to read: “ <i>Zoning be introduced which will distinguish areas for single family, duplex and multiplex residential development. The zoning regulations <b>should</b> be guided by the building schemes, which have been registered on title since the initial development of the community.</i> ” The word “ <b>shall</b> ” should remain in the policy as it holds the Regional District to follow the building schemes.	The majority (92%) of zoning reflects expired building schemes. Proposed zoning for the remaining properties responds to snow avalanche risk. The OCP and Hazard Acceptability Threshold policy directs development away from hazards.  No amendment is recommended.
The snow avalanche report is a generalization and a more detailed avalanche report is needed so that the Regional District knows the extent of the hazard and clears up Regional District’s misconception. The Regional District should not pass the OCP amendments at this time.	The report is an update of the 2000 study; it was undertaken by a leading snow avalanche expert.

Appendix C

Summary of verbal comment made at the January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Public Hearing  
Zoning bylaw amendment 0993, 2010

Comment	Response
<p>A great deal of uncertainty exists without land use regulations in Hemlock Valley for property owners and potential investors. Although there are some issues that may not suit everybody, I urge the Directors to adopt this bylaw.</p>	
<p>Restricting rentals year round on Edelweiss Drive is unfair for a snow avalanche hazard that could happen once every 10 years. It is unfair to put this restriction in writing and I do not see the difference between a month to month rental and nightly rentals.</p>	<p>Bylaw 0993, 2010 would restrict temporary tourist accommodation use in 'blue' snow avalanche hazard areas as advised in the snow avalanche report and by the Canadian Avalanche Association's national guidelines.</p> <p>Regional District staff, recommended in a memo dated October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010 two options for properties in the 'blue' snow avalanche hazard zone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Applications for re-zoning with the offer of a covenant to restrict temporary tourist accommodation use to spring, summer and early fall months ;</li> <li>2. Apply for re-zoning supported by a snow avalanche report advising the property is a 'white' zone property and safe for rentals.</li> </ol> <p>Temporary tourist accommodation use is a separate and distinct use from a month to month residential use. Temporary tourist accommodation use is a more intense commercial residential use. A month to month residential use is just that, a residential use and zoning does not to restrict users, rather only the use.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>It is unfair of the Regional District to downgrade the zoning on properties from sixplexes and fourplexes to duplex and duplex to single family dwellings. They've been paying property taxes for all of these years and now with a stroke of the pen you (Regional District) are going to change it.</p>	<p>Currently, the majority of lands do not have zoning. Previously, land use was regulated by a building scheme, a private agreement between the resort owner and property owner. These building schemes have all since expired. Therefore, the Regional District is not 'downgrading' zoning for these properties.</p> <p>Building schemes were consulted and followed for approximately 92% of properties. Areas where zoning does not reflect buildings schemes technical advice suggest residential development may not be safe.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>Under the RST-4 and RST-5 zones which are medium and high density, they are allowed 1.5 parking spaces (per unit). We are not allowed to park on the roads in</p>	<p>Parking requirements in the RST-4 and RST-5 are amended from 1.5 spaces per unit to 2 parking spaces per unit.</p>

winter conditions and Highways has made it clear that they are going to start to enforce this. We need to ensure that any new development have proper parking. Many units are owned by two families with two cars. Without the luxury of transit service to Hemlock, it is imperative that these two zones require 2 parking spaces per unit.

Appendix D  
 Summary of Written Submissions from January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Public Hearing  
 Official Community Plan Bylaw Amendment No. 0994, 2010  
 Zoning Amendment Bylaw 0993, 2010

