

LET'S TALK LAND USE

Engagement Final Report

*Exploring Land Use and Development Regulatory
Options with Residents in Electoral Areas A, B, C*

January 2022



PREPARED FOR:



qathet
REGIONAL DISTRICT

PREPARED BY:



Executive Summary

The qathet Regional District has one of the lightest regulatory frameworks in B.C. There is no zoning in 75% or more of Electoral Areas A, B and C. There is also no building bylaw or a local subdivision servicing bylaw. In April 2020, the Arlington Group Planning Inc. assisted by EcoPlan International Inc., completed a feasibility study concerning land use and regulatory options available to qathet Regional District. The report recommended a consultation program to inform the public on possible options and survey their views in Electoral Areas A, B and C. This report documents that consultation program.

The public consultation took place in November 2021 and involved in-person meetings in Electoral Areas A, B and C and a Zoom virtual meeting for Savary Island. Close to 300 people participated in the 'Let's Talk Land Use' consultations held between November 15th and November 24th. A survey generated close to 1,000 responses from residents, both year-round and seasonal, as well as renters, business owners and employees. Public interest was very high and the responses represented 20% of the combined population of the three electoral areas.

The overall survey documented the following six land use concerns by 20% or more of respondents:

- Protection of drinking water supply
- Demands on potable water supply
- Environmental impacts on watercourses
- Land use conflicts
- Coastal areas at risk
- Changes in drainage patterns/ stormwater runoff

Despite a wide range of concerns, most survey respondents indicated they did not support additional land use regulation. The predominant response in all three electoral areas was the 'Existing level of regulation is limited but no change is needed' compared to the alternatives of either more or less regulation. This response was clearly expressed in three electoral areas, with the notable exception of Savary Island.

Savary Island residents expressed a much higher level of concern about land use and environmental issues. A clear majority indicated concern for the protection of drinking water supply and coastal areas at risk. Over 40% also expressed concern about land use issues and demands on potable water supply. The different position of Savary Island residents compared to the mainland electoral areas is likely due to the fragile environment of the island and the large number of small lots that were created over a century ago. Only 10% of Savary Island responses indicated they had no land use concerns. Close to two thirds indicated 'Existing regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict'.

The report recommends that qathet Regional District engage with Savary Island residents and property owners to address their widespread concerns about managing development and land use conflicts. In the remainder of Electoral Area A and in Electoral Areas B and C, community feedback did not support further land use regulation. Ultimately, qathet Regional District Directors are the decision-makers, who have multiple considerations to weigh, including public feedback, liability and their perception of the public interest.

Table of Contents

Background for Public Consultation	2
Consultation Process	3
Summary of Topics, Questions from Meeting Participants and Answers.....	5
Topics/ Questions/ Answers at all Meetings	5
Electoral Area A Themes/ Questions/ Answers	6
Electoral Area B Themes/ Questions/ Answers	9
Electoral Area C Themes/ Questions/ Answers	11
Savary Island Themes/ Questions/ Answers.....	15
Survey Responses and Analysis	18
Findings by Electoral Area and Savary Island	18
Findings by Electoral Area and Savary Island – Key Concerns and Desired Directions	26
Electoral Area A	26
Electoral Area B	30
Electoral Area C	34
Savary Island	37
Survey Responses from Public Information Meeting Attendees.....	41
Conclusions	43
Recommendation	44

APPENDICES

- A – Print Ads in qathet Living and Powell River PEAK
- B – Location Maps
- C – Public Information Meeting Posters (8)
- D – PowerPoint Presentation for Meetings
- E – Let’s Talk Land Use Survey
- F – Qualitative Survey Responses – Electoral Areas A, B, C
- G – Emails and Letters

Background for Public Consultation

In April 2020, the Arlington Group Planning Inc, assisted by EcoPlan International Inc., completed a feasibility study concerning land use regulatory options for the qathet Regional District. The study identified six Guiding Principles for land use regulation consisting of the following: public safety, cost effective, equitable, transparent, appropriate scale and having public support with the latter applying to each applicable electoral area and proceeded by public consultation prior to undertaking any new land use regulation, both to inform the public and to gauge their response. The study recommended that public consultation take place concerning the benefits and drawbacks of an increased regulatory framework for the qathet Regional District to meet its changing needs.

A wide range of options are available to local governments to regulate land use. These options are aptly described as a 'toolkit'. The 'toolkit' of available regulatory options is at the discretion of each local government. All local governments in B.C. have adopted some of the available regulatory options but none are mandated by the Province. The qathet Regional District has one of the lightest regulatory frameworks in B.C. Currently there is no building bylaw, no local subdivision servicing bylaw and no zoning in most parts of Electoral Areas A, B and C.

Electoral Areas A, B, C and D all have Official Community Plans (OCPs), and each includes land use objectives and policies which have been developed after extensive public consultation. While OCPs are in place in each electoral area, they are intended to set the general direction of development, not establish a regulatory framework for land use, except for a minimum lot size through subdivision.

In Electoral Area A, zoning applies to the Lund Watershed east of the Lund community. The Lund Watershed Zoning Bylaw No. 513, 2017 was adopted to protect the watershed that serves the Lund community. The Bylaw includes two residential zones, two watershed zones, one agricultural zone and one lakeshore protection zone. All zones contain a prohibition of any use which results in the escape or disposal of a waste product or storage of materials which would constitute a drinking water health hazard harmful to the sustained purity and flow of water in the watershed. The bylaw applies to less than 50 properties, which is less than 10% of the Electoral Area A population¹.

In Electoral Area B, zoning applies to three areas that total approximately 25% of the Electoral Area B population. The Nootka Street Zoning Bylaw, No. 321, 1999 provides for the residential use of 45 rural and suburban parcels south of the Powell River Airport. The purposes of the Bylaw are to protect the rural lifestyle and protect the area's aquifer by restricting parcel density to a minimum of one hectare. The Myrtle Pond Zoning Bylaw No. 426, 2011 applies to over 80 predominately suburban and rural properties south-east of the City of Powell River. The purposes of the Bylaw are to ensure that the Myrtle Pond Water System users have sufficient, sustained quantities of high-quality water for domestic and commercial recreation purposes; to protect the area's aquifer by restricting the density of residential and commercial development; and to preserve the rural character and lifestyle of the area. The Bylaw includes five residential, two commercial and one agricultural zones. The Traffe Road Zoning Bylaw No. 464, 2012 applies to 38 parcels on Traffe and Pebble Beach Roads south of Highway 101. This zoned area abuts the area covered by the Myrtle Pond Zoning Bylaw. The purposes of the Traffe Road Zoning Bylaw are to protect the suburban residential character and lifestyle of

¹ Based on the average family size in the 2016 census.

the Traffe Road area; ensure the level of development in the area is consistent with available services; and protect the area's aquifer by restricting the density of residential development.

In Electoral Area C, zoning is anticipated for 55 residential properties, which include approximately 6% of the Area C population². The Random Road Zoning Bylaw No. 572, 2021 and the Douglas Bay Road Zoning Bylaw No. 573, 2021 are pending adoption following petitions by area residents. Both zoning bylaws are intended to regulate land use in their respective neighbourhoods and restrict new commercial or industrial activity. Both bylaws reflect a light regulatory approach and involved extensive consultation with the affected residents.

Consultation Process

The consultation process started in November 2021 by raising awareness and inviting public input on land use regulation in Electoral Areas A, B and C. The purpose was to take a 'Temperature Check' to determine the concerns of the public in each electoral area and if the qathet Regional District should undertake a more active role. The 'Let's Talk Land Use' public consultation posed two questions to community members in each of the three electoral areas:

- "Are you concerned about changes in land use and development in your neighbourhood?"
- "Should the Regional District do more to manage land use and development in your area?"

Background information was provided on the qathet Regional District website and full page ads were placed in the Powell River PEAK and qathet Living. Appendix A provides copies of the print publication ads. The ads invited the public to attend in-person meetings scheduled for the week of November 15, 2021 in Electoral Area A, B and C venues. These were among the first in-person meetings that the qathet Regional District was able to hold under public health orders following the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic. A Zoom virtual meeting was later scheduled at the request of Savary Island residents (seasonal and permanent) on November 24, 2021. The additional online meeting occurred due to the interest expressed by Savary Island property owners and the fact that very few would be able to attend the in-person meeting scheduled for Area A in Lund. A large majority of Savary Island property owners are seasonal residents and live in many locations throughout B.C., outside the province and Canada.

Those attending the in-person meetings were asked to sign in to enable a record of attendance. They were also asked to place a dot indicating their general location on an aerial map. The purpose was to determine the geographical distribution of those attending. Appendix B shows the location maps for Electoral Areas A, B and C. A location map for Savary Island was not possible as this was a virtual meeting and participants were not asked to indicate their property location.

Each in-person meeting followed a similar format. Those attending were welcomed by a greeter, invited to sign in, and orientated to the consultation process and agenda. Following sign in, those attending were invited to review a series of eight poster boards at their leisure. Three poster boards provided background information and an overview of the consultation process. Three poster boards provided detailed information about three land use regulatory options: a zoning bylaw, subdivision standards bylaw and building bylaw. The seventh poster indicated how different land use regulatory tools could address land use concerns. The eighth and final poster provided frequently raised questions concerning land use regulatory tools. The poster boards

² Based on the average family size in the 2016 census.

were also posted online on the qathet Regional District website for those who did not attend an in-person meeting. The poster boards are provided in Appendix C.

The formal meetings consisted of introductions by the Manager of Planning Services, a review of the agenda, and statement on the purpose of the consultation process. The consulting team was then introduced who provided a PowerPoint presentation of the existing land use regulations in that electoral area, possible regulatory land use options and the role of other government agencies. The PowerPoint presentation was also made available on the qathet Regional District website and is provided in Appendix D.

The remainder of each meeting consisted of a question and answer period. The topics raised, questions raised and answers provided by staff and the consulting team are documented in the following sections. Each in-person meeting was up to 60 minutes long. It was anticipated that two presentations would take place in each location with an interval in between presentations to enable participants to review the posters and have one on one discussion with staff and the consulting team, if desired. This occurred at the Electoral Area A and B meetings. However a third presentation was hastily scheduled for Area C due to high attendance at the first meeting on November 15, 2021. A small number were not able to be accommodated at the first presentation in order to comply with Covid-19 public health restrictions but were invited to return to one of the two later presentations.

At the end of each presentation, those attending were invited to fill out a land use survey. The survey consisted of a total of 10 questions. Six of the questions asked for basic information from those participating. Questions included which electoral area they lived in or other connection (e.g. workplace, seasonal resident), homeowner, renter or employee, length of residency and which public information meeting they attended, if any.

The next three questions asked respondents to provide responses to enable documentation of their views concerning land use regulation. One question asked respondents to indicate what land use changes are a concern to them in their neighbourhood. Respondents could indicate no concerns or check off any number of 15 listed concerns and add additional concerns. The next question asked respondents to indicate their views on existing land use management in qathet electoral areas. Those responding could indicate if they felt existing land use regulation was inadequate to address land use conflict, that regulation was limited but no change was needed, or that there is already too much regulation. The third question asked respondents to indicate what ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development. Respondents could indicate up to five regulatory tools or indicate if they did not support adding new land use regulation in their electoral area. The final question was an open-ended question asking respondents if they had any other comments, questions or concerns about land use or the management of development. The survey was provided online which accounted for the vast majority of responses. Paper copies were also available at each in-person meeting and at the qathet Regional District offices. The online land use survey was kept open until the end of November. A total of 27 paper questionnaires were received by qathet Regional District including several late responses up to December 13th. A copy of the land use survey is provided in Appendix E.

The analysis of survey responses is provided in the following sections. All qualitative survey responses are provided in Appendix F. Six emails and two letters were also submitted as part of the consultation process. These are contained in Appendix G. Names and addresses have been deleted to protect the privacy of writers.

In total, approximately 286 people participated in the 'Let's Talk Land Use' consultations held between November 15 and November 24th. Below is a summary of the consultation dates and attendance:

- 81 Participants - Area C at Lang Bay Hall Monday, November 15th, 2021
- 38 Participants - Area B at Myrtle Point Golf Club Tuesday, November 16th, 2021
- 46 Participants - Area A at Northside Community Centre Wednesday, November 17th, 2021
- 121 Registrants³ – Savary Island Online Zoom Meeting Wednesday, November 24th, 2021

Summary of Topics, Questions from Meeting Participants and Answers

The following is a list of questions raised by community members and answers provided during the consultation meetings. The questions and answers have been organized by topic or theme. Those topics which were raised at all meetings are identified first followed by each electoral area and Savary Island meeting.

Topics/ Questions/ Answers at all Meetings

Topics of interest raised by community members, which crossed all Electoral Areas included:

- **Regulatory Comparison and Potential Reach**
 - Inquiries about how the level of regulation in qathet Regional District (qRD) compares to other communities in BC.
 - Answer. It was noted in the presentation that land use regulation in BC is discretionary and varies widely. Official Community Plans (OCPs), zoning bylaws, subdivision servicing bylaws, and building bylaws are not required. However, all regional districts have adopted OCPs. Zoning, subdivision servicing and building bylaws have been adopted by the large majority of local governments in BC. Several regional districts have enacted bylaws in some electoral areas but not in others.
 - If regulation is introduced in one electoral area, will that also be applied to other areas?
 - No. Any regulation will apply to one electoral area or a part of that electoral area separately. The public consultation is taking place in Electoral Areas A, B and C separately and the results of the consultation and the survey will be documented for each electoral area.
 - Area D (Texada Island) is not included in this consultation because the qRD just completed a multi-year engagement process with Texada residents to review and update their OCP. During that process, Texada residents made it clear they were not interested in any new land use regulations.
 - Does adding one bylaw (i.e. zoning), lead to more future regulations in electoral areas?
 - That is possible but not proposed. Consultation will take place before any additional regulation. This will require adoption by bylaw. Each bylaw has to be approached on its own merits.
- **Costs of Adding Regulations**
 - Concerns were raised of potential cost increases associated with possibly adding staffing, inspections, enforcement of regulations.

³ Registrants refers to the number of persons who signed up for the Zoom virtual meeting for Savary Island. Most, but not all registrants, attended the meeting. The exact number who attended is not available.

- For a zoning bylaw, this would all depend on the geographical extent of the zoning bylaw and its scope. Staff have indicated there would be no cost or staffing increase for the proposed Random Road and Douglas Bay zoning bylaws. A broad scope zoning bylaw for an entire electoral area would likely have staffing implications as the current regional district planning staff of two is one of the leanest of the 27 regional districts in BC. Subdivision servicing and building bylaws are typically funded primarily through user fees (i.e. applicants for subdivision and new building development).
- **Non-conforming uses/ buildings**
 - What will happen to existing development if a new zoning bylaw is adopted?
 - Existing development would be 'grandfathered' for any uses and structures that predate the bylaw adoption. Another term frequently used for existing development that predates a new bylaw is legally non-conforming. A new zoning bylaw would only affect new development that takes place after the adoption of a zoning bylaw. Existing development is not required to conform to the new regulations. A zoning bylaw cannot be applied retroactively.
 - What happens if a property is sold?
 - The legal non-conforming use would continue and would be unaffected by an ownership change. A zoning bylaw applies to the use of land, not the individuals who use the land.
 - What happens if a building burns down?
 - The legal non-conforming would continue unless 75% of the building above its foundations is destroyed by fire.
 - The legal non-conforming use would continue unless the use is discontinued for a continuous period of 6 months. The legal non-conforming use also applies to seasonal uses or for agricultural purposes.
- **Development Servicing Capacity in Rural Areas**
 - Questions were raised about servicing limitations (water/ sewer) and future plans for expanding services in rural areas.
 - These issues can be addressed in OCPs and regulated through the subdivision process, where applicable. Enforcement of land use provisions in OCPs is limited if there is no zoning.
 - The presentation also addressed provincial requirements which establish basic requirements and affect most regional district tools except zoning. Interface with provincial regulators include Coastal Health (water, sewage disposal) and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (roads, storm water/ drainage, servicing).

[Electoral Area A Themes/ Questions/ Answers](#)

Themes and questions that were asked in the meeting held on November 17th included:

- **Regulatory Reach**
 - How many areas in the province are at some level of regulation?
 - All regional districts have OCPs and zoning bylaws. Several regional districts have zoning bylaws that apply to some but not all of their electoral areas. Overall, there are two regional districts with a lesser amount of regulation; Central Coast and North Coast.
 - qRD already has *Local Services Act* (Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure) requirements. Why do we need more?

- There is no requirement for more. That is the purpose of the Temperature Check, to consult with local residents to determine their concerns and ask if the qathet Regional district should do more to manage land use and development in your area.
 - Is there an agenda on the part of the RD to have more bylaws? If so, why and what are the priorities?
 - No.
 - If there is no obligation on part of the RD to have more regulation, is the OCP not enough?
 - The OCP provides a vision, objectives and policies for each electoral area. It lacks any regulatory authority and enforcement mechanism except through the subdivision review process. Without a zoning bylaw, the OCP is on an honour system.
 - Can there be another form of dispute resolution for conflicting land uses put in place by qRD following an OCP?
 - If a zoning bylaw is adopted, staff would contact the owner of a land use not in compliance with the bylaw. This typically arises from a complaint. Without a zoning bylaw or other land use regulation, qRD would not be involved. Neighbours could contact neighbours informally to address land use conflicts.
 - Can the question of regulation be tabled officially for some time down the road?
 - Yes. That would be a decision for the Regional Board.
- **Actual Land Use Concerns in Area A and other Electoral Areas**
 - Where in recent years have conflicts been occurring in Area A? How much?
 - The biggest recent land use conflict in Area A was the proposed wood waste landfill on the Malaspina Peninsula, north of Bliss Landing. The qRD received over 100 letters from people concerned about the proposed landfill and its potential impact on groundwater, surface water and the marine environment.
 - Several questions raised regarding recent wood waste disposal application (to province) and RD process/ ability to enforce OCP rural residential designation.
 - The wood waste landfill was being proposed for a property designated Rural Residential under the qRD Area A Official Community Plan Bylaw. Under the OCP, wood waste landfill is not a recommended use for properties designated Rural Residential. Without a zoning bylaw or other land use regulation, qRD has no way to enforce land use policies in the OCP.
- **Zoning Bylaw Specific Questions**
 - Can we enact a noise or odour bylaw, without going to zoning?
 - Yes
 - Does allowing some zoning, lead to more zoning (the slippery slope)?
 - No. Additional zoning in each area will require a separate bylaw and has to be approached on its own merits. The existing Lund Watershed Zoning Bylaw in Area A has not expanded in scope or its boundaries since its adoption in 2017.
- **Costs of Adding Regulations**
 - Does more zoning necessitate hiring an inspector? Or simply more teeth to regulate provincial approvals.
 - No
 - How would this be staffed?
 - Staffing would depend on the extent of zoning. The two zoning bylaws proposed for parts of Electoral Area C will require no increase in staff. A broad scope zoning bylaw for one or more electoral areas would require additional resources. However we are a long way from that determination.

