

REVIEWING AND ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CURRENT SRD OCP

COMPILED RESPONSES FROM 34 REPORT CARDS

MEETING HELD 6 DECEMBER 2008

Planning issues identified in the current OCP:	Still a valid issue?		How successfully has it been addressed in the past 15 years? (score A, B, C, D, E, F)
	Yes	No	
<p>Agriculture – under-utilized economic opportunity; endorse agricultural activities of a type and scale compatible with surrounding uses; encourage the maintenance of existing agricultural areas; minimize potential negative impacts on water quality and fish-bearing streams.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Encourage keeping ALR. MOE PRRD? Fish farming, shellfish. Agriculture includes trees, TFLs, fish, shellfish – these are existing economies. Food self-reliance is only a part of agriculture, but ALR lands need continued protection; keep fish farms out. The developers south of town have the habit of applying to the Regional Board to take ALR land out of the ALR to further their agendas and increase the density of their lots. The RB has so far disallowed these applications and should continue to do so.</p>	31	1	A – 7 B – 9 C – 4 D – 3 E – 1 F – 2 Don't know – 8
<p>Community watersheds – need for protection identified as a major issue; minimize degradation of water quality for existing and potential domestic water supply areas.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Jefferd, Myrtle Creek, Eagle River land???</p> <p>Agency overlaps; global warming, increased logging activity, increased concerns. Jurisdiction outside of PRRD – can and has done a number of surveys, supplied \$, etc., which has been addressed by PRRD within their powers and previous OCP.</p>	33	1	A – 7 B – 3 C – 10 D – 3 E – 0 F – 2 Don't know – 6
<p>Industry and commerce – desire for non-polluting employment opportunities and economic benefits; challenge of encouraging commercial and industrial development while maintaining the</p>	30	4	A – 8 B – 4

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

<p>rural lifestyle and minimizing negative environmental impacts.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> How much can the RD do to promote employment? Industry – logging especially – drives economy – dominant. Need zoning or development controls to achieve these goals, and they has been very, very little of this. Don't take up opportunities for services which could offer employment and be non-polluting. Board could have had demonstration composting on a community scale; also a teaching centre for recycling at one time; but Board does not want to spend \$ or create services, so it's a bit hollow.</p>			<p>C – 3 D – 5 E – 2 F – 3 Don't know – 7</p>
<p>Resources – potential land-use conflicts with residential use with population growth; need for integrated resource management approach; increased environmental awareness.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> There is no growth. Recently some initiatives are emerging (F). Stepping forward on Island Timberlands issue (C~F). No information. Great sentiment, again, no action to promote the goal. Fish culture is a “rural” lifestyle? Logging in recreation areas with very little opposition or voice from the Board. Even if they can't stop it, some enthusiasm for protecting the rural resident and his or her environment – i.e., living environment, next-door type neighbourhood. It's all a bit confusing. Integrate land management – D – need proactive involvement and liaison for ILMP as per provincial initiative – no communication in this regard with proactive groups in Area C especially Area B – Myrtle Creek, community watersheds need public response not just industrial and developers' input – but the onus is on citizen participation – the profits for industry and development are stronger motivation and influence to PRRD at times. It is a business, and business operates to provide private profit to the non-benefits for the larger community.</p>	30	2	<p>A – 6 B – 4 C – 4 D – 3 E – 2 F – 3 Don't know – 6</p>
<p>Environmentally-sensitive areas – need for identification and protection, including hazard areas, ecologically-important areas, and unique features and scenic areas.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> “F” until past year, then “D”. Again, agency overlaps – need enforced protection (D). Lots of areas identified in last plan, nothing done to protect them.</p>	31	1	<p>A – 8 B – 5 C – 3 D – 5 E – 0 F – 4</p>

