

**POWELL RIVER REGIONAL DISTRICT
SOUTHERN REGIONAL DISTRICT OCP REVIEW
Compiled Responses of 34 Comment Sheets, 8 November 2008**

1. The recent community survey asked for your thoughts on a number of aspects of your neighbourhood and the SRD. Did we miss any topics or issues that should be addressed during the review of the current Official Community Plan?

- More support for smaller community water system.
- Many people are not aware of how much of Areas B and C are not under RD jurisdiction – e.g., TFL, agricultural land, Private Managed Forest Land, gravel pits, lakes and streams, etc. All water systems except Myrtle Pond are private or improvement districts.
- No, it was very well done/quite thorough/very comprehensive. (5 responses)
- Please put pressure on the governing bodies (government) to tackle pollution – e.g., some inspection authority needed to ensure septic fields (etc.). Do not pollute beaches, or leach onto other properties. Regulations needed for number of bedrooms/kitchens/areas needed for septic fields.
- How to implement the plan that we come up with.
- 1993 OCP, C.1.1, C.1.2 need clarification and behavior rules. Pub some teeth into conditions of operation and types of businesses.
- Wells and groundwater need protection. They may not be our favourite popular areas and hence receive no dots! But they need to be mapped.
- Yes, recycling sites – garbage site with biomass incinerator.
- Somewhere there needs to be discussion about how the lack of regulation and zoning is really a negative regulation. It means anything goes. I could end up with a sawmill, a garage or anything next door. Lack of clear rules about what's permitted and what is not also creates the potential for conflicts, which is something we should try to plan against.
- Interpretation of OCP and potential impact of 'zoning' – among the residents of Areas B and C. Clarification of OCP items/goals.
- It is worthwhile to ask the question of the existing community plan – how effective has it been? The answer is it has failed badly in many ways because it was not followed up by regulatory bylaws. The new plan must make reference to this at least in terms of context of the OCP.
- Sorry, missed the survey.
- We didn't devote enough time to the old Plan, none of its problems were pointed out to us. By problems, I mean the manner in which it is outdated.
- I am interested in discussing the OCP in terms of land-use designations, which have gone through changes – e.g., land once used for industrial use now no longer used in this way should be re-designated to reflect its current status.

- Lots of information this time around. Need time to process info, diverse response/perspectives.
- 18% of respondents is not a democracy. If so, that means that 82% want no changes to our rural lifestyle – i.e., who will pay for all this unnecessary tax burden? No changes, no rules. Do not use faulty statistics to serve an undemocratic minority.
- Infrastructure
 - Development – no regulatory ‘code’ policy
 - Parks – improper designations
 - More funding allocations to implement securing parks
 - Wildlife – preservation of green corridors
- I did not receive a copy of the survey despite being on regional district list (I assume) as property owner, therefore cannot comment.
- Isolated community – transportation linkages – renewable energy sources and development.
- I would like to know how the OCP will become policy and bylaws, what is in its jurisdiction, how long the process will take – more clarity. What instruments and enforcement would be needed to implement? How much will it cost?
- I would like to have seen the objectives and policies of our current SRD OCP up on large bulletin boards for all attending to see that we do already have a comprehensive plan and philosophy in place.
- I am not impressed with the format of reviewing our community plan – remember it’s not Comox or Courtenay’s. We are different and our plan reflects that. Defending our plan as written was discounted while the narrow-interest group’s focus on taking private property, i.e., a logging company owning Stillwater Bluffs and Eagle River pools, pretty well dominated the discussion. This group’s fixation on acquiring these two sites has alienated the logging company to the point that they won’t talk to them. Now they think our plan should do their dirty work for them. Your suggestion that if the plan had “teeth” then this could be accomplished is very wrong. You can’t steal a property owner’s land. Whether one is for these sites or not is beside the point. As a matter of fact, these areas have already been highlighted in our community plan as being desirable for recreation and other uses. See Schedule C. Also, please bear in mind that the vast majority of residents in the Southern Regional District have not come out to these sessions because they are happy with both the plan and its philosophy and think that this process is for a plan review for minor adjustments. Several people attending Saturday’s session voiced this sentiment.
- Need to better explain what an OCP is and how it can affect the present use or future use and/or subdivision of one’s property. I have received some complaints

about beach access. The PRRD should look into installing signs and have a service group, such as Rotary, cut trails for access.