- **Non-conforming uses/ buildings**
 - If bylaws are created, what happens to properties developed prior to the bylaws taking effect?
 - Existing development would be 'grandfathered' for any uses and structures that predate the adoption of a zoning bylaw. Another term frequently is used is to call the existing development legally non-conforming. A new zoning bylaw would only affect new development that takes place after the adoption of a zoning bylaw. Existing development is not required to conform to the new regulations. A zoning bylaw cannot be applied retroactively.
 - If a Subdivision Standards Bylaw goes forward, is the OCP minimum parcel size null and void (Coastal Health regulations for 5 acre parcels)?
 - No. Any future zoning bylaw or subdivision standards regulations would need to be consistent with the OCP.
- **Climate Change - Sea level rise / Buildings/ Resources**
 - How would future development take severe weather events into planning?
 - Zoning would incorporate Provincial Flood Hazard Land Use Management Guidelines that address sea level rise. The qathet Regional District has just retained an engineering consultant to address coastal shoreline risks which could be incorporated into land use regulation. A subdivision servicing bylaw would address extreme rainfall events and onsite stormwater retention.
 - How is land use regulation articulated with climate change action (i.e. promoting sustainable building/ living)?
 - Land use regulation can address a wide range of issues to promote sustainable living. Examples include cluster housing, orientation of housing to maximize solar gain, electric vehicle charging stations, ensuring post development runoff does not exceed predevelopment levels, requiring an engineering report to ensure building safety in areas with steep slopes and where there is a risk of landslide, debris flows, and flooding.
- **Tla'amin Nation Lands**
 - Is there a timeline on Tla'amin plans for land across the street?
 - qRD Planning staff are not familiar with any plans for lands across the street. The property is affected by two qRD bylaws, the Area A Official Community Plan Bylaw and the Lund Watershed Zoning Bylaw.
 - How would future development take place?
 - Initiating future development is at the discretion of the Tla'amin Nation. If Tla'amin approaches the qRD about developing the property, any proposed development plans would be guided by the Area A OCP and need to be compliant with the Lund Watershed Zoning Bylaw.
 - Governance relations with Tla'amin Nation and qathet RD.
 - The qRD and Tla'amin Nation have a collaborative working relationship guided by a Protocol Agreement signed in 2004.
- **Development Cost Charges**
 - What are the measures in place to address development cost charges in different strategic areas (technical options)?
 - The qRD Board adopted the Lund Development Cost Charge Bylaw to support the Lund sewer service. The bylaw affects new development within the Lund Sewer Service Area.
- **Development Capacity**
 - We need a groundwater survey/ assessment before more growth. Are there plans for this?
 - No

- Provide an update on qRD current plans for water supply
 - qRD Planning staff are not familiar with plans for Lund Water Service. The Lund Water Service is currently in the hands of the Provincial Government.
- What is qRD doing to strengthen relations with stakeholders such as Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure to ensure services can support the OCP? The OCP identified growth and parcel sizes etc., but did not include language for expanding water, sewer, roads etc.
 - There is a close relationship with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. The Ministry refers all subdivision applications to the qathet Regional District for its review and comment.
 - Long term population projections indicate modest growth for Area A. The qRD has no plans for expanding sewer servicing in Lund. The majority of rural properties in Area A have on-site servicing. Water servicing and sewer servicing are under the jurisdiction of the province. Roads are also under the jurisdiction of the province.

[Electoral Area B Themes/ Questions/ Answers](#)

Themes and questions that were asked in the meeting held on November 16th included:

- **Regulatory Reach**

- Is it fair to say that without bylaws to implement the OCP, that the OCP is a hollow document?
 - Yes
- What mechanisms can qRD utilize if conflicts arise with the OCP or between neighbours?
 - Mechanisms are very limited without land use regulation. A zoning bylaw would establish clear boundaries to address land use conflict. In the absence of land use regulation, the qRD can inform and request a property owner to follow the OCP but it cannot require that to occur. Neighbours can also meet informally to address land use conflicts.

- **Land Use Concerns in Area B and other Electoral Areas**

- How large an increase in development % or number? Further context please.
- Is this planning in relation to explosive growth in other communities like Squamish/ Pemberton?
 - No. Long term population projections indicate modest growth for Area B of 20% from 2016 to 2041 (1,565 persons to 1,878).
- Development on ALR lands - What is % ALR in Area B? and % non ALR developed lands?
 - qRD Planning staff are unable to provide this information.
- Concerned about storage facility being developed at the end of Nootka, does it meet the OCP? Concerned about the possibility of polluting or noisy development near my home (industrial or commercial) – what can RD do?
 - The commercial storage facility recently developed at the top of Nootka Street is not consistent with the OCP. The property is designated Low-Density Residential under the Area B Official Community Plan Bylaw. Under the OCP, commercial uses like a storage facility are not a recommended use for properties designated Low-Density Residential. Nootka Street Zoning Bylaw regulates density but does not regulate land use. Without land use regulations, qRD has no way to enforce the OCP.

- **Zoning Bylaw Specific Questions**

- How are localized zoning bylaws designed and enacted (i.e. the 3 'pockets' in Area B)?
 - The three existing zoning bylaws for Nooka Street, Myrtle Pond and Traffe Road were adopted in 1999, 2012 and 2013 respectively. Their scope is quite limited and in response to local initiatives. Minimal amendments have taken place since their adoption. Each bylaw requires approval by the Regional Board.
- What results have we had in the past, in case of such requests (for zoning)?
 - The two most recent requests were petitions for zoning from residents in the Random Road and Douglas Bay Road areas. Three rounds of consultation were undertaken before draft bylaws were presented to the Regional Board for consideration.
- Can all aspects of zoning bylaws be enforced (compliance) without building bylaws?
 - Yes, but not as quickly or efficiently. Generally speaking, zoning is easier to enforce with a building bylaw. Setbacks from a property line and building size limits are good examples if those requirements are contained in a zoning bylaw. Without a building bylaw, compliance could still be determined through an inspection. Similarly a land use in conflict with zoning (i.e. industrial vs. residential use) would not require a building bylaw for a determination to be made.
- How can a zoning bylaw protect habitat?
 - There are various options for a zoning bylaw to protect habitat. It can include a different land use, establish a lower residential density, or require a larger parcel size. The zoning bylaw can also include a zone where conservation is the primary use of the land. If a development permit area is established for the protection of the natural environment, its ecosystems and biological diversity, these conditions must be met before development can proceed.

- **Costs of Adding Regulations**

- Would added regulations increase costs? How much would enacting zoning and bylaw enforcement cost tax payers?
 - The cost of additional regulation would depend on the type and scope of the regulation. For example, it may be possible for a zoning bylaw with a limited scope and geographical area to be administered within the existing resources of the Planning Department. A zoning bylaw with a larger scope for one or more electoral areas would require additional resources as the Planning Department currently has a staff of only two persons. Subdivision servicing and building bylaws are typically funded primarily by user fees so the cost to taxpayers may be nominal.
- If qRD takes on more management, how is that to be implemented? Larger bureaucracy? Costs to landowner?
 - That would depend on what additional management is needed. The purpose of the Temperature Check is to determine what are the concerns of the public, find out if the public thinks the qathet Regional District should do more to manage land use and development, and to inform the public about the available options.
- How to avoid lengthy delays in building bylaws administration (e.g. How long from application to build and the time it takes to receive approvals)?
 - Some regional districts have taken steps to make the application process very simple and reduce administration. Approval times vary greatly from one jurisdiction to another and depend on the volume of applications and available resources. Building inspection

requires specialized expertise and in some jurisdictions, this service has been contracted out to a nearby local government.

- **Non-conforming uses/ buildings**

- If zoning brought in, do existing conflicting uses get grandfathered?
 - Yes. Existing development would be 'grandfathered' both for land uses and structures that predate the bylaw adoption. Another term frequently used is for the existing development to be called legally non-conforming. A new zoning bylaw would only affect new development that takes place after the adoption of a zoning bylaw. Existing development is not required to conform to the new regulations. A zoning bylaw cannot be applied retroactively.
- Without a building permit process, how does the qRD enforce maximum number of dwellings? And how are existing dwellings qualified for grandfathering? (since qRD has no record of when they were built)
 - Without building permits, the qRD can undertake inspections to determine the maximum number of dwellings. The maximum number of dwellings would only apply to new development that takes place after adoption of the bylaw.

- **Development Capacity**

- Aging population – capacity of in-law/ caregiver housing?
 - This is an important housing need as the median age in Electoral Area B is 55.5, which is well above the median age of 43 in BC. Secondary suites are a permitted use to assist in addressing the needs of an aging population (i.e. aging in place). Accessory dwellings are another option.

- **Provincial Regulations**

- Is there a process for the qRD to demand the Province enforce existing laws/ regulations?
 - qRD cannot demand the Province enforce existing regulations but it can request action from the Province. There is a good relationship of co-operation between the two levels of government.

- **Consultation Next Steps**

- How is the survey being used? As a definitive support tool or just to be used for further discussion?
 - The results will be separated for each electoral area and further by neighbourhood in some cases. They will be analyzed and a report prepared and presented to the Regional Board. Any further action will depend on the report results and how the Regional Board responds.

[Electoral Area C Themes/ Questions/ Answers](#)

Themes and questions that were asked in the meeting held on November 15th included:

- **Regulatory Reach**

- What is currently regulating new residential and industrial development?
 - The only bylaw which applies throughout Area C is the OCP. This consists of a vision, objectives, land use designations and policies. The OCP has no regulatory function except for minimum parcel sizes through subdivision. Zoning in Random Road and Douglas Bay Road would apply to about 55 properties or 6% of Area C.
- Is this a stepping stone to more rules?
 - No
- How comprehensive are these regulations? How long is this proposed list of rules?

- Nothing has been decided. That is why this consultation process is called a Temperature Check. It is to hear from the public to find out if they have concerns about land use and development and if they feel the qRD should do more to manage land use and development.
- **Land Use Concerns in Area C**
 - Can a developer currently build anything they want in Area C, like a race track or heavy industry?
 - Yes, if there is no zoning.
 - What protections are in place for Lang Creek estuary and creek?
 - Lang Creek is a salmon spawning creek and site of the Powell River Salmon Society's hatchery. Salmon habitat has protection under the provincial *Riparian Areas Protection Act* and Regulation.
 - Would zoning, subdivision and building bylaws apply in the Agricultural Land Reserve, which is regulated by the Agricultural Land Commission? Would regulations further discourage local farming?
 - Land use in the Agricultural Land Reserve is primarily regulated by the Agricultural Land Commission. Local regulation can add to some non-farm uses that complement agricultural uses. One of the community goals in the OCP is to provide for regionally sustainable agriculture so any local regulation would be supportive of agriculture including local food production.
 - Will regulations discourage economic growth by shutting down home based businesses and the local economy?
 - Regulations should be designed to encourage economic growth as the Area C OCP community vision is dedicated to a "sustainable rural lifestyle where residents can enjoy the natural environment while encouraging thoughtful economic development and protecting agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands and resources." Also one of the community goals is to enhance economic opportunities.
- **Zoning Bylaw Specific Questions**
 - Are there any current land use restrictions?
 - No, although two zoning bylaws are proposed for the Random Road and Douglas Bay areas.
 - How would zoning bylaws make a more cohesive neighbourhood, control noise, traffic, peace of mind – property values, water protection?
 - They can ensure buildings are setback from property lines to protect privacy and for consistency, prevent new land uses that are not wanted (i.e. permitted) in a neighbourhood, ensure the scale of new buildings is compatible with existing neighbourhood, establish good neighbour guidelines for noise, odour, etc., provide for onsite parking for all permitted land uses, prevent land use that pose a risk to water quality, and ensure land uses and land use densities do not exceed the available water supply.
 - Is there a difference between industrial use and commercial uses when it comes to zoning?
 - Yes. The differences would be detailed in the zoning bylaw definitions.
 - Will land use regulations be implemented universally throughout Area A, B, C or will regulations be adopted separately according to each Area?
 - Any new land use regulation would be adopted separately for each area and would need to be consistent with the OCP for each area.
 - What are timelines for implementation?

- There are no timelines as that would depend on the consultation process and the request from the public. If new zoning takes place, it is unlikely that any new bylaw would be adopted before 2023 (except for the Random Road and Douglas Bay Zoning bylaws).
- Is there a plan to implement blanket zoning rather than spot zoning?
 - No there is no plan on what zoning should occur or if any additional zoning will take place. That is the purpose of the Temperature Check.
- What happens if we continue not to have zoning bylaws?
 - The status quo would continue.
- If it is decided to do zoning bylaws, can Area C decide which of those items within that zoning bylaw are chosen? Who decides which points are adopted?
 - Yes through a consultation process with staff. There were three rounds of consultation for the Random Road and Douglas Bay Zoning bylaws.
- How would land use bylaws and regulations be monitored and enforced?
 - Combination of staff administration and response to complaints.
- If neighbourhoods can agree on bylaws for their own neighbourhood, maybe we don't need bylaws for the whole area?
 - That is possible. The current consultation will hopefully provide some direction on that question.
- **Costs of Adding Regulations / Not Adding Regulations**
 - How much in tax revenue has been lost because there is no zoning or oversight relative to the BC Assessment Authority not being aware of improvements?
 - If the BC Assessment Authority is not aware of new building development, the mill rate would be increased for other property owners. The total tax revenue would not be changed but the distribution would be affected if new development is not placed on the assessment roll.
 - What are the administrative costs associated with zoning bylaws? With building permitting? How many extra staff? costs for inspectors/ engineers?
 - That would depend on the scope and geographical extent of the zoning. The zoning for Random Road and Douglas Bay Road will require no additional staff resources. A zoning bylaw for an entire electoral area would likely trigger a need for additional staff resources. The costs of subdivision servicing and building bylaws would be largely borne by the benefitting users. Staffing could be ramped up over time based on demand and shared with an adjacent local government.
 - Would there be an estimate of \$costs of regulations before a decision is made?
 - Yes. At this time, the consultation process is to determine what public concerns there are and if the qRD should do more to manage land use and development in your neighbourhood. Costs cannot be determined until the scope of further land use regulation, if any, is identified.
 - If we adopt more bylaws, will we have to pay more taxes?
 - That would depend on the type and scope of the bylaw.

- **Non-conforming uses/ buildings**

- If non-conforming, what happens if you renovate your house? How would building regulations apply to existing buildings?
 - Existing development would be 'grandfathered' for any uses and structures that predate the bylaw adoption. Another term frequently used is to call existing development legally non-conforming. A new zoning bylaw would only affect new development that takes place after the adoption of a zoning bylaw. Existing development is not required to conform to the new regulations. A zoning bylaw cannot be applied retroactively. House renovation would not be affected by a zoning bylaw unless an expansion of the building footprint was proposed that conflicted with the new zoning bylaw.
- What does the grandfathering process look like for existing businesses (home or industrial) and multiple dwellings if zoning bylaw were to go ahead?
 - The legal non-conforming use would continue. This would also apply if a business is sold as it would be unaffected by an ownership change. Zoning bylaws apply to the use of land, not the individuals who use the land.
- What happens to the numerous illegal and some legal (marijuana) grow ops in our neighbourhoods?
 - Cannabis production is under the jurisdiction of Health Canada and illegal cannabis production is regulated by the RCMP. Any existing property with a licence from Health Canada to grow cannabis would be considered legally non-conforming and not subject to any new regulation.
- Will any properties be 'grandfathered' i.e. too close to the shore?
 - Yes. Any existing property would be considered legally non-conforming and not subject to any new regulation.

- **Development Capacity**

- Are water and waste management issue outside the qRD jurisdiction?
 - Ground and surface water is licenced by the Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resources Operations and Rural Development. However a well owner using water for domestic purposes is exempt from licensing and paying provincial water fees and rentals. Domestic water applications are issued by Vancouver Coastal Health. Solid waste is managed by the qRD.
- West lake for our water system?
 - qRD Planning staff are not familiar with any plans for a West lake water system.
- Drainage ditches need to be re-assessed.
 - Agreed. The BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, in cooperation with the qathet Regional District, undertook a high-level drainage study for Electoral Areas A, B, and C in 2018. The study identified Ministry responsibility for much of the drainage system, via ditches and culverts along roads they have built or maintain. This system is needed to convey high flows safely to various discharge points and protect road infrastructure from drainage/flooding issues. The study also noted qathet Regional District is the regulatory body responsible for managing land development in such a way that it does not adversely impact the watersheds and drainage systems throughout the region. In addition, landowners are responsible for their own on-lot drainage and maintaining their local drainage systems. Their land use and development decisions directly influence runoff characteristics and so influence the condition of the watershed and drainage system considerably. The study included recommendations for a comprehensive inventory of existing drainage infrastructure, addressing coastal bluff

erosion due to drainage outfalls, and the need for public education on stormwater management.

- Who regulates roads and access roads in the Right of Way?
 - Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

- **Affordable Housing**

- How would land use management contribute to the urgent need for an increase in affordable housing supply?
 - Recent changes to the *Local Government Act* obligate local governments to complete Housing Needs Assessments every five years and to use the findings from these assessments to inform OCPs, land use regulations and development approval processes to better support affordable housing.
- How is this going to contribute to or discourage the housing crisis?
 - The qRD had a Housing Needs Assessment completed in 2021 and findings from the study will help to guide next steps the qRD can take to support affordable housing in our communities.

[Savary Island Themes/ Questions/ Answers](#)

Themes and questions that were asked in the online meeting held on November 24th included:

- **Regulatory Reach**

- How/ who enforces the Official Community Plan? and bylaws now?
 - The OCP is not a regulatory bylaw so there is no enforcement mechanism except through subdivision applications. Other bylaws are enforced on a complaint basis.
- When will the Savary Island OCP be reviewed/ updated?
 - The bylaw was adopted in 2007 so an update is in order. This is tentatively scheduled for 2023.
- Would bylaws impact insurance premiums?
 - That would depend on the bylaw. If a bylaw reduces risk, insurance premiums could be reduced. Most bylaws would not affect insurance premiums.