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

<p>ESAs are identified, can be overlaid on maps, etc., but industry dominates land use – e.g., Lang Creek estuary demands of profit-driven development. I don't see a lot of industry people here – they know and use the regs from MOF, DFO, etc., to allow or limit or guide their usage of land, water, air, etc. Little proactive info from regional districts to residents. Approvals to other agencies – e.g., DOT, MOF, MOE are only learned of from diligent reading of local paper – The Peak. Thanks to The Peak!</p>			<p>Don't know – 5</p>
<p>Residential development – concerns over water supply and septic systems on small lots, particularly in new, small-lot development concentrated within the sensitive Coastal Zone between City boundary and Lang Bay.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Bigger lots to accommodate septic and wells. Need a review of septic system efficacy. Allow composting toilets? Completing studies, etc., provides funds through PRRD. Clarify Coastal Zone. Many small acreages past Lang Bay with trailers and tenants and no water inspection. Why stop at Lang Bay? A 3-acre lot with 3 trailers, 3 septic, and 1 well is a problem for potential contamination of ground water, wherever it is. Why are real estate agents circulating water protection information and not the regional board?</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>A – 7 B – 6 C – 5 D – 1 E – 1 F – 2 Don't know – 7</p>
<p>Current OCP Objectives – Environmental:</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>How successful?</p>
<p>To encourage land-use patterns that respect natural capabilities and limitations of the landscape and to establish as a priority the maintenance of a healthy natural environment</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Five acres only. No regulations, no guidance (F). Inaction (F). No examples – who knows? (F)</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A – 6 B – 4 C – 4 D – 2 E – 1 F – 4 Don't know – 7</p>
<p>To preserve or limit from development environmentally sensitive areas or hazardous areas and areas of particular biological, recreational, scenic or historical significance</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> ALR is great. No regulations, no guidance (E). Eagle River, Myrtle Creek, Horseshoe River, West Lake (F).</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A – 6 B – 2 C – 6 D – 3 E – 2 F – 5</p>

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

Inaction (F). No examples – who knows? (F)			Don't know – 5
To maintain and/or enhance the aesthetic qualities of the planning area <u>Comments:</u> Leave it alone. Rampant destruction (F). Is this even an objective? Slow response, inaction (F). No examples – who knows? (F) What does this mean? Sounds like the “no clothesline” rule they have in some subdivisions.	29	4	A – 7 B – 3 C – 3 D – 2 E – 0 F – 6 Don't know – 6

General Planning Objectives:	Still valid issue?		How successful?
	Yes	No	
To minimize the potential for land-use conflicts <u>Comments:</u> Some dialogue, not proactive communication. Fish farm. No regulations, no guidance (F).	29	1	A – 6 B – 4 C – 5 D – 2 E – 1 F – 2 Don't know – 2
To accommodate orderly and economical development while maintaining maximum land-use options for future generations <u>Comments:</u> No examples. No action. Support for keeping ALR.	25	3	A – 6 B – 4 C – 2 D – 4 E – 2 F – 0 Don't know – 4
To foster co-operation between PRRD, City of Powell River and provincial agencies on matters of mutual interest pertaining to resource management and growth and development <u>Comments:</u> No examples. Seems to me there is only one objective of how to collect more taxes.	30	1	A – 6 B – 6 C – 2 D – 3 E – 3