2. Interest in Focus Groups: being tracked separately. The Focus Groups are to be formed in January 2009.

3. Do you have any additional comments, concerns or questions with regard to the review and updating of the SRD Official Community Plan?

- I think some more densely-occupied housing will preserve open spaces. More public beach/stream access clearly marked.
- No/Not at this time. (2 responses)
- I would like to change the OCP designation of Block 6149 on Weldwood Road from Resource to Rural.
- Beach accesses should be open and marked.
- How to address the existing concerns regarding the failures to uphold the last plan (e.g., Osprey Road)?
- Start following through on plans instead of making work meetings and appease the masses. This is a good area. Start working on it. Not mouthing around it.
- The back country also needs attention. The origins of watersheds and sources of streams need protection for water and salmon.
- Give us examples of tools – what? – that we can include in the OCP to create the ‘teeth’ to move onto legislation and enforcement.
- Perhaps a more in-depth explanation of why the review is being undertaken.
- A little scattered – too much input from personal opinions.
- It will be helpful if people can be informed how to reach beyond the jurisdictional limits of the OCP to bridge the link to provincial government agencies. Also, the plan should contain a declaration that an OCP review take place on a mandatory timetable of five-year term.
- I feel a little insulted that we had last night’s meeting with two great speakers who had very little knowledge or relevance to our situation.
- I would be more interested in having [a focus group on] the environment alone as a single focus, rather than with resources and agriculture.
- I feel like we should have actually gone over the current OCP in detail. I came to both meetings to hear about possible solutions to our problems. All I heard was the last generation rejecting change that is inevitable.
- Perhaps educational workshops about impact of progression of human development might help people to make better-informed decisions about directions. The reason I say this is because maybe the Community Plan could incorporate publicly-announced workshops to educate people about unique

geographic qualities that could be build upon. Sustainability is about educated decisions. Good to see a pro-active approach to change.

- Too few participants – where are the 200+ people who completed the survey?
- Assume we will be able to review info coming from other focus groups. Not quite sure how to comment on overlapping concerns and issues that are already being dealt with within community. Needs eventually to be endorsed and monitored.
- The current plan works. Don't change it.
- If the Plan was supported by legislation and enforcement then perhaps it should be updated on a more frequent basis.
- Am not yet familiar with the existing Plan, therefore cannot comment.
- Timelines: June 09 – Is this enough time to get through provincial and ILMB?
- I like the old plan. No regulations. No zoning out of the ALR
- Do not use outside consultants to tell us how to live. There is plenty of expertise in the Regional District population. First comes information, converted to knowledge, then comes wisdom.
- [Concern re] Constructiveness of process. Appreciation for the initiation of the process. But would like to see assurances from the RD Board to residents that their input will be acted upon. Not may. Time is precious, people need to know their participation is worthwhile in order to get their buy-in.
- Will Marsh and Rob Barrs were informative, inspired and responsive speakers. See Question #1 [comments re how an OCP becomes policy, more clarity and what is needed for implementation].
- Further to my comment above, in fact the SRD OCP in its entirety should have been on display for all to see our community's plan and determine what, if any, changes would be warranted.
- Your method of having people put red dots on other people's land is very wrong. It's pretty easy to see uses for other people's land! Remember, a community plan must also protect the interests of all its citizens, not just be used as a tool by those with special interests, no matter how noble it might be. Also, suggesting they put them where they think their neighbour has a faulty septic system is foolish. Even the Provincial Health Department has bowed out of issuing permits due to liability. The Regional Board would be crazy to get involved, so why is it being considered for a plan? And, if not – why suggest it at all?
- How can we get a more representative cross-section of Area B/C involved in the review?
- Just leave it as it was.