- **Land Use Concerns Specific to Savary Island**

- What is the population of Savary Island? How many lots are there on Savary?
 - Most of the population of Savary Island is seasonal so the population varies greatly depending on the time of year. Savary Island is part of Area A which had a population of 1,105 in the 2016 census. New census population figures will be released in February 2022. There are an estimated 1,368 properties on Savary Island. When the OCP was prepared in 2006, 647 properties were developed.
- Visitors are using beaches and trails as toilets because there are no facilities on the island. Who do we contact to get outhouses/ facilities?
 - Outhouse facilities could be provided through a Recreation Service.
- Does the RD have any responsibility in regulating campgrounds / commercial uses on Savary? There is a commercial tent facility. Can it be regulated?
 - If the qRD had a zoning bylaw, campground and commercial land uses could be regulated.
- How can Savary become a priority for the RD and not lost like in the census?
 - Savary Island is an important part of Area A. They are encouraged to contact their Area Director or regional district staff for any concerns they wish to raise.

- Concerned about parking and vehicles being a problem. Who enforces that now?
 - It depends on where the vehicles are parked. qRD can regulate parking on qRD owned and leased lands. Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure can regulate parking on dedicated roads and right of ways.
- Seeing that the qRD provides no services to Savary Island, should we be paying taxes?
 - qRD provides many services to Savary Island including planning services, fire services, emergency services, and dock services.
- **Questions not related to Zoning**
 - There is a rush to develop the island. Savary Island is environmentally sensitive, yet some residents are removing all trees on their property. What can be done about tree removal?
 - Tree removal can be restricted in a Development Permit area for environmentally sensitive land. A tree removal bylaw is another option.
 - What can be done to control noise?
 - The qRD could pass a bylaw to deal with noise and other disturbances.
 - How can Savary Island have its own regional director?
 - The person was advised to contact the Chief Administrative Officer.
- **Zoning Bylaw Specific Questions**
 - How would the qRD enforce new / future bylaws?
 - Through inspection or on a complaint basis.
 - If the qRD gets involved in zoning, how will bylaws be drawn up? Will everyone get a vote or will it be like Vancouver where, every year, more and more bylaws are introduced, permits get more expensive and the everything takes too long and gets bogged down at city hall.
 - Any bylaw will only take place after consultation with affected residents. The current consultation is just an initial step. Under the *Local Government Act*, a zoning bylaw requires four readings to be approved by the Regional Board.
 - Can we learn from the zoning process that occurred on Texada Island?
 - Texada Island recently completed an extensive consultation process for its OCP which clearly stated that additional regulation was not wanted.
- **Costs of Adding Regulations**
 - What is the cost to create new bylaws? What is the process?
 - It is too early to determine the costs, if any. That would depend on the scope and geographical extent of the new bylaws. The process will require extensive consultation with residents. The consultation for the zoning bylaws for Random Road and Douglas Bay Road involved approximately 55 properties but involved three engagements with the affected residents. Once the scope of the bylaw is known, a formal bylaw is drafted which requires four readings by the Regional Board including a Public Hearing.
 - Do you know how much a geotechnical engineering review of one's property costs these days?
 - Cost could vary from \$5,000 to \$10,000 or more depending on the number of test pits or deep auger holes.
 - How will my taxes be affected if there is more regulation?
 - It is too early to tell as that would depend on the extent and scope of any regulation. These meetings are intended to be Temperature Check to survey the public feelings on what, if anything, should be done.

- **Non-conforming uses/ buildings**

- What happens to buildings that were in place before bylaws were adopted?
 - Existing development would be 'grandfathered' for any uses and structures that predate the bylaw adoption. Another term frequently used is the existing development is called legally non-conforming. A new zoning bylaw would only affect new development that takes place after the adoption of a zoning bylaw. Existing development is not required to conform to the new regulations. A zoning bylaw cannot be applied retroactively.
- What happens if a building is burnt down?
 - The legal non-conforming would continue unless 75% of the building above its foundations is destroyed by fire.
- Can the existing building footprint be used?
 - That would depend on the circumstances. Yes, if the building footprint complied with the setbacks of the new zoning bylaw. Yes, if the building was only partially destroyed by fire. Possibly no, if the building was removed and a new building was proposed that did not meet the new setback requirements. However, the owner would still have the option of applying for a zoning variance or applying to the Board of Variance.
- What setbacks will apply for a new development if a zoning bylaw is adopted?
 - If a new zoning bylaw includes setbacks, those setbacks would apply.

- **Development Capacity**

- Given the increase in construction, permanent residents, and extended seasonal visitors, I am concerned about aquifer protection in the long run. Can the qRD educate the population about this threat to a common resource?
 - Yes. The Savary Island OCP addresses this issue. Other organizations such as the Savary Island Land Trust Society (SILT) have publicized a Best Practices Guide to educate the public.
- What can the qRD do to protect water supply?
 - Options include public education, adopt a Zoning Bylaw as stated in the first implementation action in the Savary Island OCP and work with other public interest organizations.
- How can lots be consolidated?
 - There are two options. An internal lot line cancellation can be used if the lots are in the same legal plan. If the lots being cancelled are from different plans or any lot line boundaries are changed, a new legal survey would be required.

- **Provincial Regulations**

- Regulating septic installation is important, how can that happen?
 - Septic approval is regulated by the Provincial Sewerage System Regulation which covers site assessment, planning, design, installation, and maintenance of on-site sewerage disposal systems under the *Health Act*. Vancouver Coast Health is the responsible body, has prepared guidelines and has an office in Powell River.
- Taxes should pay for proper roads, how can the qRD advocate for roads on the island?
 - Roads in electoral areas are the responsibility of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. The qRD has a good working relationship with the Ministry and can request action be taken. Residents can also contact the Ministry directly.

- **Consultation Next Steps**

- How can we have more engagement the future?
 - Make a request to the qRD.

Survey Responses and Analysis

There was a total of 954 responses to the Let's Talk Land Use survey engagement that occurred from November 15th, 2021 to December 1st, 2021. The online survey was open until December 1 but several paper copies of the survey received by the qathet Regional District up to December 13th were included in the survey results. Over 95% of the survey responses were submitted online. The remaining paper copies were inputted manually by qathet Regional District staff. The high response rate to the survey indicates the topic is of great interest to residents of Electoral Areas A, B and C.

This section reviews and analyzes the survey findings. The survey consisted of a total of 10 questions of which the first six asked for basic information from those participating. The remaining four questions asked for the views of participants concerning land use conflicts, the management of development and the desired regulatory role for the qathet Regional District. The results have been documented both in aggregate form as well as by electoral area.

Findings by Electoral Area and Savary Island

Q1: In which qathet Electoral Area or part of the regional district do you live or work?




Figure 1. Responses by participants location of residence or employment.

Figure 1 shows the breakdown of responses by Electoral Area. Of the total responses, 38% indicated that they live or work in Electoral Area A of the Regional District north of the City of Powell River and includes Lund and Savary Island. The 363 responses from Electoral Area A was the largest number of responses. This was due in part to the virtual meeting added to accommodate Savary Island residents (seasonal and permanent) and property owners in addition to the in-person meeting in Lund. The second largest number of responses - 36% - were from Electoral Area C south-east of Powell River, including Black Point and Saltery Bay. The third largest number of responses - 17% - came from Electoral Area B, adjacent and east of Powell River including Paradise Valley and Myrtle Rocks.

The remaining 10% of responses reflect those who live and work in multiple areas. Question 1 accommodated respondents who worked in one of more electoral area but did not live in that electoral area. This also accommodated seasonal residents, including those in Savary Island. The vast majority of other responses came from Powell River residents (80% or 75 of 94).

Population and Demographics

Table 1 shows the distribution of responses by electoral area and the number of responses relative to the population of each electoral area. As noted above, Area A and Area C each had over one third of all responses. The proportion of responses from Area B was much lower, slightly over one sixth of all responses. Most of the remaining responses, one tenth of all responses, came from Powell River residents.

Table 1 also shows the response rate by electoral area compared to the 2016 census population ⁴⁵ for each electoral area. The highest response rate from the survey came from Area A. This is a remarkable response rate of 36% of all Area A residents. This is due in part to the virtual meeting held for Savary Island residents, both seasonal and permanent. It should also be noted that seasonal residents are not included in census data, which documents the primary residence of the respondent. If seasonal residents of Savary Island were included, the response rate would be close to one quarter of the total population. This is still the highest response rate of the three electoral areas. The response rate for Area C was 16% of the total population while Area B had a response rate of 10%. These numbers would be elevated if the 94 other responses could be allocated to one particular electoral area. It should also be noted that one family member in a household often fills out a survey rather than all members of a household. As a result, the response rate by household is likely considerably higher as the household size in 2.0 in Area A, 2.1 in Area B and 2.1 in Area C. Two person households represent the largest proportion of households in each electoral area (between 43% and 48%). By any measure, the response rate was remarkably high and shows great interest in each electoral area⁶.

Table 1. Analysis showing breakdown of survey responses by electoral area based on 2016 census data.

AREA	Survey Responses by Electoral Area	% Responses by Electoral Area	2016 Census Population	% Responses Compared to 2016 Population
A	363	38%	1,008	36%
B	159	17%	1,565	10%
C	338	35%	2,060	16%
Other*	94	10%		
Total	954	100%		

* Other responses included 75 from the City of Powell River, 5 from Tla'amin Lands and 14 from other locations.

⁴ 2021 census population not available until February 2022

⁵ See qathet Regional Housing Needs Study, April 2021

⁶ Consultation rates vary greatly in land use planning projects but a 10% response rate is not frequently achieved.

Q2: Which of the following applies to you in Electoral Area A, B or C? (check all that apply)




Figure 2. Participant responses for activities/residency in Electoral Area A, B, or C

Figure 2 indicates that most responses were from homeowners. Of the 890 respondents, there were 1,478 responses, indicating that those surveyed often both resided, owned a home or business, or worked in the area. Respondents under the 'Other' category shared that many of them owned property that they visited seasonally, or were landowners, including farmers.

Q3: Are you a year-round resident or a seasonal resident?




Figure 3. Responses by participants regarding yearly length of residency

Figure 3 illustrates the seasonal residency patterns for respondents indicating that a large majority (80%) reside there year-round. The majority of 'Other' answers were from respondents that come periodically (non-seasonal) or for greater than a season (on a weekly basis or from 5 to 8 months a year). There were also some that indicated they are business owners in the area.

Q4: How long have you lived in the region?




Figure 4. Length of time Respondents have lived in qathet Regional District.

Of the 916 responses, over 40% surveyed indicated that they have lived in the qathet Regional District for greater than 20 years. This indicates that the majority of respondents are long-term residents who have a history in the area and care deeply about where they live. This can be compared with the 2016 census, in which over one third of qathet Regional District residents indicated they had moved in the previous five years.

Q5: Did you attend a qRD land use public information meeting (check all that apply)




Figure 5. Respondents' attendance at qRD land use public information meetings.

Figure 5 notes that a total of 225 persons indicated they had attended one of the three in-person meetings. However, a large majority (73%) of respondents indicated that they did not attend a qathet Regional District land use public information meeting. While the qathet Regional District website provided the same background information for those who did not attend any of the meetings (i.e. 8 story boards and PowerPoint presentation), it is not known how many respondents reviewed this information prior to undertaking the survey⁷.

Q6: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood/ area? (check all that apply)




Figure 6. Land use or development concerns for the qRD as indicated by respondents.

⁷ Survey results for those that attended a public information meeting were separated and analyzed on pages 41-42 to determine if their responses differed from the overall survey results.

Respondents were given an opportunity to identify a wide variety of concerns they would like addressed in the qathet Regional District land use plan or indicate they did not have land use or development concerns, as shown in Figure 6. There were 15 specific concerns that respondents could identify as well as an open ended response with additional concerns. This resulted in a total of 2,993 selections made from 819 respondents.

The largest concern was for the 'Protection of Drinking Water Supply', which included water quality and pollution concerns, which over 40% selected. A closely related response was 'Demands on Potable Water Supply' (27%). Other environmental issues were 'Environmental Impacts on Watercourses' (27%) and 'Changes in Drainage Patterns and Stormwater Runoff' (24%). Both were marked as important by approximately a quarter of responders, which shows that freshwater management is a critically important issue. Coastal areas at risk, which includes flooding and shoreline erosion also was marked as important by nearly a quarter of respondents.

Land use conflicts, including incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, and commercial uses were marked as a concern by over one quarter of respondents (26%). All other building related issues were identified by less than 20% of respondents. These included concerns about the number of buildings on a property, the proximity of buildings (e.g. setbacks from property lines), the size and height of buildings, unsightly premises, and parking concerns (including too many vehicles on road right of way or cluttering the front yards of private property). Land use regulation is the essence of zoning.

Top Overall Concerns (>20%)- qathet Regional District:

- Protection of drinking water supply - 40.5%
- Demands on potable water supply - 27%
- Environmental impacts on watercourses -27%
- Land use conflicts - 26%
- Coastal areas at risk - 24%
- Changes in drainage patterns/ stormwater runoff - 24%

On the other hand, over 300 persons indicated they had no land use or development concerns. This represented 37% of all respondents.

Q7: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?




Figure 7. Respondents' views regarding existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas.

The largest proportion of respondents (39%) indicated that the 'Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed' (327 of 816 responses). This was considerably higher than the 24% that felt the 'Existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict (it's too much like the 'Wild West')' (197 of 816 responses). On the other hand, 20% of respondents indicated 'There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area' (167 of 816 responses). This is quite revealing considering that qathet Regional District has less regulation than nearly every other regional district in BC.

None of the Q7 responses received 40% or more support, let alone a majority of respondents. However, a much larger proportion indicated support for the status quo than supported either more regulation or less regulation. The status quo clearly has the support of more respondents than either increasing or reducing regulation. This indicates that introducing additional zoning in areas where it is not present, local subdivision regulation and building regulation across Electoral Areas A, B and C does not have broad community support.

It is noted that while land use conflicts were cited as the fourth most pressing land use concern in Question 7 (26%), the proportion in Question 8 that indicated the existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict is very similar at 24%.

Q8: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)




Figure 8 Respondent's views on ways the qathet Regional District can manage land use and development in the Electoral area.

Question 9 was structured so respondents could indicate their support or if they do not support specific regulatory tools identified to manage land use and development in their electoral area. The highest support was for the use of an Official Community Plan followed by subdivision regulation and a zoning bylaw (either limited or broader scope). The least support was for a building bylaw, which was endorsed by less than 10% of respondents. Support for new regulatory tools was much lower than the existing OCP, which has been adopted in all electoral areas. Most noteworthy is the fact that a clear majority of respondents - 56% - (461 of 824) indicated that they did not support adding new land use regulation in their Electoral Area.

Findings by Electoral Area and Savary Island – Key Concerns and Desired Directions

This section overviews findings by specific areas across the total responses from the qathet Regional District on four questions on the Let's Talk Land Use survey (7, 8, 9 and 10).

- **Question 7:** *At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)*
- **Question 8:** *What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?*
- **Question 9:** *What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)*

These three questions were prioritized for their insight into opinions on land use changes in the qathet Regional District and their helpfulness in comparing to specific electoral areas. For a summary of general findings, please see the previous section.

Key Highlights

- Areas A, B, and C responses all indicated similar concerns around changes in land use and environmental issues. They were Protection of drinking water supply, Environmental impacts on watercourses, Demands on potable water supply, and Changes in drainage patterns / stormwater runoff.
- Areas A, B, and C all had similar responses concerning land use regulatory options. The predominant view in each area was the 'Existing level of regulation is limited but no change is needed'. The level of support either for more regulation or for less regulation was much lower.
- Savary Island's top concerns were mainly environmental and were expressed by a much higher proportion of respondents compared to the three mainland areas. Top concerns were Protection of drinking water supply, Coastal areas risk, Parking, Demands on potable water supply, Proximity of buildings.
- Savary Island responses indicated a widespread feeling that existing regulations are not adequate to address their key environmental or land use concerns.

Electoral Area A

Area A responses were documented by only including those who indicated they were living or working in Area A. This section highlights findings from Questions 7, 8, 9 and 10 from the Let's Talk Land Use survey. These were prioritized as key questions that allow direct comparison on opinions towards land use planning compared to the total responses from the qathet Regional District.

A total of 202 responses were analyzed in this section for those living or working in Area A.

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)




Figure 9. Participants’ concerns regarding changes in land use - comparison of Area A to qathet RD responses.

Area A’s responses to this question were very similar to the overall survey results. ‘Protection of drinking water supply’ was the top concern, both in Area A and in the overall survey. The next two highest concerns were ‘Environmental impacts on watercourses’ and ‘Demands on potable water supply’, both in Area A and in the overall survey’. Land use conflicts’ was the fourth highest concern in Area A and in the overall survey although the level of concern was lower in Area A. The top four concerns in Area A which received the support of more than 20% of Area A respondents are summarized below and compared to the overall survey responses.

Top Concerns (>20%) - Area A:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **36%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses ((i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **27%**
- Demands of potable water supply (e.g. quantify of water being taken) - **22%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **20%**

Top Concerns – All Responses:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **40.5%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **27%**
- Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken) - **27%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **26%**

In Area A, 35% of respondents indicated ‘I have no land use or development concerns’. The only specific concern which exceeded this was ‘Protection of drinking water supply’. In the overall survey, 38.5% indicated than had no land use or development concerns.

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?




Figure 10. Respondents’ views of existing land management - Area A and qathet RD comparison

In Area A, 40% indicated ‘Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed’. This was almost identical to the overall survey in which 39% provided the same response. In Area A, however, a lower proportion (16%) indicated ‘Existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict’ compared to the total responses from the qathet Regional District (24%). A much higher proportion of Area A responses (30%) indicated ‘There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area’ compared to 20% of overall responses in the survey.

Support for additional regulation was lowest in Area A with less than one in six respondents so indicating. The predominant position in Area A respondents was ‘Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed’.

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)




Figure 11. *Opinions on land use management - Area A & qathet RD comparison.*

Opinions in both Area A and the total responses from the qathet Regional District for new land management and development practices were similar across all responses to this question. The OCP was the tool most supported by Area A residents to manage land use and development. A much lower proportion supported zoning, local subdivision regulation or a building bylaw to manage land use and development. Less than 20% of Area A residents supported any of these tools. This was confirmed by a clear majority (56%), who indicated ‘I do not support qathet Regional District adding new land use regulation to my Electoral Area’.

Individual comments from Area A respondents to Questions 7 to 10 are documented on pages 1-12 of Appendix F⁸. This includes responses from Savary Island residents (permanent and part-time) and property owners. Area A includes Savary Island and the Zoom meeting was scheduled after the survey questionnaire was prepared and finalized.

⁸ All comments in Appendix F are printed verbatim except for obvious typos. Any references to the writers have been deleted for privacy reasons..