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

Regional District has a very non-cooperative approach to City. For example, refusing to consider holding a vote on cost-sharing for Rec Complex.			F – 2 Don't know – 0
Industry and Commerce:	Yes	No	How successful?
To encourage a diversified local economy and increased local employment opportunities through the establishment of small-scale commercial and industrial enterprises <u>Comments:</u> I encourage cottage industries. Can't see evidence of this policy.	26	5	A – 7 B – 2 C – 6 D – 1 E – 3 F – 1 Don't know – 2
To recommend appropriate locations for industrial and commercial enterprises which are environmentally and socially acceptable to the community <u>Comments:</u> Not sure if any recommendations. Board reviews subdivision application on case-by-case basis with no consideration for environment or the community. Can't see evidence of this policy. No industries in SRD!	28	2	A – 7 B – 4 C – 4 D – 0 E – 2 F – 4 Don't know – 1
Parks and Recreation:	Yes	No	How successful?
To ensure the provision of sufficient parks, recreation and open space areas to meet the long-term diverse recreational needs of local residents and visiting public <u>Comments:</u> Not proactive, no new parks. No action although in OCP – focus. Natural only. (2 comments) “E” for effort in the last two years.	26	4	A – 8 B – 3 C – 4 D – 1 E – 1 F – 5 Don't know – 0
Residential Development:	Yes	No	How successful?
To provide an opportunity for rural residential development (within a framework of historically slow growth) in those areas most suitable and desirable for this purpose <u>Comments:</u> Not consistent, where are they?	23	7	A – 8 B – 2 C – 6 D – 2

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

<p>Approved subdivisions but require OCP improvements. Encourage growth in the City. Need to cover housing.</p>			<p>E – 1 F – 1 Don't know – 1</p>
<p>To provide for a range of residential development options which retain the qualities of residential peace and privacy <u>Comments:</u> Small subdivisions – small lots. Not consistent. Need to cover housing.</p>	25	4	<p>A – 6 B – 5 C – 3 D – 2 E – 4 F – 1 Don't know – 1</p>
Resources:	Yes	No	How successful?
<p>To encourage the use and management of natural resources on a sustainable basis to maximize their long-term benefits, minimizing the adverse environmental, social impacts of resource dev't <u>Comments:</u> Some action, but not proactive enough with OCP. Over-logging in places. Board doesn't do much.</p>	27	3	<p>A – 8 B – 2 C – 5 D – 1 E – 1 F – 2 Don't know – 3</p>
<p>To ensure that development within community watersheds occurs in accordance with sound watershed management principles, particularly the preservation of water quality as well as long-term availability of a suitable supply of water. <u>Comments:</u> Have done studies; request for moratorium on logging; agency overlap. No need yet for water system. No system needed. The jury is still out; probably "C". Health Department</p>	29	1	<p>A – 6 B – 2 C – 3 D – 4 E – 3 F – 2 Don't know – 0</p>
<p>To encourage the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitats <u>Comments:</u> Little action. Eagle River, Horseshoe River and Myrtle Creek – Board not speaking up for these types of areas.</p>	28	1	<p>A – 7 B – 2 C – 3 D – 2 E – 2</p>

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

			F – 3 Don't know – 3
To support the Agricultural Land Commission objective to preserve land with agricultural potential for future agricultural production and encourage development of agricultural operations that have economic and social value <u>Comments:</u> Public hearing re removal of ALR from waterfront – how did it proceed even that far? Stopped ALR removals on waterfront through public process. Needs our support. Could use more support. Should read: "... agricultural operations that can feed us or some of us." Why does agriculture need an economic value?	28	2	A – 7 B – 6 C – 5 D – 1 E – 1 F – 1 Don't know – 1
Coastal Zone:	Still valid issue?		How successful?
	Yes	No	
To maintain or enhance the environmental, economic and recreational values of the coastal zone as development occurs <u>Comments:</u> Some efforts have been made recently. Clarify or change heading. Recreation is more than campgrounds and groomed parks. It's also being able to be active in our community. Destination parks that we can walk to would be nice. Passive public access to creeks, foreshore, viewpoints that we can walk and bike to – these things would be nice and low maintenance.	28	3	A – 5 B – 5 C – 3 D – 4 E – 2 F – 2 Don't know – 2
To achieve a balance between private and public interests in coastal zone development	29	2	A – 6 B – 4 C – 4 D – 5 E – 1 F – 1 Don't know – 1
Servicing:	Yes	No	How successful?
To encourage a settlement pattern and residential density that will ensure each homesite has			A – 7