4. Did you find today's workshop to be a good way to provide us with your input?

- Yes/very good (14 responses)
- Yes, I thought pinpointing areas on the map to be a good way to talk to people about their interesting area.
- Yes, but teeth to get objectives completed are missing.
- Somewhat. It focuses on 'wish' lists; does not address the great fear of regulation.
- This worked very well. Look forward to the summary of results.
- I found today's workshop a waste of time. I noted others who left rather than sit through it.
- No, I feel like, as a young, fairly new landowner, that I was not given enough information to give an educated opinion.
- Good start. I think it would be good to review/analyze gaps in information collection such as concerns about air quality.
- We'll see.
- Yes, however, back country zones on maps are unclear.
- Re-do this survey to include the majority of residents and get the survey to all residents however possible.
- No. The presentations by Friday evening's speakers were fine but would be more appropriate for a community developing its first OCP. Ours is a review, not a rewrite. This was an unnecessary cost.

5. How could we improve the process?

- Give out knowledge of how watersheds/forest management/etc. relates to residential land use.
- Make it work.
- Bring concrete means of enforcing policies.
- The OCP should have mandatory reviews, and policies accepted should be enforced with bylaws and zoning.
- Provide coffee.
- Task/advise residents of research to do before the info gathering session. Include more sites to check out on the notice sent out informing residents and continue to address concerns expressed about regulations, zoning and (possibly) increased taxes. More info to make better informed choices.
- Bigger map for dots. This map should have roads and road names so people can orient themselves.
- Specific questions/answers – send in receive answer and/or address in public forum.
- At some point it would be helpful to have a representative from the Local Government Department of the Ministry of Community Development.

- I feel our current Community Plan is fine and is just in need of minor housekeeping.
- Hold a session, a class, for the young landowners to teach us about the process and what exactly we can do to improve our community.
- More real-time information being accessible to newcomers by a better introduction process.
- Reach to more of residents of region. The one-page flyer did not do it.
- Thank you for facilitation – allowing one group to dominate, especially vocally, can be discouraging to others and process.
- Initial survey could be improved by allowing more space for answers.
- I think that the Regional District representatives – both – in place or wanting to be elected, should have a least introduced themselves.
- Review every three years instead of every five. This would keep amendments in process instead of forgotten.
- Do not send surveys as junk mail, as most of us do not read/nor subscribe to receive junk mail. Mail a proper survey to all residents, advertise extensively, websites. Scrap this undemocratic process.
- Could provide larger-scale maps for foreshore areas as there seems to be more focus there – i.e., small-scale maps and larger-scale maps.
- See #3 [assurances from the RD Board that residents’ input will be acted upon].
- It would have been interesting to have one big map, have each person identify an area, everyone who also supported that area to raise their hand and have people explain why – write it down on a single flipchart. Then we could all see and hear about all the areas of interest.
- The workshop agenda 1:30 – 2:00 p.m. stated that you would advise as to “what can and cannot be addressed in an OCP” but this was not followed through by you.
- Start by recognizing that we have a community plan, one that has worked well for fifteen years. It is a review and should only require updated where necessary. It doesn’t need change just for the sake of change.

Additional comments:

- I enjoyed both presentations last night. The talk given by the first consultant (Rob?) was informative because it gave us an insight into how other areas have made their OCP reflect their values. Dr. Marsh’s talk was fantastic. It was so informative about the crucial relationship human settlements have with watersheds and how important for OCPs to address this.
- I felt that the professor who spoke on Friday was very informative. I will definitely be looking into my personal effects on the watershed.
- Friday evening: suggest reverse order of presentation –

1. Watershed talk by Dr. Marsh was excellent and sobering.
2. Rob's presentation was informative and well presented – unfortunately some folks took the info the wrong way.

All in all, a very educational night. The marketing was inadequate; it did not reach the entire community.

- “Rules are made for the guidance of wise people and the obedience of fools.”
- Last night: Rob provided good ideas and examples of responsible development. Dr. Marsh was brilliant! Should have spoken first.
- Environment should have own Focus Group or perhaps there's room for dialogue on how each affects the other. Jefferd Creek is #1 importance to me.