Area A responses were wide ranging, both in terms of issues raised and opinions expressed. The predominant sentiment, however, was for a limited role for the qathet Regional District. Numerous respondents indicated they moved to Area A to avoid government regulation, high taxes and for the freedom they had in their rural area. Many indicated additional regulation was not needed or desired or was being addressed by senior governments. Alternate views expressing a need for greater environmental protection, local land use regulation to avoid use conflicts and the view that the OCP is hollow if not backed up by regulatory bylaws were much less common.

Specific issues raised include comments about clearcutting, tree removal and logging practices, wildfire risk, climate change, riparian protection, B&Bs, derelict vehicles, food security , aquifer protection, drinking water supply and quality in Lund, housing affordability and the proliferation of cannabis grow operations. Although there were numerous concerns raised, the predominant view was they can be managed without additional regulation or the drawbacks of additional regulation would outweigh the benefits (in terms of cost, government intrusion, loss of freedom, etc.). The qualitative responses indicated that while Area A respondents had numerous concerns, they were not supportive of additional regulation. This was confirmed by the quantitative responses which indicated the status quo was preferred to either more regulation or less regulation.

Appendix G⁹ contains eight emails and letters received through the consultation process. The first three emails were from Area A residents.

[Electoral Area B](#)

Area B responses were documented by including only those who indicated they were living or working in Area B. This section highlights findings from Questions 7, 8, 9 and 10 from the Let's Talk Land Use survey. These were prioritized as key questions that allow direct comparison on opinions towards land use planning in the wider qathet Regional District.

A total of 151 responses were analyzed in this section for those living or working in Area B.

⁹ No changes have been made to any of the emails or letters in Appendix G except to delete the names and addresses of the writers.
Let's Talk Land Use: Public Engagement & Final Report- January 2022

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)




Figure 12. Participants’ concerns regarding changes in land use - comparison of Area B to qathet RD responses.

Area B’s responses to this question generally aligned with the wider qathet Regional District’s responses. Area B’s top concern was ‘Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns)’ as occurred in the overall survey. Of the top five concerns from Area B respondents, four were environmental. The only exception was land use conflicts.

It is noted that the overall level of concern about land use changes and development in Area B was lower than the overall survey results. Each concern in Area B was identified less than one third of those responding to the survey. The following summarizes the five concerns expressed by 20% or more of Area B respondents compared to the overall survey responses¹⁰.

¹⁰ The total exceeds 100% as respondents could check off all the land use and development concerns they had.
Let’s Talk Land Use: Public Engagement & Final Report- January 2022

Top Concerns (>20%) – Area B:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **32%**
- Changes in drainage patterns / stormwater runoff - **26%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **22%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **21%**
- Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken) - **20%**

Top Concerns – All Responses:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **40.5%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **27%**
- Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken) - **27%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **26%**
- Changes in drainage patterns/ stormwater runoff - **24%**

A much higher number of Area B survey responses stated ‘I have no land use or development concerns’. This represented the views of 44% of the 151 respondents.

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?




Figure 13. Respondents' views of existing land management – Area B and qathet RD comparison

Area B's responses to this question did not differ greatly from those in the wider qathet Regional District. The highest proportion, 37% of Area B's responses, indicated they felt the 'Existing level of regulation is limited but no change is needed'. This was similar to the overall qathet Regional District response rate of 40%. However, a higher proportion of Area B responses (27%) agreed with the statement 'There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area' than the 20% that felt the 'Existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict'.

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)




Figure 14. *Opinions on land use management – Area B & qathet RD comparison.*

Opinions in both Area B and the qathet Regional District as a whole for new land management and development practices were similar across all responses to this question. Approximately 62% of responses from Area B did not support new land use and management regulations, the same proportion in the overall survey. Less than one quarter of Area B respondents indicated support for a Zoning Bylaw, local subdivision regulation or a Building Bylaw.

Individual comments from Area B respondents to Questions 7 to 10 are documented on pages 13-20 of Appendix F. The dominant sentiment expressed was satisfaction with the existing rural lifestyle and privacy coupled with opposition to additional regulation. There were concerns that increased regulation was not needed, would result in increased taxation and that residents would not be better off with greater government involvement. A much smaller number of commented that additional regulation was needed for a variety of reasons including managing new development, addressing better environmental and biodiversity protection, environmental sustainability, climate change mitigation, providing for needed parkland and holding developers responsible for their practices (e.g. tree cutting, erosion, drainage changes, noise).

The individual comments in Appendix F were wide ranging and included the following issues: protection of the natural environment, concerns about tree cutting, opposition to cannabis grow operations, shoreline protection, lack of enforcement of existing regulations, a belief that provincial regulations are adequate to address water and sewage services, lack of enforcement by the ALC on ALR land, housing affordability and satisfaction with the existing OCP. There were no emails or letters from Area B residents in Appendix G.

Electoral Area C

Area C responses were documented by only including those who indicated they were living or working in Area C. This section highlights findings from Questions 7, 8, 9 and 10 from the Let's Talk Land Use survey. These were prioritized as key questions that allow direct comparison on opinions towards land use planning in the wider qathet Regional District. A total of 331 responses were analyzed in this section for those living or working in Area C.

As shown on the Figure 18 bar graph, the Area C responses to this question generally follow the concerns of the overall qathet Regional District survey. However, there is a significant difference. That is the lower overall level of concern in Area C. Each of the top five concerns in Area C were identified by less than 20% of respondents. The remaining Area C concerns were identified by 10% or less of respondents. In comparison, the top four concerns in Area A were identified by between 20% and 36% of respondents. In Area B, five concerns were identified by between 20% and 32% of respondents.

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)




Figure 15. Participants' concerns regarding changes in land use - comparison of Area C to qathet RD responses.

The following summarizes the key concerns in Area C identified by more than 10% of respondents compared to the top concerns in the overall survey identified by over 20% of respondents.

Top Concerns (>10%) – Area C:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **17%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **14%**
- Changes in drainage patterns / stormwater runoff - **13%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **12%**
- Coastal areas at risk - **10%**

Top Concerns – All Responses:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **40.5%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **27%**
- Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken) - **27%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **26%**
- Coastal areas at risk - **24%**
- Changes in drainage patterns/ stormwater runoff - **24%**

Notwithstanding the numerous specific concerns, the most frequently recorded response in Area C was ‘I have no land use or development concerns’. This was expressed by 20% of respondents.

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?




Figure 16. Respondents’ views of existing land management - Area C and qathet RD comparison

The predominant response in Area C was the ‘Existing level of regulation is limited but no change is needed’. This corresponded to the overall qathet Regional District results. Less than half as many Area C respondents felt ‘There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area’ or the ‘Existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use or avoid conflict.

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)




Figure 17. *Opinions on land use management – Area C & qathet RD comparison.*

The responses both in Area C and the overall qathet Regional District survey indicated similar responses for new land management and development practices. The most frequent response in both instances was ‘I do not support qathet Regional District adding new land use regulation in my Electoral Area’. This response outnumbered any other response by at least 2:1.

Individual comments from Area C respondents to Questions 7 to 10 are documented on pages 21-34 of Appendix F. The dominant sentiment expressed was opposition to additional regulation and the anticipated taxation that would result. Many indicated support for their existing rural lifestyle and resulting privacy and freedom. There were concerns that increased regulation would be bad for their area and was neither needed nor wanted.

A much smaller number commented that additional regulation was needed for a variety of reasons including managing large new developments(e.g. clearcutting, erosion, drainage changes, noise), development in hazardous areas, environmental conflicts, protection of water quality, stormwater management and destruction of natural habitat.

Individual comments in Appendix F were wide ranging and included the following issues: taxation increases, opposition to overregulation, providing for needed parkland, beach access, riparian protection, natural habitat protection, concerns about tree cutting, opposition to cannabis grow operations, lack of enforcement of existing regulations, nuisance, smell and odour from unsightly premises, a belief that provincial regulations are adequate to address water and sewage services, providing more land for single family development, lot sizes, and housing affordability.

Several persons expressed support for the organization of the meeting and information provided. Several others were upset that they were turned away from the first meeting as there were over 50 persons already at the Lang Bay Hall or they felt the meeting was rushed and their questions not adequately answered in order to accommodate a third meeting that was hastily scheduled that evening due to the overflow attendance at the first meeting.

Appendix G documents email and letter responses. The last two responses are emails from Area C residents.

[Savary Island](#)

Savary Island responses from the survey were documented by only including those who indicated they were living (year round or seasonal) or working on Savary Island. This section highlights findings from Questions 7, 8, 9 and 10 from the Let's Talk Land Use survey. These were prioritized as key questions that allow direct comparison on opinions towards land use planning in the total responses from the qathet Regional District.

A total of 147 responses were analyzed in this section for those living, vacationing or working on Savary Island.

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)




Figure 18. Participants’ concerns regarding changes in land use - comparison of Savary to qathet RD responses.

The two biggest concerns from Savary Island respondents were environmental. A majority cited ‘Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns)’ and ‘Coastal areas at risk (e.g. flooding, offshore erosion)’. This represented a much higher level of concern for these key environment issues from Savary Island respondents compared to the overall survey results. Although significant, a much lower 40% of overall respondents indicated a concern with ‘Protection of drinking water supply’ and all environmental issues were cited by less than 30% of respondents.

Three other issues were a concern to over 40% of Savary Island respondents. Two were land use issues, ‘Parking (e.g. too many vehicles on road right of way or cluttering front yards of private property)’ and ‘Proximity of buildings (e.g. setbacks between houses, setbacks from roads/property lines)’. The third was ‘Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken)’.

Top Concerns (>40%) – Savary Island:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **57%**
- Coastal areas risk (ocean) - e.g. flooding risk, shoreline erosion - **54%**
- Parking (e.g. too many vehicles on road right of way or cluttering front yards of private property) - **49%**
- Proximity of buildings (e.g. setbacks between houses, setbacks from roads/property lines) - **44%**
- Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken) - **44%**

Top Concerns – All Responses:

- Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns) - **40.5%**
- Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands) - **27%**
- Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken) - **27%**
- Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses) - **26%**
- Coastal areas at risk - **24%**
- Changes in drainage patterns/ stormwater runoff - **24%**

Very few Savary Island responses (10%) indicated ‘I have no land use or development concerns’, a much lower proportion than the overall survey (37%). This is a major contrast to the responses from all other electoral areas.

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?




Figure 19. Respondents' views of existing land management - Savary and qathet RD comparison

Only 1% of Savary Island's responses indicated that 'There is too much regulation in my Electoral Area'. Instead, 65% indicated the 'Existing regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict'. Only 22% felt 'Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed' compared to 40% of qathet Regional District responses.

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)




Figure 20. *Opinions on land use management - Savary & qathet RD comparison.*

Responses from Savary Island concerning land use management and development practices also differed greatly from the overall survey responses for the qathet Regional District. Only 8% of Savary Island responses indicated that 'I do not support qathet Regional District adding new land use regulation in my Electoral Area' whereas 34% of the wider qathet Regional District indicated such a position. Of the available land use management tools, the OCP received the highest support followed by a broad scope of zoning. A Building Bylaw was the land use management tool with the lowest level of support from Savary Island respondents.

Individual comments from Savary Island residents, both year round and seasonal, to Questions 7 to 10 are documented in Appendix F. They are included within the overall Area A responses on pages 1 to 12 as the survey questionnaire did not include a breakdown within Electoral Area A. The survey questionnaire was finalized before the Zoom meeting for Savary Island was scheduled.

Fortunately, many Savary Island responses contain geographical references that are clearly identified. These responses cover a wide range of issues including the high lot density and small lot size on Savary Island, overbuilding, erosion, concerns about unsafe building construction close to cliffs, aquifer protection, storage of fuels, public sanitation, garbage, archaeological impacts, tree removal, and negative development impacts on the fragile island environment. Unlike the other electoral areas, there were very few negative comments about land use regulation and for local government to leave the current regulatory regime unchanged.

Appendix G contains emails and letter received through the consultation process. The first five responses concern Area A while the fourth and fifth items are specific to Savary Island. The fourth item is a complimentary email about the Zoom meeting and the fifth is a detailed letter concerning regulatory options to address Savary Island issues.

Survey Responses from Public Information Meeting Attendees

Survey responses by those who have attended the public information meetings were explored further for Questions 8 and 9. The purpose was to determine if the survey results from the in-person meetings were substantially different from the overall survey results. In other words, did the additional background information and group dynamics of attending an in-person meeting affect the survey results?

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?




Figure 21 Views regarding existing land use and development changes from those who have attended the public information meetings held in Electoral areas A, B & C. The percentages are given as the proportion of each electoral area who shared views regarding regulation, with the responses given from the electoral area totalling 100%.

Data from those who have attended the public information meetings indicate the predominant response in Area A (48%) and in Area C (44%) was the ‘Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed’. In Area B, an equal proportion (37%) also felt ‘There is already too much regulation in my electoral area’. In Area A and in Area C, more felt that the existing level of regulation is inadequate than felt there is too much regulation. The opposite occurred in Area B. These results are similar but not identical to the overall survey results.

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)




Figure 22 Views regarding ways to manage land use and development changes from those who have attended the public information meetings held in Electoral areas A, B & C.

Responses have been broken down into each area showing the answers given by those who attended one of the three public information meetings in the area. The results show that considerably more people attending a meeting in Area A, Area B or Area C indicated they did not support new land use regulation compared to those who supported any specific land use regulatory tool. There was virtually no support for building regulation. Support for local subdivision regulation was higher but very limited. Support for a limited scope for zoning was higher again but also quite modest. The OCP, which is an existing bylaw in all electoral areas, received the most support.

One benefit of holding in-person meetings, which featured a PowerPoint presentation, eight posters available for viewing and a question and answer session, was the number of undecided responses was negligible. Only one person indicated they did not have an opinion on the subject of regulation.

Conclusions

There was a high level of interest concerning land use regulation in each electoral area. Each in-person meeting, to consider land use regulation in the three electoral areas, was well attended (total of 165 participants). The Zoom virtual online meeting held for Savary Island residents, seasonal and permanent, was exceptionally well attended (121 registered attendees). Nearly 1,000 survey responses were received in the three electoral areas. The response rate represented 20% of the total population in the three electoral areas (4,663 in the 2016 census). This is an extremely high response rate for a land use survey.

The overall survey documented the following six land use concerns by 20% or more of respondents:

- Protection of drinking water supply
- Demands on potable water supply
- Environmental impacts on watercourses
- Land use conflicts
- Coastal areas at risk
- Changes in drainage patterns/ stormwater runoff

Four or more of these concerns were identified by 20% or more survey responses in each electoral area. Nevertheless, most survey respondents indicated they did not support additional land use regulation. This response occurred across all three electoral areas, with the exception of Savary Island. It may appear inconsistent to cite numerous land use concerns and also oppose putting in place the tools necessary to address these concerns. The most likely explanation is residents are willing to live with these concerns and do not, on balance, support an increased regulatory network – one that prevails in the vast majority of the province, including all urban areas. While the existing level of regulation is limited, the status quo is preferred to the adoption of additional tools to manage development and reduce land use conflict. Although there are variations between Area A, B and C, this represents the prevailing position in each electoral area.

Savary Island residents expressed a much higher level of concern about land use and environmental issues. A clear majority indicated concern for the protection of drinking water supply and coastal areas at risk. Over 40% identified three other concerns. This different position of Savary Island residents compared to the mainland electoral areas is likely due to the fragile environment of the island and the large number of small lots that were created over a century ago. Only 10% of Savary Island responses indicated they had no land use concerns whereas 65% indicated 'Existing regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict'. Savary Island residents clearly indicated support for additional land use regulation to protect their island paradise.

An analysis of responses of those who attended a public information meeting was similar to the overall survey results. In other words, the general direction of the survey results was the same whether or not respondents attended or did not attend an in-person meeting. Based on the individual survey comments, many appreciated the information provided but the information was selectively referenced to support existing opinions held by survey respondents.

The individual survey responses provided a wealth of information. The lack of support for additional regulation was clearly evident although the reasons cited varied greatly. Although some took the opportunity to vent their hostility to local government, many more indicated their preference for a limited and less intrusive role

for local government and a willingness to live with the consequences. A wide range of issues was covered and some responses were very thoughtful and lengthy.

The 'Let's Talk Land Use' public consultation purpose was to present information about land use regulation and managing development in Electoral Areas A, B and C, and hear the concerns and aspirations of residents. This report documents what was heard from each electoral area in the consultation process. Savary Island residents and property owners expressed clear support for qathet Regional District to advance regulations that would address widespread concerns managing development and land use conflicts. In the remainder of Electoral Area A and in Electoral Areas B and C, community feedback did not support further land use regulation. Ultimately, qathet Regional District Directors are the decision-makers, who have multiple considerations to weigh, including public comments, liability and their perception of the public interest.

Recommendation

That qathet Regional District engage with Savary Island residents and property owners to address their widespread concerns about managing development and land use conflicts. A strong desire was expressed to continue public engagement. This is a good start. While the most logical solution is to adopt zoning for Savary Island, its successful implementation will require extensive consultation and the crafting of a bylaw that recognizes the fragile environmental characteristics of the island, its unique subdivision legacy, and the predominance of seasonal residents.

Appendix A – Ads

1. Powell River PEAK
2. qathet Living

Let's Talk Land Use

Are you concerned about changes in land use and development in your neighbourhood?

Should the Regional District do more to manage land use and development in your area?

qathet Regional District is hosting public information meetings and an online survey to gather feedback from community members in Electoral Areas A, B and C.

HOW CAN YOU GET INVOLVED?

Attend a Public Meeting

You are invited to attend public meetings to discuss land use and regulatory options in qathet Regional District.

Public meetings will be hosted in each of the Electoral Areas, listed below.

Background information is available online:
www.qathet.ca/land-use.

Answer the Online Survey

An online survey will be available at:
www.qathet.ca/land-use.

Paper copies are available upon request. Please call the qRD Planning staff at 604-485-2260 or email planning@qathet.ca to get your copy.

The survey will be open from November 18th to December 1st, 2021.

ALL MEETINGS: 4:30pm to 8:30pm drop-in, presentations 5pm and 7pm

AREA C

*South of Town,
including Black Point
& Saltery Bay*

Lang Bay Hall
11090 Highway 101

MONDAY, Nov 15th

AREA B

*Southeast of Town,
including Paradise Valley
& Myrtle Rocks*

Myrtle Point Golf Club
2865 McCausland Rd

TUESDAY, Nov 16th

AREA A

*North of Town,
including Lund &
Savary Island*

Northside Community
Recreation Centre
9654 Larson Bay Rd

WEDNESDAY, Nov 17th

Let's Talk Land Use

Are you concerned about changes in land use and development in your neighbourhood?

Should the Regional District do more to manage land use and development in your area?

qathet Regional District is hosting public information meetings and an online survey to gather feedback from community members in Electoral Areas A, B and C.