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

available an adequate and healthful water and a safe waste disposal system <u>Comments:</u> Many residences do not have adequate water. Don't want it!	30	0	B - 4 C - 6 D - 2 E - 0 F - 0 Don't know - 2
Transportation:	Yes	No	How successful?
To accommodate a safe and efficient transportation system to meet but not exceed the needs of the planning area and the region <u>Comments:</u> More public transit needed – more hours of operating needed. Not enough people to support this = F. Is there \$?	27	4	A - 6 B - 3 C - 7 D - 2 E - 1 F - 3 Don't know - 0
Current OCP Development Strategy:	Still valid?		How successful?
	Yes	No	
Maintain the planning area's rural character and lifestyle by maintaining relatively large parcel sizes along the Coastal Zone, and by encouraging rural-agricultural neighbourhoods in the Paradise Valley, Kelly Creek and Roberts Road areas	26	3	A - 8 B - 4 C - 5 D - 0 E - 1 F - 1 Don't know - 2
Encourage the establishment of commercial development in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ north of Highway 101 between the City boundary and Stevenson Road; ◆ In the vicinity of Black Point Store; ◆ In the vicinity of Lang Bay/Highway 101 intersection; and ◆ In the vicinity of Saltery Bay. <u>Comments:</u> Not – we can not even get fuel out here now!	27	4	A - 6 B - 5 C - 5 D - 0 E - 1 F - 2 Don't know - 3
Encourage the establishment of a range of home-based businesses <u>Comments:</u>	18	2	A - 9 B - 0

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

<p>How is this being encouraged? Done by no zoning.</p>			<p>C – 3 D – 2 E – 2 F – 0 Don't know – 1</p>
<p>Focus future residential development in the Brew Bay/Lang Bay area because this area can be economically serviced by a community water supply system using Lang Creek <u>Comments:</u> Lang Creek? Water already committed to fish and City. Need a water strategy for supply. Bring water from West Lake or Haslam.</p>	24	9	<p>A – 5 B – 3 C – 3 D – 1 E – 1 F – 0 Don't know – 5</p>
<p>Protect community watersheds through the establishment of watershed management policies <u>Comments:</u> They already exist!</p>	29	1	<p>A – 5 B – 5 C – 5 D – 1 E – 1 F – 3 Don't know – 0</p>
<p>Protect the recreation potential and aesthetic and environmental qualities of coastal resources <u>Comments:</u> Saltery Bay Park?</p>	24	3	<p>A – 6 B – 3 C – 3 D – 2 E – 0 F – 5 Don't know – 1</p>
<p>Limit minimum parcel size adjacent to Highway 101 from the City to Brew Bay to 0.4 ha. Until such time as an engineering study can ascertain the area's capability to support smaller lot development without the implementation of community water or sewer systems <u>Comments:</u> Health Dept. regulations dictate lot sizes.</p>	24	4	<p>A – 4 B – 2 C – 3 D – 1 E – 1 F – 2</p>

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

			Don't know – 5
Recognize existing land uses whenever possible <u>Comments:</u> Jurisdiction can make this impossible.	27	0	A – 7 B – 2 C – 4 D – 2 E – 1 F – 0 Don't know – 3