Comment	Response
<p>Opposed to bylaw 0993, 2010 and bylaw 0994, 2010 as this will have a serious negative impact on our property value.</p>	
<p>We own a property (full time resident) in the “affected area” on Edelweiss Drive and find these bylaw proposals unacceptable. Therefore, we are <u>AGAINST</u> this amendment.</p>	
<p>We would like to express that we are firmly against the proposed change. Our understanding is that the most recent study came out to show this area to be medium to low risk for avalanche so therefore we question the need to rezone the area!</p>	<p>The recent snow avalanche report determined that ‘blue’ zone properties are in a medium risk area and residential construction is not recommended.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>I do question the timing of this rezoning application as it appears to be concurrent with the proposed Master development plan, and the beneficial effect that this rezoning would have on the Mountain’s ownership as to their development plans with respect to water and sewer issues.</p>	<p>Building schemes were consulted and followed for approximately 92% of properties. Areas where zoning does not reflect buildings schemes technical advice suggest residential development may not be safe.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>In addition...could it be the proposed ski runs that may be the reason for the avalanche concerns above Edelweiss Drive. One can only speculate, but one does wonder...</p>	<p>The snow avalanche engineer evaluated avalanche hazards associated with Edelweiss Drive. Staff is not aware of proposals for ski runs in the avalanche area.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>While I appreciate the issue that the Regional District might feel that it faces, rezoning properties in question will have a definite and dramatic effect on property values, and I view this as being in effect an expropriation of property rights without my being compensated for the same. ..</p> <p>Needless to say, I am firmly against this proposed rezoning, as I view it as simply being an expropriation by the Regional District without any form of compensation to the owners in question. If the Regional District does pass this re-zoning By-law, I would expect the Regional District to expropriate the properties so affected.</p>	<p>Pursuant to the Local Government Act section 914 states “Compensation is not payable to any person for any reduction in the value of that person’s interest in land, or for any loss or damages that result from the adoption of an Official Community Plan or a bylaw under this division (zoning).”</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>I question the need for rezoning, as to my knowledge there has never been a slide in the area in question and in the 25 plus years that I have owned the property in question, there has never been a slide, so I do question the need for rezoning the property in question.</p>	<p>The recent snow avalanche report states “...avalanche hazards at Hemlock Valley are very subtle to the people without experience in evaluation of such hazards... are well beyond the experience of any resident of Hemlock Valley. For example, if a resident</p>

	<p>lived there for 30 years, the chance of observing a 300 year return period avalanche is less than 10 percent.”</p> <p>The report recommends that properties located in the ‘blue’ zone may not be suitable for residential development. This is consistent with the Canadian Avalanche Association’s national guidelines.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>We have a six and eight year old sons that spend almost every weekend skiing at Hemlock. Safety is obviously a concern for us. If this is deemed unsafe (or having an increased safety risk), why were these approved for building 25 years ago? Like every mother or father, I want my family to be in a safe environment; we invested our hard earned money for our family’s enjoyment. Now we are told that this building carries extra risk but where was that determination when these were approved for building?</p> <p>Rezoning does not solve the problem because you are now telling me my investment is worth much less than we paid. There has to be a better solution for the homeowners involved.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>If we built and had friends or friends of friends or relatives over night or visiting during the day are we to warn them of a risk? This is not logical. If this property is unsafe we do not want it, give us new property or buy us out, the government in the end is fully responsible for this. Please address this situation properly and honestly before potential legal action eventual will occur.</p>	<p>See above comments.</p> <p>Staff is working with agencies to address the uncertainty for ‘blue’ area avalanche properties, as noted in the discussion section of this memo.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>The authors of the proposed Zoning Bylaws consider properties in the blue zone to be at risk for habitation. Apparently it is OK to put certain people at risk, those presumed to be aware of the potential avalanche dangers, their children, friends and other guests, but not those who might unwittingly spend the night as a third party renter. Sorry, I just cannot see the logic in this argument. Either these properties are safe for habitation or they are not.</p> <p>I can only speculate as to the comments coming from a professional risk manager with respect to the FVRD’s liability if this line of thinking is not altered. The Authority having jurisdiction over this exercise is mandated to consider risk to the public no matter who they are, property owner, guest or renter alike. With respect to the proposed suggestions to allow seasonal rentals, I do not see how that alters the basic premise of the argument which should be unqualified safety for the public.</p>	<p>See above comments.</p>