HOW CAN YOU GET INVOLVED?

Attend a Public Meeting

You are invited to attend public meetings to discuss land use and regulatory options in qathet Regional District.

Public meetings will be hosted in each of the Electoral Areas, listed below.

Background information is available online:
www.qathet.ca/land-use.

Answer the Online Survey

An online survey will be available at:
www.qathet.ca/land-use.

Paper copies are available upon request. Please call the qRD Planning staff at 604-485-2260 or email planning@qathet.ca to get your copy.

The survey will be open from November 18th to December 1st, 2021.



AREA C
South of Town,
including Black Point
& Saltery Bay

Lang Bay Hall
11090 Highway 101

MONDAY, Nov 15th
4:30 to 8:30pm Drop-in
Presentations 5 & 7pm

AREA B
Southeast of Town,
including Paradise
Valley & Myrtle Rocks

Myrtle Point Golf Club
2865 McCausland Rd

TUESDAY, Nov 16th
4:30 to 8:30pm Drop-in
Presentations 5 & 7pm

AREA A
North of Town,
including Lund &
Savary Island

Northside Community
Recreation Centre
9654 Larson Bay Rd

WEDNESDAY, Nov 17th
4:30 to 8:30pm Drop-in
Presentations 5 & 7pm




qathet
REGIONAL DISTRICT


For background information, visit www.qathet.ca/land-use
Contact: ✉ planning@qathet.ca 📞 604-485-2260


Appendix B – Location Maps


1. Area C Participants – November 15, 2021
2. Area B Participants – November 16, 2021
3. Area A Participants (2 maps consisting of Lund plus land to the north and south of Lund) – November 17, 2021



Area 6
March
2011







Appendix C – Posters


1. Consultation Overview – Background (What’s happening?)
2. Consultation Overview – Isn’t the OCP enough?
3. Consultation Overview – Why are we here?
4. What are the Land Use Regulatory Options? – Zoning Bylaw
5. What are the Land Use Regulatory Options? – Subdivision Standards Bylaw
6. What are the Land Use Regulatory Options? – Building Bylaw
7. What are the Land Use Regulatory Options? – How could land use regulatory tools address land uses concerns?
8. Frequently Asked Questions

Appendix D – PowerPoint Presentation for Meetings

Let's Talk Land Use

Electoral Areas A, B, C

November 15, 16, 17, 2021



A topographic map of the qathet Regional District area in British Columbia, Canada. The map is rendered in shades of blue and white, showing the intricate coastline of the Strait of Georgia and the surrounding landmasses. The text is overlaid on the left side of the map.

qathet Regional District (qRD) is a local government authority in British Columbia and located in the traditional territory of the Tla'amin, shíshálh, Klahoose, Homalco and K'ómoks First Nations.

A dark blue background with a white topographic map showing contour lines and geographical features.

3 Goals for Consultation

1. Provide you with information about the different land use management tools available to local government and answer any questions you may have
2. Hear about any concerns you have related to land use and development in your area
3. Hear your perspective on whether qathet Regional District should be doing more to manage land use and development in your area

Overview

The purpose of this meeting is to learn about and discuss options for regulating land use

Let's Talk Land Use

Are you concerned about land use and development in your neighbourhood?

Should the Regional District do more to manage land use and development in your area?

qathet Regional District is hosting public information meetings and an online survey to gather feedback from community members in Electoral Areas A, B and C.

HOW CAN YOU GET INVOLVED?

Attend a Public Meeting

You are invited to attend a public meeting to learn about and discuss options for regulating land use.

Public meetings will be hosted in each of the Electoral Areas, listed below.

Background information is available online: www.qathet.ca/land-use.

Answer the Online Survey

An online survey will be available at: www.qathet.ca/land-use.

Paper copies are available upon request. Please call the qRD Planning staff at 604-485-2260 or email planning@qathet.ca to get your copy.

The survey will be open from November 18th to December 1st, 2021.



AREA C South of Town, including Black Point & Saltery Bay

Lang Bay Hall
11090 Highway 101

MONDAY, Nov 15th
4:30 to 8:30pm Drop-in
Presentations 5 & 7pm

AREA B Southeast of Town, including Paradise Valley & Myrtle Rocks

Myrtle Point Golf Club
2865 McCausland Rd

TUESDAY, Nov 16th
4:30 to 8:30pm Drop-in
Presentations 5 & 7pm

AREA A North of Town, including Lund & Savary Island

Northside Community
Recreation Centre
9654 Larson Bay Rd

WEDNESDAY, Nov 17th
4:30 to 8:30pm Drop-in
Presentations 5 & 7pm

Why Are We Here?


1

LAND USE CONFLICTS



2

THREATS TO WATER SUPPLY




3

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS



What Are The Options?



Official Community Plans



**Electoral Area B
Official Community Plan
Bylaw No. 465, 2012**
Adopted March 28, 2013
Consolidated for Convenience Only Jan 22, 2021

"Area 'B' is dedicated to a sustainable rural lifestyle where residents can enjoy the natural environment while encouraging thoughtful economic development and protecting agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands and resources."

**SAVARY ISLAND
OFFICIAL
COMMUNITY PLAN**

BYLAW NO. 403, 2006

Adopted February 22, 2007

Consolidated for Convenience Only September 12, 2012




Powell River Regional District



**Electoral Area A Official Community Plan
Schedule A to Bylaw No. 500, 2015**
Adopted December 16, 2015




"Our vision is a vibrant and diverse community that preserves and enhances its rural, coastal character and balances economic opportunity with the environment."



**Electoral Area C
Official Community Plan
Bylaw No. 467, 2012**
Adopted April 25, 2013
Consolidated for convenience only Jan 22, 2021

ZONING BYLAW

Zoning bylaws are the first regulatory tool to consider, as they implement the broad policies and land use direction in an OCP. C



What Can a Zoning Bylaw Regulate?

Permitted land uses (residential, industrial, commercial)

Size (area) of buildings (principal & accessory)

Height of buildings (principal & accessory)

Setbacks for buildings (from property lines & ocean)

Site coverage for buildings (% of lot area)

Parking requirements (onsite)

Protection from hazards (e.g. flooding)

Habitat protection (riparian areas)



SUBDIVISION STANDARDS BYLAW

Enables land use
density to be
regulated and
provides for
servicing standards



What Subdivision Standards Bylaw Can Do



Standards
for road
dedication/
construction



Water
supply
including
fire hydrants



Sewage
collection
and disposal



Sidewalks
and Street
Lighting



Public Safety
elements
including
driveway
locations,
signage



Minimum
clear vision
sight lines



Parks
dedication
(5% of the
subdivision
area)



BUILDING BYLAW

Ensures public safety and compliance with existing land use regulations

Involves issuing building permits with inspections undertaken at key milestones in the construction of a building



What Building Bylaw Does

Ensure that approved land uses in OCP are being followed

Ensure plans comply with local bylaws

Setbacks are met, if applicable

Hazard mitigation undertaken, if applicable

Ensure building meets BC Building Code



Provincial Land Use Regulations

BC Building Code - applies to all property in BC

Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioner - septic installations


Ground and surface water licensing (BC Ministry FLNRORD)

Water supply systems - Vancouver Coastal Health

Subdivision – Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure

Fish and wildlife habitat - Provincial & Federal Legislation






Are you concerned about land use and development in your neighbourhood or area?



*Should the qathet Regional District
do more to manage land use and
development in your area?*




A dark blue background featuring a topographic map of the Pacific Ocean region. The map shows landmasses in a slightly lighter shade of blue and uses white contour lines to represent elevation. Visible landmasses include the Hawaiian Islands, the western coast of North America, the Gulf of Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean Sea, and the northern coast of South America. The word "Questions?" is written in white, sans-serif font on the left side of the image.

Questions?

Next Step & Enquiries

- Survey now open. Inviting feedback by December 1, 2021
- Information available on qRD website at www.qathet.ca
- Letter or email planning@qathet.ca



Survey

Open now until December 1st

www.qathet.ca



Appendix E – Let's Talk Land Use Survey

Let's Talk Land Use Survey

Let's Talk Land Use



The qathet Regional District (qRD) is hosting public information meetings and an online survey to consult with community members in Electoral Areas A, B and C. The purpose of this consultation is to discuss land use and regulatory options and gather feedback from community members. This online survey is open until December 1st, 2021.

About You...

This survey aims to understand and reflect diverse community voices to better support future planning needs. For this reason, the following questions ask you:

1. In which qathet Electoral Area or part of the regional district, do you live or work?

- ☐ Area A (North of Town, including Lund & Savary Island)
- ☐ Area B (Southeast of Town, including Paradise Valley & Myrtle Rocks)
- ☐ Area C (South of Town, including Black Point & SALTERY Bay)
- ☐ City of Powell River
- ☐ Tla'amin Lands
- ☐ Other (please explain): _____

2. If you live or work in Electoral Area A, B or C, which street or road most applies to you?

- ☐ _____

Let's Talk Land Use Survey

3. Which of the following applies to you in Electoral Area A, B or C? (check all that apply)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ☐ Resident | ☐ Business owner |
| ☐ Home owner | ☐ Employee |
| ☐ Renter | ☐ None |
| | ☐ Other _____ |

4. Are you a year-round resident or seasonal resident?

- ☐ Year-round
- ☐ Seasonal
- ☐ Other (specify): _____

5. How long have you lived in qathet Regional District?

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| ☐ Less than 5 years | ☐ 10 - 20 years |
| ☐ 5 - 10 years | ☐ Over 20 years |

Background Information...

To support shared understanding of options for managing land use and development, public meetings were held from November 15 to 17. The meetings included a presentation on the topic and also information boards. The presentation slides and information boards are also available on the qRD website www.qathet.ca/land-use. If you did not attend a public meeting, it is recommended that you read the background information boards, before filling out this survey.

6. Did you attend a qRD land use public information meeting? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Area C meeting on Monday November 15th
- ☐ Area B meeting on Tuesday November 16th
- ☐ Area A meeting on Wednesday November 17th
- ☐ No, I did not attend a public information meeting

Let's Talk Land Use Survey

7. At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)

- ☐ I have no land use or development concerns
- ☐ Land use conflicts (e.g. incompatible land uses in areas where there is a mix of residential, industrial, commercial uses)
- ☐ Size and height of buildings
- ☐ Proximity of buildings (e.g. setbacks between houses, setbacks from roads/property lines)
- ☐ Number of buildings on a property
- ☐ Parking (e.g. too many vehicles on road right of way or cluttering front yards of private property)
- ☐ Demands on potable water supply (e.g. quantity of water being taken)
- ☐ Protection of drinking water supply (e.g. water quality /pollution concerns)
- ☐ Changes in drainage patterns / stormwater runoff
- ☐ Environmental impacts on watercourses (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, wetlands)
- ☐ Coastal areas risk (ocean) – e.g. flooding risk, shoreline erosion
- ☐ Watercourse hazards near lakes, streams, rivers (e.g. flood and erosion risks)
- ☐ Hazard steep slopes/risk of landslides (e.g. rock fall, debris slides, unstable development sites)
- ☐ Building safety and compliance with BC Building Code
- ☐ Unsightly premises
- ☐ Tax inequity (e.g. new construction not reflected in BC Assessment and taxation calculations, some property owners not paying their fair share of taxes)
- ☐ Other (Please explain) _____

8. What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?

- ☐ Existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use and avoid conflict (it's too much like the 'Wild West')
- ☐ Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed
- ☐ There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area
- ☐ Don't know, not sure
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

Let's Talk Land Use Survey

9. What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw (high level vision, general objectives and policies to guide land use and development)
- ☐ Zoning Bylaw (limited scope of zoning to manage land uses and number of dwellings to ensure compliance with OCP)
- ☐ Zoning Bylaw (wider scope of zoning to manage land uses, number of dwellings, maximum building size, height, lot coverage, and setbacks)
- ☐ Subdivision Regulation (standards for road building, septic, connection to drinking water systems, drainage and stormwater management)
- ☐ Building Bylaw (building permits and inspection of building construction to ensure compliance with BC Building Code)
- ☐ I do not support qathet Regional District adding new land use regulation in my Electoral Area
- ☐ I do not know
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

10. Do you have any other comments to share?

Is there anything else you would like qathet Regional District to know about future land use and development management? Any comments, questions, concerns?



Appendix F – Qualitative Responses for Electoral Areas A, B & C

Appendix F: Qualitative Responses for Electoral Areas A, B & C (Questions 7, 8, 9, 10)

Area A Qualitative Responses

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)

Other (please explain):

- Lack of input by regional district
- land parcel size; disregard for land covenants
- Controlled water run off
- Not having a proper scheme for docking my boat. We should have a
- Temporary dwellings ie trailers, canvas tents, etc
- Not sure yet. Just engaging in the processes.
- Noise control.
- Hazards of floods cutting off Area C from entering into town if Myrtle Rock/Hwy gets impassable due to water runoff. Area C will have a lack of food supply and medical needs.
- Density of lots on Savary - too much pressure on groundwater resources and not enough room for all the septic systems.
- Taxes are too high
- Burning regulations
- Unnecessary tree removal
- agricultural land owners putting up multiple rentals on their property and not using as farm use
- RCMP Services (availability),
- No ALR enforcement
- Lack of parkland
- beach access
- too many rich people exploiting the working class
- rising price of land and high fees and taxes, making ownership too hard for ordinary people
- Savary Island has a very fragile ecosystem that is at risk of being destroyed by development. Wanton tree removal is a specific concern.
- Un paved road
- storage of fuels on Savary Island
- Present and further access
- Too much bureaucracy/red tape/addition cost.
- Strata regulations
- Large cannabis grow operations with major odor impacts throughout neighborhood. Said to be for "medical" purposes, although impacted residents cannot confirm this through police, regional district or Health Canada. Regulations at municipal, provincial and federal levels need to be put in place to ensure that the health "needs" (they have alternative supply options) cannot outweigh the negative health and well-being impacts for dozens of residents in a large surrounding area (500 m or more). To say nothing of the other negative impacts to the

neighbourhood, including increased traffic, potential for criminal activity, increased risk for fires and likely loss of property values.

- No rules on Savary- clearcuts, buildings on crown land close to a fragile cliff, digging to find bedrock to build (there is none) , running a business with multiple yurts, delivering and serving food and drink- nit sure is there is food safe, shower on crown land on high bank causing erosion, garbage all over the front of the property, ? Sanitation- had pit toilets... I could go on!
- Neighbours are ignoring an archeological covenant
- Affordability is my main concern and the fact that people are allowed to buy and evict with no repercussion. We are losing housing and instead of putting in zoning that usually prevents affordable housing from going into place, the qRD should be putting in place a housing strategy for Area A
- The RD sticking it's nose in where it doesn't belong.
- housing affordability
- Zoning
- Vehicles too wide/heavy for rural sand dirt road. Erosion.
- Cutting down all or most of the trees on a property
- logging in residential neighborhoods
- This survey is vague and misleading. By checking a box I feel any information I provide will be misconstrued and manipulated to promote restrictions that are unwanted and will negatively affect the majority of qathet regional residents.
- No concerns
- possible waste storage, industrial use, building of a prison, just too much development, area should mainly stay like it is
- Potential noise
- industrial uses not compatible with residential, light industry, and business/other land uses
- Tax increases are my biggest problem
- No tax increases
- Lack of planning, oversight or advance warning for neighbours r/t development behind centennial. Lack of information regarding easement emergency vehicle road abutting our property.
- No cannibals farms within residential areas
- minimum lot size
- Seven of the eight noted priorities relate to climate change and planning forward for it. The limitation and list with a five word box is viewed as a design constraint - I'll send my related inputs by another means.
- There are too many land use and development restrictions in place by all levels of government. And the Regional District continues to put their nose into business that isn't theirs. (Ex: water and septic)
- Do not want changes
- Logging on private lands, increasing taxation because the current government seems to be on a spending spree
- Climate change impacts

- Once again there is no direct mention of environmental protection - creek and surrounds, "urban / community forest protection, groundwater protection. We cannot rely on DFO and the Province - totally underfunded and under staffed.
- destruction of natural habitat especially around creeks and ocean front.
- Proliferation of small or private water systems. Limited qRD operated utilities (ie sewer, water, fire, etc.)
- Lot size regulation (historical)
- Leave us alone out here.
- Don't need air B and B's in area or they should be regulated
- Aerial pesticide spray
- Don't charge us to bring up your tax income . That and the fire fighter thing how crooked are you
- Taking away the unique freedoms that we have always enjoyed.
- Tax inequity is due to no physical assessment in over 12 year. Now assessment are calculated on the outrageous prices people are willing to pay. Also, neither regional nor provincial care that private logging companies have created changes in drainage patterns/ storm water runoff.
- Ninnies
- Did you seriously list that first option? Why? But more importantly....Why are you spraying off Land Back tags but not actually even considering landback when allowing a proposed dump to become 28 homes? Who made that decision to give a park or give up giving land back? That's sadly neglecting everyone.
- Its no concern of others what I do on my property
- I do not currently have concerns. Things are fine as they are. No need for change.
- No concern, leave us alone.
- excessive tree removal
- I do not want Land Use Bylaws implemented in Area C.
- I am against any regulations concerning building codes or land use if you bring this in I will have to remove my shop and house cause it does not conform with your building codes but it is suitable for what I am doing this is why I bought out in this area so there are no codes to contend with and now all of a sudden you people want to regulate everyone
- Don't want building permits or building inspectors
- Don't change it
- No change needed
- In town I'd like to see vacant land used to build homes, apartments or mobiles. Get building
- no changes please
- High lot density and small lot size (on Savary) result in deforestation and overbuilding, with implications for ecological values, aquifer safety, and erosion problems.
- There are no checks and balances on development on Savary. We cannot assume that the island can sustain it - traffic, safety, noise, pollution, erosion are all a huge concern
- Lois Slim's property is a disaster.
- # of vehicles on Savary
- Climate Change Impacts
- Traffic and day trippers

- Dangerous trees on the road allowance
- my taxes went up 600% when the NDP got in and has gone up every year
- too many regulations
- The concerns listed above are well thought out and address many current issues but it would be great if future regulation could include tools for long-term preservation of the unique aspects that make Qathet a place of significance. This would include: Preserving night skies, wildlife habitat and green spaces, including parks. Preventing or reducing noise pollution. Preventing or reducing traffic hazards with regards to: Wildlife, existing infrastructure, pets and humans. These are key issues when viewed with an eye to mitigating climate change, protecting endangered species and native biodiversity. It takes five minutes to cut down a tree, 50 years for another to grow to an appreciable size. Can we do more to make development work around Qathet's natural gifts rather than viewing them as obstacles to profit?
- too many restrictions, bureaucracy and costs involved with doing any home improvements
- We would like to see the natural environment in this area protected as much as possible
- smell, noise disruption associated with marijuana growers in residential areas
- I don't think it matters if one is seasonal or a resident. We all pay the same taxes.
- over loggings
- Real Estate agents not forced to prove and inform all purchasers of actual lot boundaries and any infractions
- Abandoned vehicles incl large trucks and old travel trailers
- Condition of Southview Road surface, potholes and extreme dust, would like to see it paved
- fire risk due to logging
- building on high water mark for decks
- protection of properties designated in ALR
- Protection of coastal resources
- protection of riparian areas and increased parkland / preservation
- Foreshore protection and riparian protection
- The OCP is 10 years old. If you want regulations, update the OCP.
- We need land use bylaws - zoning to protect the uniqueness of Savary Island.
- Too many cars and trucks, worry about water table and excess water use, too many trees are being taken down which could cause heavy sand erosion particularly on sand cliffs
- Forcing building permit and regulations on owners
- Noise by law enforced
- These concerns truly seem a little too late. Where were all these questions when you allowed all the Cannabis Grow Operations to take over the 2 mile strip of Padgett Rd. You made "No" efforts to control all these environmental strains on our lands. Now Qathet Regional District wants to control how we as established homeowners use our land! Come on--not much thought stopping the Cannabis Grow Operations to erect massive structures!!
- Preservation of Stillwater bluffs as parkland
- I am concerned with increased regulation. I chose to purchase here because of having no zoning! This freedom is much of the charm and uniqueness of the region.
- potential noise and odour pollution

- People building new and multiple cabins on their existing property without permits for water and sewage
- Leave things as they are
- effects on air quality
- The increase of local government rules and expenditure.
- Road safety
- Holding developers accountable for how they manage their activities, including misuse of road allowances, dust suppression, noise, hours of operation. Residents have little recourse in the face of abuses.
- Clearcutting and creating wind channels
- extreme wildfire risk and other climate change risks
- Derelict vehicles
- Stop spraying land back off the road and signs when you figure out what it means
- Old wood stoves still in use
- Is Savary Island sustainable with over 1500 parcels?
- do not want any form of zoning
- FOREIGN BUYERS!!
- Go away
- Love living South of town, have pretty much my life, do not want to see smaller parcels implemented, do not want to see a whole bunch of rules and regulations, we live out there for a reason. Privacy, and being left alone.
- nobody enforces what's been in place
- Do not want Bylaws
- What water? Well goes dry by June. We need a community water system. We do not need taxes to go any higher. So easy to assume that regulations will be beneficial, however, all that happens is more staff to push papers!
- Waterfront taxes are way too high - we are hit far too hard on any increases
- Over regulation is a major problem within many jurisdictions! Less bureaucratic involvement would be favoured.