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1. The Regional Board Directors have done a good job of passing bylaws when necessary to look after the interests of its citizens – e.g., a bylaw to acquire park land or money in lieu of at time of subdivision. This was not a bylaw passed when the OCP was originally implemented, but some time later. Our OCP is working beautifully!
2. Please make legislated changes only to current plan.
3. Since its adoption in 1993, our SRD OCP has more than met its obligations and has worked exceedingly well as a tool to guide the Regional Board Directors in their decision-making when presented with land-use applications or referrals from other agencies. During this review process it is imperative that we strive to preserve the quality of life enjoyed by our residents of the planning area – i.e., “Maintain the freedom from restrictions and costs associated with government services” and make alterations only where required by provincial government legislation. Thank you.
4. Have answered on how plan has addressed issues, not how issues have been addressed.
5. More public access to ocean. Bylaw to protect visual sensitive areas – Eagle River corridor and Stillwater Bluffs. 30-metre buffer on each side of the Sunshine Coast Trail.
6. The existing OCP has many good policies and objectives, but it is a sad and embarrassing failure when it comes to implementation. Our Regional District is under-staffed with regard to planning administration. For that reason, among others, our R.D. is ineffective. I am disappointed that the word conservation is conspicuous by its absence.
7. Transportation – Roads – need reduced speed limit in some areas toward Saltery Bay. Need a barrier on right-hand side of road approaching Saltery Bay.
8. We really need to enhance recreational opportunities including bike and walking paths from Saltery Bay to Lund. Need to promote beauty and value of our area. Also need water and sewage systems – start at boundary and work outwards. Need building and development rules.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

9. The major fails of the PRRD addressing areas of the OCP are
 - a. Area governed by Province of municipality, not R.D., and they ignore the OCP.
 - b. Competing interests mean he who shouts loudest decides – especially regarding industry and commerce.
 - c. I believe that the lack of teeth in the OCP means it is ineffective.

Commercial areas – done well but what about Pine Tree area – Skeeter Jack’s, etc.

10. We need planning permission for industry/commercial business. Ensure public access to beaches and forests. Licensed premises should not be allowed to move licence on the basis of the licensee. We need a water supply system; access to beaches.
11. Concerned about water supply, need community water system(s) that will supply clean water.
12. I am new to area, so I am not qualified to say if conditions have improved. My impressions are that status quo is acceptable. Why should this area be treated differently than the rest of the Regional District?
13. As it turns out, I am in complete agreement with the current SRD OCP. But I have no knowledge of how well it has been implemented. Just moved here from the City last year.
14. Develop more housing closer to town using Haslam Lake watershed use area at end of Duck Lake Road. Would be easy to run a pipeline down Duck Lake Road to service all areas to Black Point. Bring in water from West Lake or Haslam.
15. Sorry, I miss real vision of self-sustainability! It looks to me – the only objectives here are for the government (regional, provincial and federal) just want more tax dollars and that some “anonymous” big shot companies who are behind all this! We just learned that the economic guestimators are always wrong! Never trust a survey/statistic you did not do yourself. Bad question formulation.
16. New to P.R. therefore unaware as to successfulness of addressing issues at hand.
17. I am hoping that the “new” OCP can preserve the values of this area, while setting up objectives and guidelines that will allow for controlled, sustained and sensible growth. The uniqueness of this area needs some careful consideration. Recreation, backcountry uses should be included in OCP boundary expansion. Should have had today’s meeting as the first one! The review presentation was good!
18. This is not a very good format. We can’t “grade” the current OCP without knowing what has or hasn’t been done on these matters, or even if the Board can actually do anything. Yes, no and comment, with more room for comment, would have been better.
19. Caveat: Because I have only resided in Area C for just over three years, I can only evaluate the success of the OCP by examining the present consequences of former actions or inactions.
20. Leave things the way they are, that’s why I live where I do. In other words, don’t waste your time and our money fucking with it.
21. The best place on earth is right here. If we allow people to develop down to small lots, it creates a demand to have services. If they want that, let them build it with their own money. The people who jammed themselves on tiny lots like waterfront did it knowing that they

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW



would have problems, so let them have them. There are ways to deal with septic and water privately. But they want us to pay for their stupidity. Most of all, our watersheds are controlled by the provincial government, and they don't care. They want money from logs and mining, etc. We moved here to get away from other places that have zoning, triple government and developers who leave us with problems. I've lived in cities over 30 years, and this is a place where I own my land or more of it. This is a great place to live and work and raise a family, which I did for 28 years. Please don't tell we have to do like all other places. Thanks. (PS: My taxes are \$400 a year – fantastic!)