<p>Combined with the stigma of “increased avalanche danger”, there are now so many conditions to satisfy before a permit could be issued that even building a duplex would be an onerous and unreasonably costly exercise, with no realistic chance of recovering the costs. The property has been effectively rendered unusable. When we purchased this property there were no unusual conditions to satisfy to obtain a building permit. Then the first set of restrictions was added as a result of the perceived “avalanche danger”, now even more conditions. On top of that we would be reduced to a duplex site from 24 units. I don’t care what the FVRD thinks, given the precedent set 30 years ago and the clear intent to divert density to others at no cost to them, I think there is the potential for legal recourse. Maybe you can make this point to Wendy as our Provincial representative. Either relocate us with our density intact or buy us out.</p>	<p>Property owners have the right to apply for re-zoning and undertake their own technical evaluation of snow avalanche hazards by a qualified professional to increase density.</p> <p>When the resort was first approved by the Province, hazard information was largely unknown. Over the years with new hazard evaluations and new snow avalanche modeling technologies, more information is known about the nature of snow avalanches and their relationship to forest penetration</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaws in most cases (92%) follow expired building scheme’s density. Based on community feedback, the Regional District applied a density provision for the RST-4 and RST-5 that closely matches the expired building schemes. No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>To have our property down zoned to a duplex site from 24 is arguably ridiculous. On what reasonable basis could this be seen as either justified or even remotely ethical. Either the site is safe to build on or it’s not (you can’t be just a little bit pregnant as the saying goes). The number of units is irrelevant. This is like saying that because people get killed in car accidents that all vehicles should be restricted to 2 occupants. No more mini vans and SUVs. This is nothing short of a redistribution of density to favour lots controlled by the resort operator (or could it be just a remarkable coincidence). The FVRD has effectively rendered our lot and others in the blue zone worthless. No one in their right mind would purchase or develop one of these lots, given the proposed conditions and restrictions. As suggested by others, the Province should either relocate these properties with their original density intact (as was done in the past) or purchase the lots outright.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>To suggest that the density on our property should be reduced to a maximum duplex use is impossible to rationalize. The proposed site coverage would suggest a duplex with an 8,400 sq. ft. foot print. As a permitted 2 story building, that is a total 16, 800 sq. ft. of duplex. I don’t know of any market for such a building (anywhere). How does this protect the public? How many occupants will fit in a 16,800 sq. ft. duplex. Say 4 /1000 sq. ft. The code allows 2 /bedroom. 2 bedrooms = about 1000 sq. ft. That could be about 70 people. To better protect the occupants of any theoretically permitted structure on our site (as a stated objective of the rezoning exercise) it would make sense to allow, at the very least, the current density of 24 units, with a floor area of 24,000sq. ft. This would</p>	<p>This property is one of those properties best dealt with on a site specific application</p> <p>The Regional District is working with Provincial agencies to secure long term protection for the Mt. Keenan slope above Edelweiss Drive, Snowmist Place and Snowmist Drive.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>

<p>potentially allow for an economically viable development, with a full concrete parking structure. This might, in fact, be a way to get past the engineering requirements and produce a cost effective and adequately secure structure to resist any future avalanche (with or without the protection of the tree buffer zone).</p> <p>The current proposal does nothing of the kind. As far as we are concerned, the proposed zoning is a non starter with respect to our circumstances. I gather many other property owners in the blue zone feel the same. Keep in mind that if the trees uphill from us burn down, all those lots in the white zone, downhill from us, turn into blue zone lots. What do you do then? Best to keep density as it is (or even increase the density) all along Edelweiss Dr. With higher density, property owners are better equipped to deal with the cost of providing avalanche protection. Or just relocate everyone to a safer area of the valley, or buy them out.</p>	
<p>Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the Public Hearing scheduled for Jan. 20 as I will be out of town. FVRD did not notify me of this date and I arranged my flight dates several weeks ago. As you know, this rezoning will negate the value of the affected (blue zone) properties, and in some cases life savings of the owners. Therefore of course we reiterate our objection to the rezoning as it is proposed. We believe planning staff and representatives may not be aware of workable and <u>achievable</u> alternative solutions that would be more equitable and provide a win-win solution. We urge the FVRD to not pass this Third Reading, and to refer this rezoning back to planning staff to do more intensive investigation and planning of other alternatives. If this rezoning (and transfer of density and utility service allotments from our lots to others) proceeds in this form, then we will lose levers that currently exist to work out an equitable solution for all. We note that Barry Penner, MLA and heads of various government departments including Transport, Forest, Tourism, etc. have all recommended that the FVRD strive to work out an equitable solution</p>	<p>The Regional District exceeded legislated requirements for public hearing notifications</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw is responding to the updated snow avalanche report. Based on Regional District policies and Official Community Plan policies, development should be directed away from areas susceptible to hazards. In this case it is not possible to entirely direct development away from hazards, but it is possible to assign a lower density to these lots to reduce the number of people exposed to hazards.</p> <p>A variety of alternative approaches were explored. Staff continues to recommend this approach.</p> <p>As noted, under referral responses, ministries either supported or felt the proposed bylaws did not affect their interests.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>If the FVRD wants to allow construction on blue zone properties, the onus is on them to establish the standards that need to be met. This was done in the past by the resort when they were the defacto approving authority via the old District of Frazer Chiam. Our original building permit was approved on the basis of standards set by the resort, at their initiative and cost. Our engineer was then required to meet those standards. That's what engineers do. They don't set the standards, they comply with them. The obligation to set those standards is with the authority</p>	<p>The Local Government Act and Community Charter set out the need for engineering evaluations in areas of hazards.</p> <p>The Regional District has identified lands susceptible to hazards. The Regional Board policies set an acceptable threshold for risk and development approvals.</p> <p>National Resources Canada sets a snow load threshold and this threshold must be met for development</p>