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?

Other (please explain):

- Infrastructure needs to improve before future development can be considered
- The concerns I have could be addressed by existing rules if they were actually enforced but unfortunately they aren't. Illegal septic tanks and no enforcement of ALR rules
- It is great the way it is!
- Needs simplification and common sense applied to each situation rather than a one-size-fits-all set of rules
- In general I'm grateful to live in a region that is not over regulated and do not wish for most of the forms of regulation being offered. But after attending the meeting it seemed clear that perhaps the majority of our community would support a bylaw preventing large scale industrial projects that would have a negative impact on the local watersheds. ie. the previously proposed Wood waste land fill site or any project of that scale.

- clear cut logging
- The development of Jacks Boat Yard was very painful to locals (blasting, crushing for an extended period. Residents had to move away because of the noise level. Now there is open burning and much pollution of harmful paint particles going into the soils and air, not being carefully collected. This type of development is best located in a non-residential area and should be far more stringently regulated.
- The Wild West reference disinclines me to selecting option 1. Please. Many people moved and stayed here because they did not want regulation, and have consistently tried to bring that perspective to similar consultations on area land use. Change is definitely needed, but not only with the existing level of regulation - with the nature of regulation and what's prioritized for protection. An ecosystem based approach, more protection for remaining intact ecosystems and biodiversity, continuing and more education and advocacy about how "the community" can effectively manage to sustain the values that matter to it. As was noted at the public meeting, area specificity is already a characteristic of the region. Uphold it.
- some regulation would be an improvement
- Poor, gave a 3 acre park to not Tla'amin the rightful stewards of this land, to a guy who tricked you into wanting a dump. 28 new houses at Sarah point instead of land back? For 100k who makes these ignorant decisions. Everyone wanted a park there you ignorant privileged fucks. Everyone meaning all businesses, tourism, tourists, locals, it was the literal end of the road that just got fixed and it in good condition (all the way past bliss landing) why are u so greedy and unable to make accurate access nets of land use?
- Excessive money grab taxes in recent years. Do not reflect needs of this community.
- Don't want to change from current status

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)

Other (please explain):

- can not support QRD adding new land use regulation until confident that there is a holistic approach to how the OCP develops. For example, if I am subject to building permit fees or need to go through a costly rezoning or development application, does that money go into coffers to build water and sewer to my property? Has QRD planned how to build tax base to deliver infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, sidewalk, lighting, etc...) not interested in process, fees and regulation if QRD has not planned to take over everything. not interested in cost and headache if you can't tell me when you will be expanding good quality water and sewer to my street. need confidence of holistic long term growth. you need to give me improvements for my money.
- Think about it
- Existing authorities having jurisdiction are sufficient if not already over reaching
- Don't let builders or contractors influence the process. We need objectivity not vested interests
- Local government seems eager to protect the quality of life for some areas and allow total disrespect for others.
- clean drinking water in Lund please as well as public toilets
- I would only consider supporting a ban on large scale industrial projects, as above
- My only real concern is population density along
- bylaws must be enforceable

- A visionary strategy that integrates reconciliation with First Nations, a zoning bylaw that is entirely focused on implementation of the OCP, more education on how regional district level options are shaped and defined by higher levels of government and "the givens", respect for the Area A desire for autonomy, with limits that promote ecological and cultural/heritage values and climate change mediation.
- ass to land for agricultural purposes
- Land back retards.
- Stick to your little Village, and stop reaching out beyond. Stop taxing us under to cover your dreams of grandeur. Stay away you sick puppets.

Q10: Do you have any other comments to share?

- No
- Poorly worded questionnaire. There is a cost to regulations and this was not addressed adequately.
- Stop wasting our money with these studies and surveys, you know we don't want more regulation, take no for an answer and leave us alone.
- paper copy
- there are other ways to manage land and mitigate conflict; bylaws, zoning, compliance enforcement, etc., are expensive and seem to serve bureaucrats but not the people living here
- I am concerned with increased regulation. I chose to purchase here because of having no zoning! This freedom is much of the charm and uniqueness of the region.
- The reason I love my area is there is none of this here.
- development management needs to include Transportation, infrastructure strategies to match growth in OCP. Has there been any financial work how to turn bylaw fees to expanded and improved water, sewer to all properties, road standards, etc.,
- Think about it
- Waterfront anchorage,
- No more regulation! The OCP is enough. Definitely no zoning or building bylaws.
- I only support building codes, permits, and regulations on public buildings and businesses.
- We have a wonderfully unique area where the dream of a self sufficient homesteader lifestyle is more possible for capable people. The problems due to lack of regulation aren't great enough to justify any major changes in my opinion. One of my main concerns is the ever increasing tax burden on homeowners and further regulatory costs will add to the problem. If its not broken don't fix it. Savary Islands subdivision was a mistake made long ago which has detracted from its potential but that is not the normal situation in area A
- Current status of land use regulation is adequate. There are very few conflicts in area A and those that have occurred have been dealt with the same way for many years successfully. Most longer term residents that we know do not desire increased regulation or costs associated. As in other areas it appears that newer and wealthier residents have a "nimby" attitude.
- Us who buy and rent outside the municipality do so for a reason. We like to do things that we want. It's our land and our decision if we want other housing, sheds, shops. We should not be told what we can do with our land. That is why we buy outside the municipality.
- It is imperative that considerations are made to current state of infrastructure in Area 'A' ie; Lund water system does not meet current health and safety standards or can provide enough

water to support future development with current state of infrastructure, current state of highway and road accesses (drainage) unavailability of family /child and youth services.

- I am concerned about the weight of new development on the water supply.
- In the case of conflict I would like to see the rd being an informer and mediator rather than an enforcer of rules regulations. I.e. in the case of that toxic waste dump on Shara point rd I would have liked to see the rd informing us, the residents, and offering input on that question. In case of a smaller, neighborhood problem (i.e. if somebody can run a saw shop and when) only the affected neighborhood could get involved. In short I like to have a dialog.
- Regional District should focus all energies on slowing climate change.
- Qathet Regional district is building an ever-growing internal money spending structure offering no real services for good tax dollars.
- Start utilizing all the logs shipped out of our resource area via secondary manufacturing. If you're all wanting something to do ?
- Bringing more regulation into area A will change the character of the area and hamper the affordability to young families. One of the best features of the area is the ability to slowly build a house or renovate an older structure as it can be afforded. I believe further regulation will make the area a place for the rich, retired, and out of town buyers only. This impacts the future of the area from being affordable and attracting small businesses, farms, and self sufficient living. I value this aspect the most!
- With the increase of land use management comes increase taxation and a larger regional government. I do not support this. I also would like to have better communication regarding upcoming important meetings regarding such topics.
- no
- OCP should cover any density or land use restrictions.
- No additional rules and regulations are needed
- Leave things be
- Zoning bylaws are known to reduce access to affordable housing by restricting what is possible. It is unconscionable to add restrictive bylaws during a housing crisis. We do not need to do something because everyone else is doing it. This does not breed innovation, and we should really allow ourselves to be nimble and creative. No new bylaws.
- There is very limited development in this area now. I would be ok to have this revisited in 5 years but not before
- paper copy
- I do not support, and have not met anyone in my area who does support, introducing building codes or new zoning in the Lund area. Most houses in Lund are not compliant with current building codes, having been built by homeowners decades ago, and forcing residents to comply with new building codes would leave many older folks financially unable to maintain their homes. I do not think that this area needs any more regulation, we are getting along just fine without it. .
- Patrick Brabazon does not represent area A interests. We do not want further regulation.
- Water system in Lund needs to be taken over by the RD to allow for appropriate funding and operation.
- A new Lund area A regional district should be developed in order to make decisions appropriate to the locals who live here

- All of the places where the issues brought forward are being handled by their regional districts these conflicts and problems exist more than they do here. These regulations do not help or serve the interest of people living in the areas whatsoever. Please do not do this. Thank you.
- Very one sided questionnaire, misleading. We do not want changes thank you.
- There are no problems with the way it is currently working. Please do not change a thing.
- Lund water demand and infrastructure
- No
- Limit land development and building in Lund area, The water system is already inadequate in the summer months.
- Focus on food security, rebuilding salmon, herring and clam stocks. Remove the Theodosia dam asap. In the 60s up to 250,000 salmon returned each year, now perhaps 1 or 2%... this is a travesty and ecological nightmare. And all so some lawyers in Toronto can keep raking in the profits. This may seem unrelated but it's all part of the same social and economic system, and is fundamental to long term well-being in my opinion. Finally, let's focus on "brownfield" development rather than "greenfield". Plenty of wasted industrial land around to restore.
- Stop making government bigger! Stop More government involvement, as this means creating more rules that leads to hiring more staff that leads to higher taxes for No additional values to the community. Another attempt at a money grab, that will stifle innovation & design for future opportunities. This will ultimately limit the opportunities for young adults and families to live & own property in our communities.
- What has been not mentioned is the history of Lund volunteerism ..the community comes together and builds without big brother government. For example the donation of land for our fireball ..we don't need any zoning.
- Keep air b and b's out of our area. There is now one next door to me and it is noisy and there is a second one just down the road. Regulate the air b and b's
- Everything is fine the way it is
- Can anyone help figure out the Lund/Savary parking , no public washrooms & trash collection out here!!
- How much has this cost? My taxes are already too high we pay \$1,000 a year just to qRD for what, just dumb useless studies to create more tax grab. I am very concerned about a appointed director being the chairman of the financial committee. I think it is unethical for him to hold that position when he holds the same position in the city of Powell River. Since the chairman thinks that is okay, why should I trust anything that the district does. Totally pissed off!
- How much is this costing the taxpayers? Which directors voted for it? Whose idea was it to bring this up again?
- No no no
- The reason we own land in RD is because of the lack of bylaws and land use designation. It gives us the freedom to do what is needed on our land to grow food and raise livestock without issue of inspections and applications.
- I do not support any new land use regulations or by-laws.
- I have environmental concerns for industrial land use without regulations. I don't want to see toxic waste dumped or created that can impact the marine & land wildlife. If specific bylaws can stop this I am all for them.

- There are many existing bylaws in place to date. Provincial, Federal, ALR, Insurance .Taxes are way to high for what we are ing for ,and now to add bylaws then enforcement
- I'm concerned about any new bylaws coming into this area when they are not necessary.
- 1- make sure there is adequate fresh water before expanding the population 2- develop local food production on appropriate land
- No new rules or codes
- The regional district has a unique opportunity to develop guidelines for Tiny Homes on Wheels use. THOWs fill a much needed niche in housing, encompassing a demographic that can not afford to buy residential real estate or even vacant land, but can afford the investment required to own their own HOME. Currently, building bureaucracies cannot seem to work outside of their "box" when it comes to these innovative solutions to our housing crisis. I would like to see the qRD become leaders and innovators in this area
- I would like to see some forward motion in accepting Tiny Homes On Wheels (THOWS) as a viable option for housing in this time of severe housing shortages.
- Less government intervention and cash grab would get my support.
- Tiny homes are mobile homes too easy to put a lot of residents on small acreage
- Lund has no opportunity to grow.....all land is owned
- Information and discussions of such magnitude need to be more widely distributed and for a longer periods of time, as they have extensive and long lasting impacts on the communities involved.
- I am happy with the way the community is and I do not see the need for more regulations. Upon purchasing my home, this was one of the draws
- The official community plan states that changes mage to qathet properties will not disrupt neighbourhoods but plans for a new community centre will make this impossible. We feel bullied as we did when the clam processing plant in Lund was supported by local government.
- If the regional district is serious about tourism in the region, it needs to put some money into supporting the infrastructure for that. For example, access to toilets, access to clean water, access to adequate public parking.
- My concern is not so much with individuals, but the current RD. I find this group petty and out of touch. To see certain members brow beat into submission and spending beyond reason horrifies me. Time for certain members to retire especially when they don't live in the region they serve
- You didn't even advertise that there was a meeting, no one heard about it. Don't do this, just leave us alone.
- Don't do it
- Go away
- In regards to the industrial wood waste landfill site or any other such proposal in our region. Since at the moment the OCP has no clout and it may take a long time for any amendments or bylaws to be implemented, I would suggest that in the mean time of such project comes to the awareness of the qRD whether that be to staff or the board, that a community feedback loop should be in place so that community can take grassroots action, in a well informed way without having to find out last minute or after the fact, as that is clearly the messy way to handle such a situation. In general I was very proud of our community response and heartened by the effectiveness, but it could have been clearer it we had the facts earlier. I would suggest a email to the Lund Community Society as a communication channel, The LCS has contacts all through

the community, information can be shared quickly and transparently. My only other topic of concern is the annual parking disaster in Lund proper, I don't think this needs a bylaw, it just needs a solution, Either an expansion of the shoulders of the highway so the cars can actually get off the road or a parking lot(s) with a shuttle to the harbour, maybe even one from existing parking in Powell River. Proper public transit to and from Powell River is so needed there are so many of us commuting back and forth every day, with climate change and the price of gas people would use it if it was a schedule that worked for real life

- I am firmly against bringing permits and inspection in for buildings and properties. Code already exists and adding red tape is not going to benefit property owners it's just making work and money for bureaucrats. Control over industry that has negative environmental impacts concerns me but otherwise I am firmly against adding bylaws.
- Please leave as is...we live rural because this what we want
- My greatest concern is the destruction of nature
- This would make sense in Lund at the tourist areas but that's it. Leave everything else alone, this is going to be a huge mistake. People move out here to not have to deal with this. Don't "fix" what's not broken.
- There does not need to be regulation. People move outside of the city limits for a reason. All you're going to receive is hate from angry home owners. Dumb idea.
- Please leave us alone. That is why we moved out here. For peace and solitude.
- Thank you for the community consultation on this important issue.
- I am concerned about the deterioration of the road surface of Malaspina Road - it looks like one side of the road has been used by a heavy duty vehicle coming up from the Okeover
- With more people moving into the qathet district, I feel that adopting Zoning and Subdivision bylaws will help ensure order and safety as our region continues to grow. Right now it feels like the 'wild west' where anything goes, especially in Area A. The only way to ensure that future development is done responsibly and strategically is to adopt tools that allow for more oversight and enforcement.
- paper copy
- Keep out.
- A noise bylaw would be nice and definitely need a ban on fireworks.
- There are bylaws in the area A OCP but my neighbours refuse to comply with any of them.
- No thank you.
- paper copy
- Yes. I hate these small boxes where I can't see the connected points I'm trying to share. I'll send my "other comments" in an email. Thank you for considering them.
- Speeding on highway north of Powell River to Lund....drivers unaware speed limit is 60 k. Many hidden driveways, narrow highway, etc.
- No
- paper copy: No, not at this time. Thank you for the meeting on Wednesday Nov 17th
- It's all good like it is. Thank you
- More transparency is needed with planning all future land usage and building development in Area A. For many decades, most land use topics have been exempt from any real range of vision, insight or understanding by Area A residents. We need to build our structures, develop good

land stewardship practices and enact rules (for people who do not follow the rules) responsibly for the foreseeable future with solid 'Land Use' deliverables. More than anything, Area A should ensure that there is a level playing field for land use being observed by all.