22. I feel the old plan in place works well, and do not encourage over-development, and being overrun with bylaws. If it's not broke, don't fix it.
23. Our old plan works well, simplicity is key. Over-complicating things only encourages bylaws, zoning, etc. I feel no need for a water system or over-development of this area. ALR should be kept from over-development. I don't feel we should be telling our neighbours what to do as long as they're not breaking environmental laws. Water quality is our own burden and cost, and we were aware of this when we chose to live and buy here.
24. My wife and I moved here from Vancouver 3½ years ago, but if we were looking here now instead of 4½ years ago, we probably wouldn't move here now because of so much clearcutting of forest everywhere (along highway and in the backcountry and the lot behind and uphill from us!); developments popping up all along highway; inadequate parks and recreation areas that are truly protected. The only protection effort is coming from grassroots citizen groups, and the RD is belatedly doing some studies now on a 15-year old commitment. I don't believe there has been one new park added in that time, although I could be wrong. Stream and fish protection work is again being done by grassroots groups (and individuals) with little help from the RD on Eagle River salmon and trout, due to the efforts of Friends of Eagle River. Federal Fisheries now recognizes it is a salmon river and is starting the process of getting proper flows of water from the private corporation dam, for the first time in 70 years!
25.
 - a. OCP has good preliminary planning. Has guided some development but contradictions from Board direction such as ALR removals; too small lots or non-action.
 - b. Should not perpetuate poor planning and layout from the first OCP.
 - c. Need to keep large pieces of property intact in production as forests and establish visual quality objectives, review changed drainages due to too heavy logging. Lobby for private managed forest lands improved regulations, retain mixed age and species forest cover.
 - d. Maximize air, water quality and protection with other provincial agencies. These are health issues that need constant monitoring, education. Work with provincial agencies to increase protection and well-being of population.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW

- e. Increase planning staff as required. Too much of response of can't implement guidelines of OCP.
 - f. Yes – there may be a need for some types of zoning. Educate. The old thinking needs to recognize change and adaptation.
 - g. Environmental concerns first. We can build on the OCP and new legislation, to make SRD an improved functional area.
 - h. New demographics – from large holdings in pioneer families such as McRaes, Lamberts, M&B, are being whittled down. So many absentee land owners who do not contribute to the community – should have absentee tax or maybe it's better that they are absent.
26. Maintain as is.
27. a. There are industries that are situated in residential areas, e.g., cement plant, that are totally unsuitable. There is noise and air pollution as well as soil and water degradation. There are numerous cases of industry in residential areas that need to be assessed and ideally relocated into “industrial zones”.
- b. It is time to look at lot sizes in “coastal zone” – limiting size to .4 ha acreages lot size has NOT been consistently applied and in fact feels more like a penalty given the development of some areas. Of more importance is to maintain agricultural land blocks and encourage local food production while at the same time allowing for the development of “villages” within the area. I would love to see denser development with small commercial hubs, bike and pedestrian walks so that the highway stops cutting us in half and sending us all to the town centre to shop. We need small clusters of services to create small village mentality – corner store, pub, restaurant within walking or cycling distance.
- c. Look at re-routing Highway 101 up Duck Lake and behind residential and farm areas and link into back of Westview – the road is going to wash out along the Myrtle Rocks Marine Park stretch in the next few years – now is the time to get Highways planning an alternate route to avoid all the traffic through residential areas and allow the park to become a park by removing heavy vehicles (local use only).
28. 15 years is too long a time frame. In order to evaluate all these planning issues effectively, we need to look at them relative to current conditions. Some areas may have been effectively addressed for conditions 10 years ago that are no longer relevant now. Because I didn't live in this region 15 years ago, I cannot say whether what was done (or not done) in that 1st decade of the OCP was successful. I need to know specifically
- Which of these issues falls within the jurisdiction of the PRRD?
 - What is the 10% veto caveat all about? Will it apply to a new OCP or be grandfathered into any RD plans?