<p>having jurisdiction. For the FVRD to suggest that individual property owners are required to effectively set their own standards via some investigation by an engineer hired by them is nothing less than frivolous. Just try to find an engineer that would participate in such an exercise for any amount of fee. These sorts of standards are established for the public good, by government authorities to apply as appropriate. Snow loads, design live loads, seismic criteria and so on are all established for the public to use when designing structures. For example, property owners (or their engineers) are not required to do earthquake studies to establish seismic design standards when applying for a building permit, how could they? They and their engineers have no ability do this. Similarly, the public does not have the ability or mandate to establish standards for structures in an acknowledged avalanche zone. The revised avalanche assessment establishes that the blue zone is not safe for habitable uses. To suggest that the onus is now on individual property owners to find some way around this is not only completely impractical it borders on negligence. In any practical sense, it can't be done. With respect to this issue, this entire exercise appears to be a sham. Just don't know what else to say. The FVRD may think they have no obligation to the property owners to compensate them for their probable loss, but I'm not so sure about the Province. They approved this subdivision and have provided compensation for exactly the same reasons in the past. When will common sense prevail? Pass this on to others at your discretion</p>	<p>approval (building permit).</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>
<p>1) Proposed text amendment (Bylaw 0994): We oppose the proposed text amendment to the Official Community Plan, Bylaw No. 0030, 2000, Part II, Schedule "A" Section 3.4.1 (B) that would change the word "<i>shall</i>" to "<i>should</i>".</p> <p>2) Proposed new restrictions to temporary tourist accommodation for 'Blue' area properties (Bylaw 0993): Based on the October 2010 update to the 2000 avalanche report, the 19 properties remaining in the Blue area would no longer have temporary tourist accommodation as a permitted use. This will have a negative impact on the value of those properties.</p> <p>3) Off-street parking requirements for RST-4 and RST-5 zones (Bylaw 0993). The proposal is that Medium and High density residences built on lots zoned RST-4 and RST-5 would be required to provide off street parking for only 1.5 automobiles per dwelling unit. The HVHA believes that all residential developments in Hemlock Valley should be required to provide off street parking for 2 automobiles per dwelling unit, as is proposed for the RST-2 and RST-3 zones. The majority of homeowners in Hemlock</p>	<p>See comments above.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>

<p>Valley use their dwellings for recreational purposes, and so there are many units with more than one family as owners, which means more than one automobile. For full time residents, since there is no transit available, most families will have at least 2 automobiles.</p> <p>With these concerns outstanding, the HVHA is not in favour of the proposed Bylaws 0993 and 0994. We welcome the opportunity to work with FVRD on these issues and the upcoming consultative process.</p>	
<p>We are not satisfied with the proposed land use zoning for parts of Hemlock Valley. With the new Master Plan that the resort has put forth, we feel the proposed zoning is a poor use of space. Phase one of the new plan will centre around Laurel Rd, not snowflake Crescent.</p> <p>We as homeowners on Snowmist Drive would prefer to see more multi-family and some commercial. Geotechnical hazards are minimal in our area and lot sizes are comparable to those in other municipalities.</p> <p>We propose there be more properties designated duplex, but preferably multi-family, as the area will most certainly be a part of the growth that is in store for the Hemlock community.</p> <p>As homeowners and full time residents, we fully understand the ramifications of the water and sewer systems. But, as the utilities are tied to the growth of the Resort community we feel sure, that water system will be brought into compliance long before more doors in the new community plan are put in place.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the sanitary system that is in place may need some upgrading, but it is more than sufficient to handle multi units that are predominantly used only a few weeks a year.</p> <p>It will be some time before Hemlock is considered a bedroom community to other parts of the Fraser Valley. We should be prepared for growth as a Resort community and not predominantly a single family unit development.</p>	<p>OCP policies, expired building schemes, hazards and servicing thresholds guided the proposed zoning bylaw. Zoning must address servicing levels and thresholds- these were set by the province and utility provider.</p> <p>Zoning and land uses can change over time. This may be the case for Hemlock Valley once servicing and hazard issues have been addressed.</p> <p>No amendment is recommended.</p>