- I like how it is now. Only limited development, no industrial use, no waste storage, protection of nature, no change to protected areas
- Qrd needs to assess the greater Lund Area's aquifers to see what kind of growth and development this area can even sustain.
- Preserving clean nature and ecosystems should be paramount. It's the most valuable asset of qathet and ensuring sustainable growth and regulating responsible development and environmental stewardship should be the top priority.
- protection for old growth or large second growth trees should be considered
- I would like to see land made available to young families, especially but not exclusively for food production
- Lund is the last frontier where a person can still afford to buy land and build without paying tens of thousands of dollars for permits, inspections and bureaucracy, ie taxes. There has not to my knowledge been disputes of land use in my neighborhood. Disagreements have been addressed in person, neighbour to neighbour, without policy, government and fees. I believe people inherently want to get along and care for the environment. If it ain't broke don't try to fix it.
- Figure it out shit heads
- paper copy: No Building Code! My brother sat on Cnd. National Building code committee for 10 years - he helps to write ventilation code for BC still - don't bring it into Area A.
- paper copy: We already have codes in place to govern water use and disposal, to govern Hydro-installs, waste disposal and watershed use. That's enough.
- paper copy: There is enough government regulation on Building (electrical power permits, sewer permits)
- paper copy: No new land use regulations
- To be blunt, I basically don't want qathet Regional District to "manage" land use and development in district A. Now that is not entirely avoidable I realize but more bureaucracy will destroy Lund's character in my opinion. There is nothing broken here that needs fixing or changing in terms of regulation. Our unique composition, environmental, geographic, social and civic density factors, are the envy of other districts and need to be preserved.
- The use of BC building code, septic, electrical, road access, etc as it stands today. Works well here for us that live here, those of new arrival that want the city here should go back to it.
- Did not receive any info about this whole thing so didn't attend the meeting. Just heard about this by chance from a South of Town friend. Very poor communication
- Leave the land use as it is !
- Maintain your dirt roads better that 2 or 3 times a year. The increasing rains are degrading our main property access. Increased dust suppression in summer months is also a need. We need yearly updates on the completion schedule in paying off the new fire hall. This will build confidence as to the direction of our taxes, and that they are not being gouged beyond their agreed duration.
- I would like the RD to leave things alone and quit trying to race the city and other on getting as big as possible
- fix the roads

Area B Qualitative Responses

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)

Other (please explain):

- No concerns
- There are too many land use and development restrictions in place by all levels of government. And the Regional District continues to put their nose into business that isn't theirs. (Ex: water and septic)
- no changes please
- Lack of parkland
- The OCP is 10 years old. If you want regulations, update the OCP.
- Forcing building permit and regulations on owners
- Love living South of town, have pretty much my life, do not want to see smaller parcels implemented, do not want to see a whole bunch of rules and regulations, we live out there for a reason. Privacy, and being left alone.
- Burning regulations
- Lack of planning, oversight or advance warning for neighbours r/t development behind centennial. Lack of information regarding easement emergency vehicle road abutting our property.
- No cannibals farms within residential areas
- Don't charge us to bring up your tax income . That and the fire fighter thing how crooked are you
- Old wood stoves still in use
- Neighbours are ignoring an archeological covenant
- Un paved road
- The concerns listed above are well thought out and address many current issues but it would be great if future regulation could include tools for long-term preservation of the unique aspects that make qathet a place of significance. This would include: Preserving night skies, wildlife habitat and green spaces, including parks. Preventing or reducing noise pollution. Preventing or reducing traffic hazards with regards to: Wildlife, existing infrastructure, pets and humans. These are key issues when viewed with an eye to mitigating climate change, protecting endangered species and native biodiversity. It takes five minutes to cut down a tree, 50 years for another to grow to an appreciable size. Can we do more to make development work around qathet's natural gifts rather than viewing them as obstacles to profit?
- We would like to see the natural environment in this area protected as much as possible
- Holding developers accountable for how they manage their activities, including misuse of road allowances, dust suppression, noise, hours of operation. Residents have little recourse in the face of abuses.
- No ALR enforcement
- These concerns truly seem a little too late. Where were all these questions when you allowed all the Cannabis Grow Operations to take over the 2 mile strip of Padgett Rd. You made "No" efforts to control all these environmental strains on our lands. Now Qathet Regional District

wants to control how we as established homeowners use our land! Come on--not much thought stopping the Cannabis Grow Operations to erect massive structures!!

- Its no concern of others what I do on my property

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?

Other (please explain):

- RESIDENTIAL IS RESIDENTIAL ONLY ALR IS ALR ONLY. NEW DEVELOPMENT STRICTLY REGULATED.LY
- It isn't the wild west. That statement is 100% false
- minimal interference, should restrict how many grow ops should be in Powell River, attracts unsavory activities and the smell of pot is everywhere.
- Local government cannot run unbiased
- Building Code needs to be enforced but that's about it.
- There is no enforcement of current regulations; until the rules have consequences there is no point in adding more.
- I'm fine with how it is
- Existing level of regulation is focused on preventing conflicts between humans, which is important, but that leaves aside conflicts between humans and the environment. At the heart of all this are the conflicts which arise between those who wish to live on their land as is and those who wish to profit from the land, sometimes when not living on it. A compromise between those two positions needs to be found through appropriate regulations. People need to earn a living today but qathet's gifts should be preserved forever. Striking the balance between these two sometimes conflicting issues is key.
- Inconsistent enforcement
- Definite zoning, adherence to farming/ALR designation; limiting residences re septic/wells
- I think you should regulate where the obvious strains are on lands in our area. For our particular area B it is definitely the amount of Cannabis Grow Operations you allowed to open. I hope resources are going into managing these operations.
- Main concern is lack of regulations along shoreline

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)

Other (please explain):

- Don't do anything
- The Area B OCP vision statement is "Area "B" is dedicated to a sustainable rural lifestyle where residents can enjoy the natural environment while encouraging thoughtful economic development and protecting agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands and resources." Please note that it says "encouraging". It does not say "enforces" or "requires". I am fine with a guiding document encouraging sustainability. So I have no issues with the OCP. But bringing in further requirements into Area B would not be consistent with the Area B OCP Vision statement.
- set aside land for park use
- Just protection of water, do not need setbacks, size restrictions etc... we choose to live out here versus the municipality for the freedom to enjoy our property.

- Regulate burning with stronger bylaws
- Everything is already covered
- More recognition of archeological covenants. Presently there's no accountability to uphold archeological land use covenants
- You guys can't handle what you have
- Zoning bylaws to include minimum amounts of greenspace in the Electoral area; minimum amounts of tree cover that must be left standing on any given property, higher fines for habitat destruction - either on site or downstream. Current fines are viewed simply as a cost of doing business, not a deterrent.
- There needs to be more coordination between the qrd and MOTI. Developers commandeer public ROWs and nobody notices or cares unless a big stink is made. Why are they free to ignore the law? Furthermore, who decides where roads are to be put for purposes of subdivision? Boundary road, Penticton and Yaroshuk were all put in at owners expense and then allowed to go to waste. Useless and placed where they give no benefit to the one subdividing.
- Environmental Protection By laws for water, river, and habitat
- Subdivision regs is that not already in place when people buy in a rural area and you don't like what your surroundings look like don't buy we don't need the conflicts
- Limited building bylaw that does not inhibit emerging and alternative sustainable/green building practices and affordable home building/renovation.

Q10: Do you have any other comments to share?

- This is criminal what you are doing. This should be put to a referendum
- This should be a referendum at election time. You know 90% of the people don't want it
- Step into my office. You're fired
- No
- The treatment of the rural community by this Regional District has been appalling. It seems like every couple of years the rd is spending more money on studies to ask the community for more regulations. The rd is acting like a horny teenager on prom night. No means NO. Don't tell me "just the tip"
- no
- I would like to see the qRD replace their planner.
- No
- I don't like people who move in and want to change it into a bunch of city rules . if you want that move to the city . here we go again. maybe it's time to change our leadership to some one that understands who we really are and stop catering to new people that don't check out where there buying land and want to change our way of life that we enjoy. yes we seam backwards to you but we like it. it looks like we need new leadership if this stuff is starting over again. .
- Really no concerns and have had no issues with folks in the RD for over 30 years.
- I feel the regulations that are in place are more than adequate and the need for more government over reaching is not wanted or needed.
- It seems to me that without bylaws to implement our OCP, it is a hollow document. It may save tax money to have clear regulations that support the OCP, then planners don't have to waste time cajoling people to abide by the OCP.

- I am concerned that there seems to be no long term plan to establish non road rights of way ie a trail system. This could be linked into land set -aside for parks and recreation
- NEW DEVELOPMENT CLOSELY REGULATED
- Have land here for lower taxes and certain freedoms, I do not develop or build without code and land use compliance, and don't need anyone telling me how to do it for a fee.
- We would like to keep our area as it is without the added cost of more regulations, infrastructure and higher taxes.
- Update the OCP, and ask us then. You're not telling the whole story. Most people don't even know what is in the OCP or what it does.
- We want to keep our rural life, hence we do not live in town. Water protection is something we should have more protection on, if an industrial property comes in or business, the properties surrounding should have their water protected and informed before so they can have input.
Thank you for the survey
- I would like to suggest noise bylaws for the area. Building codes, density planning (no more trailer parks)
- Love the bridge access connecting Myrtle Rocks to Myrtle Creek Estates. How can we improve access between Maris Rd and Padgett Rd.
- no
- I'm concerned with a lack of down the line planning. Permits for clear cuts but nothing about roads or water quality or storm runoff of any kind. If you permit one then you have to plan for the rest.
- It's time for zoning!!!!
- With recent land development behind centennial there was not proper drainage installed, resulting in flooding of several homes that are along side of the development. This is partially due to an unnecessary access lane being put there. It should have been placed along the top of new development.
- Ministry of Transportation should pay more attention on the access points where these recent land developments intersect the main access roads. The road access north bound for both Maris road and Hamill hill estates will force vehicles to cross over into the on-coming traffic.
- be more upfront and do study to see how proposed housing impacts water supply
- Concerned about eroding alt areas
- Nothing else
- We do not wish any further regulations with regard to land use and building bylaws.
- many land owners are doing what they want in the ALR because they think the laws don't apply to them, or if they damage stream bearing creeks.(Ron Radon's trailer park area).
- Leave as is. Not time to change.
- paper copy
- We need to promote building not restricting making it more expensive.
- We need a vote to pass zoning
- We need a vote
- I would like things to stay as they are thank you .
- The way you're going about this is so wrong

- The demand to live in this area is only going to grow. I would like to see some careful provision to regulate 'in-law' suites, carriage houses, etc. I think we need more housing, and more variety in housing, but I think we need some regulations to make sure it takes into consideration the sustainability of all resources.
- First Nations sites are not being protected!
- I am happy with homeowners and landowners making decisions on their own land
- Keep everything the same
- Biggest concern is the lack of side road and highway mowing and drainage ditch maintenance. This affects visibility and biking and walking.
- Why do we not start with a zoning bylaw and see where we go from there
- I don't understand the point of taxation inequity in question 7. The BC taxation authority sets the tax rate province wide, new construction is already taxed higher. This higher taxation rate also extends to a higher rate of taxes set for the recreation centre.
- Zoning is long overdue. Having the OCP with no teeth is not effective.
- I do not want more taxation. I say no to all of it. If people don't like rural living they can move to town.
- We need more development to lower housing cost
- Concern - this survey does not provide an accurate picture of what the general electoral base would like due to limited participation, and should not be used to initiate further actions. Most people that are not concerned with the current situation will not complete this survey or attend the open houses. Concerned people can fill out multiple surveys if they want to warping the data. The only way to get a true reflection of what the majority of people want is to include an unbiased referendum question as part of a future election. Prior to this referendum, voters would need to be provided with additional information that include a full costing of proposed changes. I have additional concerns regarding unsustainable increases in the size and cost of our regional district's staff. Using Financials off the website, Other Employee Costs have gone from \$1,032,324 in 2012 to \$2,243,783 in 2020 which is an increase of 117%. This unsustainable cost increase happened at a time when the majority of our electoral areas do not have zoning or bylaws, which if brought in - would only exasperate future cost increases. Please just stop pushing for zoning and bylaws when the majority of our population doesn't want them.
- I can not afford for my taxes to go up. Leave things as they are.
- Leave as is.
- I don't like where this is going we choose to live out south for a reason . Keep the city bs in the town . Leave us out here alone . How much more control and money do you need . How many other crooked deals will be made out here if our regs change. Keep out of here and stay in the city . Keep your big wig bs to yourself . If we become part of the city are you putting in sewage and water lines ? Probably not so how about you just stay out of Powell River south not qathet . What kind of name is that anyway . I'm native and this town makes no god dam sense . Need a new mayor, need better representatives . How much more money is enough . How many more big screens do you need in city hall. How many more renovations are you doing there . How much more money can you waste. Stay outa out south, I'm pretty sure every person that has lived out here for 20 plus years feels the same . Just get lost will ya
- Land use is fine just the way it is
- Please leave our qathet district the way it is, I don't want any more regulations and taxes!

- I chose to buy property in the RD specifically because I DO NOT want many regulations and bylaws governing my private property decisions. I do not want to pay taxes for regulations, street lights, water and septic systems. I DO NOT SUPPORT any changes. If people are complaining to the RD office about what others are doing in the RD, and the fact that there isn't any bylaws or enforcement to stop it, ask them "WHY DID THEY BUY PROPERTY In A RD? You have to take the good with the bad if you choose to buy property in the RD. MOVE if you want more bylaws to protect you from others. Also, do NOT permit the few to govern the many. If any changes are requested it needs to go to referendum.
- Board seems to spend and spend. Far too much money being spent. Taxes have increased every year and I now pay triple from just a few years ago.
- No
- Development, considered part of the housing crisis solution, is a concern because development contributed to the current housing crisis which was, in part, created by qathet being a place where people want to live, not where they need to live. Covid made qathet more attractive. Additionally, there is now a societal mobility that did not exist 20 years ago. Leaving central Canada for coastal BC used to be akin to saying one was moving to Jupiter. It was not done. But the internet, cheap airfare and higher incomes (for some) facilitate living in qathet while regularly flying out for work or family. This mobility indicates that more houses will not equal more affordable houses, it will equal more humans living in increasingly expensive homes. More humans further impacts the rural electoral areas with urbanization and commercialization by those for whom cost is of little object, not to mention the climate impact of fewer trees, more cars and more flights in and out of qathet. This then impacts people already living here, particularly those for whom cost is an object. I have no idea what the solution is but I do know that at the heart of this issue is influx, driven by qathet being "discovered" and the profit to be made by those capitalizing on the electoral area's relatively cheap land and taxes, our lack of regulations and our desire to build more housing in an effort, of the best intentions, to make housing more affordable. This track has been pursued in many BC municipalities and yet house prices continue to climb to absurd levels. It's not unlike the claims in large cities that building more roads will equal less traffic. That's never worked out either. As such, could the electoral areas not look into long-term regulations similar to that found within the UK's Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty? In areas where development must work around the landscape's natural features and where maximum subdivision is prevented, house prices are often lower than places where clearcutting, bulldozing and tiny lots are allowed to make room for as many houses as possible. It's almost impossible to come up with a quick solution. But if we rush for a quick solution, it's likely the only ones to truly suffer will be the climate, wildlife, native biodiversity and those who can no longer afford to live here.
- There are many beautiful aspects to our electoral areas and we hope they can be preserved and not destroyed in the name of development.
- Why does the RD want to control stuff that the Province already has control over. Is this just a way to try to justify the over staffing and spending by the RD?
- paper copy
- paper copy
- No

- We all recognize that change is inevitable. When deciding what to change and where, local residents need some protection from those who would wantonly disturb the peace of the neighborhood. Better supervision is needed.
- Don't take away opportunity for young families and entrepreneurs by increasing taxes and preventing affordable development
- Thanks for the opportunity. Without more bylaws the RD has little influence on how future development occurs.
- Where are the property owners that do not live in AB or C ?
- Multiple residences on ALR. 20 years ago approx. I understood the RD signed a contract of enforce for ALR land. If such an agreement does no longer exist then the RD should petition ALRC to enforce. Planning wants food growing/sustainability yet ALR land being used for businesses/multiple residents.
- no
- No further regulations are needed, this is why we choose to live rurally.
- I would like to see Tla'amin Nation engaged in land use for Area B and enhance Land Education for this area. I would also like to see action moving forward for bylaws in Area B post the public engagement process.
- I strongly support adopting zoning bylaws to regulate land use and number of homes on a lot. I am concerned that an attempt to bring in building bylaws that lead to further inspections etc will receive such strong opposition that even the zoning bylaws could fail to move forward. Change is happening here, and if we don't implement so level of control (land use regulation) I fear the results could be really negative for residents and the environment.
- We need to encourage building
- We don't need regulations we have enough
- Happy with land as is. Lots of area for my dog to run and want to keep it that way.
- We have a housing crisis. We don't need our neighbours complaining about what or how we manage our property. Money spent on building permits or inspections would be better utilized building green (solar panels, quality windows, insul, etc.) I have lived in another regional district up north for 30 years with zoning regs it does not work. It is a tool for a chosen few that want control to their benefit. Not all of us have sold a home in the city and some here with full pockets and want to change the rural lifestyle. We look after our own water & sewage. When the well runs dry we don't run to our politicians. We deal with it.
- We don't need more regulations
- Money spend better elsewhere
- Are people's complaints justified or plain jealousy? It seems jealousy overrides justice.
- The provincial govt. already regulates enough of the safety issues and a further level of bureaucracy is not needed. Restrictive or exclusionary zoning has contributed to the homeless problem most area in Canada now have. I have a concern that this survey talks about 'community feedback' implying that if you are not living or working in the community your opinion is not required - what about property owners that live elsewhere in the world. I was surprised that in the list it refers to employees but if you are simply a property owner you would have to write that in 'other'. Shouldn't they have been near the top of the list. They are the ones who pay the taxes that fund our regional district.

- Thank you for undertaking this very important and no doubt contentious process. There need to be mechanisms to ensure OCP objectives are being met and to address conflicts.
- I would like to know how often you look into the disposal of highly fertilized soils from cannabis grow operations? who specifically over sees this? who samples the water from the Myrtle Creek that runs through Paradise Valley to make sure our waters ways are not being polluted by chemicals? To make a difference everyone needs to do their part!
- Envy of neighbors is never good reason for more regulations and government
- Leave it as it is. Property owners have to have the right to decide what is the best for them, not neighbours or the government
- Just want full transparency with any thoughts they have. My concerns lie mainly with the shoreline and use of our forested areas.
- Make no changes
- Leave as is keep taxes down
- My concern is how this Survey is being conducted

Area C Qualitative responses

Q7: At this time, what changes in land use and development are a concern for you in your neighbourhood / area? (check all that apply)

Other (please explain):

- destruction of natural habitat especially around creeks and ocean front.
- Leave thing as they are
- Tax increases are my biggest problem
- my taxes went up 600% when the NDP got in and has gone up every year
- Do not want changes
- Hazards of floods cutting off Area C from entering into town if Myrtle Rock/Hwy gets impassable due to water runoff. Area C will have a lack of food supply and medical needs.
- What water? Well goes dry by June. We need a community water system. We do not need taxes to go any higher. So easy to assume that regulations will be beneficial, however, all that happens is more staff to push papers!
- Waterfront taxes are way too high - we are hit far too hard on any increases
- Do not want Bylaws
- Taking away the unique freedoms that we have always enjoyed.
- Noise by law enforced
- Taxes are too high
- No tax increases
- I do not want Land Use Bylaws implemented in Area C.
- Don't want building permits or building inspectors
- Over regulation is a major problem within many jurisdictions! Less bureaucratic involvement would be favoured.
- Zoning
- Large cannabis grow operations with major odor impacts throughout neighborhood. Said to be for "medical" purposes, although impacted residents cannot confirm this through police, regional district or Health Canada. Regulations at municipal, provincial and federal levels need to be put in place to ensure that the health "needs" (they have alternative supply options) cannot outweigh the negative health and well-being impacts for dozens of residents in a large surrounding area (500 m or more). To say nothing of the other negative impacts to the neighbourhood, including increased traffic, potential for criminal activity, increased risk for fires and likely loss of property values.
- Controlled water run off
- Once again there is no direct mention of environmental protection - creek and surrounds, "urban / community forest protection, groundwater protection. We cannot rely on DFO and the Province - totally underfunded and under staffed.
- Leave us alone out here.
- The RD sticking it's nose in where it doesn't belong.
- protection of riparian areas and increased parkland / preservation
- Foreshore protection and riparian protection
- beach access

- smell, noise disruption associated with marijuana growers in residential areas
- Strata regulations
- minimum lot size
- Preservation of Stillwater bluffs as parkland
- nobody enforces what's been in place
- agricultural land owners putting up multiple rentals on their property and not using as farm use

Q8: What is your view of existing land use management in qathet Electoral Areas?

Other (please explain):

- We don't need any regulation
- I agree that the level of regulation is somewhat inadequate but don't agree that it's like the wild west
- I am glad there is no zoning bylaw as we as young generation can be freely creative to find climate solutions to keep the global warming below 1.5C. We need to be very creative to reach this goal and this is only possible if we are regulated as little as possible.
- Existing management adequate
- satisfied with the way things are and have been
- It's fine just the way it is.
- Environmental concerns wrt big SPAS being developed in environmentally sensitive areas!
- Can we find a better way to minimize depriving an adjoining owners of the reasonable enjoyment of their property?
- Some management regarding shared resources such as water, responsible sewage disposal, riparian areas, foreshore development need some structure. The freedom to build creatively is a boon, and non industrial home based business as well. I would hope to be left as is.
- no change is needed
- It's definitely not the Wild West but I'm concerned about the Regional District making decisions about changing land use designation and considering a subdivision or "resort?" In a rural neighbourhood. Conflicts with the local lifestyle. Taxes resources, and invades local wild life.
- I see that home owners are constantly upgrading their homes - without controls set by government. Adding regulations means adding bylaw officers, which means increased taxes - again. We already have regulations through the Province so they should ensure that the rules are followed, not our Reg. Dist.
- No regulation needed
- I agree with the first statement; however there is no mention once again of the conflict with land use impact conflict with the environment - this is going to be an on going issue; so you might as well start including these types of issues.
- We are fine the way we are.
- Residential expansion into commercial enterprise that impacts noise, odour fumes etc and unsightly structures and general yard waste that is visible. This appears to be inadequately managed and controlled. use that would impact noise, smell, fumes etc unsightly structures not in ing with residential street.
- Existing level is adequate.

- Existing level of regulation is inadequate to manage land use. Zoning is needed to avoid conflicts. Building bylaws are NOT necessary and will create issues and conflicts
- Regulation is needed in certain areas but "unintended consequences" which can result need to be mitigated.
- move forward to improve land use and regulatory back up in Area C.
- existing regulations not enforced
- regulations and bylaws have been in place to protect ALR use for years but in the 30 years of living here the regional district has done no enforcement nor has really done anything to benefit the area
- I like the lack of regulation as they have worked for the most part. As the region grows and more people move here, people could take advantage and conflicts will arise. I could be in favour of more regulation regarding setbacks and environmental, having an inspector, but not go as far as needing building permits.
- Limited regulations needing minor charges
- It is quite unregulated, and I liked it that way, but now I am starting to feel like there's more conflicts of interest as more people move into the area.
- I'm not aware of existing regulations.

Q9: What ways should the qathet Regional District use to manage land use and development in your Electoral area? (check all that apply)

Other (please explain):

- Reduce staff lower our taxes
- Instead of spending money on surveys and regulations that puts limits on people, use the money to get a water system that works for all residents!
- I don't want industrial or commercial too close to me so specific areas particularly for industrial would be good.
- Nuisance remedies
- I put a tick beside no further changes are needed because I didn't like the other options. The qRD can be a leader in change if it seeks alternative approaches to land use in the area. We already have much; the ALR (big picture land use, perhaps reform this to better capture its intent), the OCP, highways (subdivisions), health (water and septic) , DFO (rivers and streams as well as oceans), Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture. I could go on but my point is that much exists to affect misuse of lands but I find it nowhere in the consultants report or the posters.
- The OCP has no enforceable plan but a full on zoning by law is too much.
- I don't think there is regulation of existing land use areas AND who has jurisdiction Region, Province or Federal is not clear
- Most of the land in the Reg. Dist. is already subject to the ALR that severely limits what can be done on the land. We already have rules for road building, septic, drinking water and, I assume, drainage. Why do we need more?
- Tree preservation bylaw to avoid clear cutting for new builds.
- I checked both Zoning Bylaw options because I would like to see zoning that is balanced... somewhere in between limited scope zoning and wider scope zoning.

- The OCP for Area C needs to be updated and amended to be in line with the rest of the Regional District.
- you already have bylaws in place for ALR land use how about finally enforcing them, the district has done nothing for the residents out here in at least 30 years. before you start adding new bylaws start enforcing the ones already in place
- I think bylaws to ensure that large developments would need to go to public hearing and ensure location is suitable and environment protected. But I think all houses should be allowed a secondary dwelling
- I'm not sure if we need development in this area.

Q10: Do you have any other comments to share?

- The clash of residential and commercial land use is a concern. I am concerned that we don't have enough beach access, Mahoods Beach for example should be a park. Wildlife corridors should be protected as well. Unsightly properties should be addressed, multiple dwellings on single properties is really becoming a problem. Substandard living conditions for people unable to afford rent.
- Leave this alone. If you want to change how thing are, move back to the city. We live south of town for a reason.
- none
- The district must develop regulatory authority relative to hazardous areas and protection of residential areas to avoid industry setting up “mom and pop” shops in residential neighbourhoods. We are losing tax base as there is no zoning within the OCP. (No reference point within the OCP to guide the assessment authority)
- Time to replace clay and Brabazon
- We live in a beautiful natural habitat . I have concerns that we need protection from uncontrolled and rampant development such as factories ,industrial farming and huge residences .I am in favour of respect to Native land claims. I am passionate about creating an alternative safe trail roughly parallel to the highway for pedestrian and non motorized vehicles and horses. Would such zoning become a tax burden for people on fixed incomes??
- We don't need to be managed by regional district
- Get out of my life
- I move to a rural area to have freedom of use of my land and don't want a dictatorship to take that away if people want that move to town
- Why did I have to find this survey on an FB page that someone kindly put up?!?
- We want to live in a rural Area leave our as it.
- no
- The mill just closed. We need all the help we can get. Stop putting barriers for someone trying to start a business.
- Reduce land tax we do not need to hire more people to tell us how to live on our own land
- I do not feel the regional districts are a form of the Wild West in any way. We have to be careful of changing regulations for the wrong reasons or influenced by people who want city regulations in a rural setting. When you compare the results of city regulations and rural regulations they are quite similar. They both have nice well kept properties, properties that are more of a working persons property and they both have properties owned by people that are struggling

and in need of repair and maintenance. To put all sorts of regulations in place will be an overwhelming hardship on farming and rural living as it now exists and should NOT be expanded. I have lived and raised my family in area C for thirty years and still feel the residents take pride in their properties and homes.

- in the last few years, our water bill has gone up 500% plus a lot of this is taxes imposed by the NDP
- The reason we all, or most live in this area because we don't want your rules, we have enough, thanks!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- I understand the concerns pointed out in the regulations. I believe some basic zoning laws should be in place, but overall my concerns are with water sources due to our neighbourhood.
- We at scotch fir area are suffering from water quality problems and it is getting worse despite the cost and improvements we are doing. If we were a first nation government would be throwing money at us but we do not qualify for any government assistance.
- I support the land in area C remaining undeveloped and forested. I would prefer minimal interference from the regional district regarding future land use and development.
- more regulations are not necessary at this time
- Reading through the posters it seems to me that the Regional District is moving toward being a city. The only change needed in our opinion is regulations that keep light manufacturing out of residential areas so that they pay their fair share of taxes and don't disturb the neighbourhood.
- no
- We should discuss future land use in relation to the changing climate and how we can use our land to draw carbon out of the atmosphere and store it in the ground. Land also needs to be protected as forest park so that the carbon in the forest won't get released. qRD could turn the airport reserve land into a qRD park to keep nature accessible for people who cannot travel on a logging road to access nature. Land use and development needs to be connected to the changing climate.
- Not needed
- We really prefer things to stay as they are with *NO* additional regulations.
- Should have no say on private property.
- Leave things the way they are
- NO REGULATIONS RE LAND USE / NO INSPECTIONS / NO INCREASE IN TAXES
- An increase in regulations will only open the door to increased bureaucracy, taxes and non conforming use
- Proposals such as the large health center should not be allowed. No foreign investors should be allowed
- I do not see any reason to change the system it would appear that this is just a stepping stone to a lot more rules and regulations . None of the new changes proposed will accomplish anything except add expense to the budget .The tax's the last three years have gone up incredible. Keep things as basic as can be, stop building an empire in an area that isn't growing very fast
- paper copy: None
- paper copy: 1. Pretty obvious, my main concern is the lack of water that is dependable; 2. No need to waste money on enforcing such things as where one puts their chicken coop etc; 3. Keep taxes affordable by not having to hire people to enforce regulations.

- Land use regulations exclude young families on a shoestring trying to get a start. More land needs to be opened for sale in 5 acre parcels
- as far as I am concerned, I like it the way it is, I know my neighbors, we all already work together in making a safe and welcoming community. Why should any of you take away the opportunity for imagination and dreams, If he/she wishes to build a castle let him, all I ask is that we respect each other's dreams.
- I would like to comment on the format of the qRD Public Meeting I attended for Area C on Monday, November 15/21. Having arrived early, it was nice to be able to walk around and 'read the walls', review some hand-outs, and chat a little with other Area C residents and the RD representatives. (Before I go any further, it would have been nice if the space I am typing in would expand to accommodate my typing instead of continuing with the ability to only view a single line. This will make reviewing my comments for clarity and spelling mistakes very difficult). In my opinion, the meeting was well organized, but at the same time did not allow for active public participation. If we had any questions to ask, we were required to write them out on a recipe card and hand them into the woman who grouped them together into 'themes' that she determined. Although this could be seen as an efficient way to maintain order during the meeting and keep us on track, many of us viewed this process as a means to control & limit the public's participation and our ability to ask questions or verbalize our opinions. Even when we were permitted to ask a question, we had to confirm that the question was directly related to the 'theme' we were currently discussing, and we were reminded that we had limited time to spend on questions, since a spur of the moment decision was made to schedule an additional meeting at 6:00 pm due to over 50 people showing up for the 5:00 pm meeting. We were told that you didn't want to rush us, and that we could stay afterwards for additional questions, but we knew that our later questions would be delaying the presentation of the next meeting which started immediately after our 5:00-6:00 meeting. Consequently, I did not stay to have my questions answered out of respect for the next group coming in. I felt rushed to leave, and it felt rude to stay and delay the next meeting since those people had likely been waiting outside the building for the last hour when they were turned away once we reached our 50 person maximum capacity. I don't know how well attended the un-scheduled 6:00, or the scheduled 7:00, meetings were (or if they were granted discussion time) but the 5:00 meeting attendees were deprived of our 1 hr post presentation question period. As such, the meeting ended up being simply a presentation of what the qRD wanted to say, and did not provide Area C Residents the opportunity to ask questions, comment, or express our concerns. I left the meeting feeling rushed, disappointed, un-heard & angry. In the document titled "Consultation Overview", it states that "This is only a first step" and "IF, community members confirm an interest in having qRD do more to manage land use and development, these preliminary information meetings would be the 'first step' in a larger process with additional community consultation to determine details about proposed regulatory tools". I trust that you will honour what is written about these meetings only being the "first step" in a larger process, and that further meetings will take place which encourage (rather than stifle) community consultation & interaction to take place. PLEASE..., do not simply review the survey results yourself, then inform us that you determined there was enough public support to establish Zoning, Building & Subdivision Standards Bylaws, and thus are moving forward with implementing/imposing these additional rules & regulations. Many people view these types of 'presentation meetings' as

simply a way for corporations/governments to impose their pre-determined agendas on the public, and later defend their actions by saying "well we asked for public opinion". The Public's opinion was not heard/granted during the 5:00 presentation on Nov 15th for Electoral Area C. Hopefully our opinions will be well represented in this survey, and they are listened to by the qRD Representatives. Please share the detailed results of the survey with all of us. If I heard right at the 5:00 meeting on Nov 15th, there are approx. 50 property holders (on Douglas Bay Rd & Random Rd), out of approx. 1,000 total properties in the qRD that have expressed an interest in establishing more bylaws in our area. If these numbers are accurate, it means that a mere 5% of our area A, B & C residents were expressing an interest in further regulatory options prior to these meetings. Apparently one of the concerns 'floating around' among residents is simply a rumour, and is not true. Some believe that if the residents on Douglas Bay Rd & Random Rd are granted the regulatory bylaws they have requested, these same bylaws will automatically be imposed of all residents in all 3 Electoral Areas. If this is not true, please clarify this misunderstanding during the next steps of your consultation with the community. At best, the concern is that once two areas have additional bylaws in place, it will simply be used as a stepping stone for the qRD to force the regulatory tools on the other 95% of us. I look forward to hearing the results of the survey, and 'IF' the majority of our community members confirm an interest in having qRD do more to manage land use and development, then I look forward to attending additional meetings that allow & encourage community participation through adequate question & answer time allotments. Thank you for reading & listening to my concerns.

- paper copy: chose two for #8 - "Existing level of regulation is limited, but no change is needed" & "There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area"
- paper copy: My taxes are already too high! I don't want taxes going up - for the fire dept. my taxes were raised for too much when it costs no more to put my house out than my neighbours who are not waterfront and they had almost no increase. I understand flooding concerns with climate change - that needs to be dealt with.
- I did not like the method of the meeting out here it was controlling and not informative, I do not believe you got a proper filling of what people think of your plans nor will you unless the whole area gets this information and has a chance to react. AT your presentation you made mention this first step but within that same meeting the ladies started referring. Thing that are in your 4th step. you have enough protection already national home warranty , septic inspection, electric inspection. Gove
- The concern would be higher taxes going forward, making housing even more unaffordable. Raising cost of building with inspectors and engineering is a problem with housing shortages.
- Don't restrict secondary suites - affordable housing is necessary. Reduce the minimum size of lots in areas serviced by water systems in order to make it possible for more people to own a home.
- paper copy: chose two for #8 "There is already too much regulation in my Electoral Area" and "Existing level of regulation is limited, but not change is needed"
- We live in a unique and special place. It has been my home for nearly 50 years. people have settled here because of that, People have come who want to change it to be like they came from at a lower price point. It really isn't fair to the long term residents.

- Driving along the highway to town from our home it is evident that there are a number of marijuana grow-ops on properties adjacent to the highway. The smell is obvious. After reading the existing guidelines for our community, I would like to know why these grow-ops have been allowed to continue despite not following the guidelines? They are on very small lots, not 2.0 hectares, and must be impacting their neighbours. Do you have to have a complaint to act??
- With the way the past 2 years has been going. The taxes already being raised people should not have to worry about this at this time.
- we live in a underdeveloped area with a lot of land still waiting to be developed and it's not fair to now add more and more rules, we live rural and slowly town will be growing out this way and a few new homeowners shouldn't be able to move out here and dictate city rules to us who have lived here for years, someone cleared and had a stump fire on your lands once ,so leave thing be
- I am happy with the current situation with regards to no building permits or regulations needed. My one and only main concern is the industrial settings going up in what I feel should be residential only. I also think a noise by law should be enforced if commercial/industrial businesses continue to operate
- I like it the way it is already and do not want it to change.
- Things should remain the way they are. I didn't come here to have more government interference into what I can and can't do on the land that I own. This place is special, part of what makes it special is ones ability to make a life for themselves without being burdened by all the restrictions and monetary costs that come with building a life for ones family. Everywhere I turn I see laws, you must do this, you can't do that, I would argue that laws are already girdled too tight. Thank you.
- I am happy with the Status Quo of Land Use Regulation that Presently Exists. Please DO NOT Change.
- Keep things as is
- I think that they should leave the regional district the way it is. No change is needed in my opinion. It is what makes me want to stay in Powell river.
- No one likes more regulations but the more people moving to this area the more comments I hear like "that's why I moved out of the city so I could have more freedom and not have rules.
- no more sand stone type of development
- We moved here partly because we enjoy the largely free-and-easy approach to regulation. We hope there are other ways to manage conflict.
- We need to focus on making it easier and more affordable for housing
- Large commercial waterfront development needs to be completely curtailed, however "eco friendly" it may be. This type of development does NOT suit the rural nature of the area.
- I think moving in the direction of low footprint/green/eco and cooperative/affordable housing is the direction we need to go in coastal BC in general. I recently moved from Salt Spring Island where outdated bylaws that favour the wealthy are creating a major housing crisis. I hope that any changes made in the qathet region are made with this in mind.
- Current restrictions seem adequate, even if they are sometimes unevenly applied
- Lower taxes
- Decrease taxes
- No

- This should be put to a referendum. Not this way.
- We should be free to do whatever we want on our own land as long as there is no harm done.
- We need to focus on building housing and infrastructure
- Although I am not in favour of more regulations in area C I am very concerned with any subdivision development that is not based on acreage sized lots. Larger lot size of an acre or more should have less impact on well water and drainage. It is my understanding (from your material) that the OCP documents community objectives and policies to guide land use and development in our area yet it does not have the ability to regulate land use development at the property level. I have to question what good is an OCP if there is no reason or desire by some individuals to follow these guidelines. So if the OCP does not control development that is contrary to the communities expectations how do the residents and owners of Area C go about stopping unwanted development without bring in Bylaws and Zoning changes? Considering the amount of land in the ALR there is also a fair amount of inequality where land use is concerned.
- One of the main reasons we chose to make our home in this area was the freedom from regulations and absence of bylaws.
- I absolutely do not support implementing Land Use Bylaws in Area C. Residents (including myself) tend to own and reside properties outside city boundaries specifically to be unregulated giving us more ability to use our parcels as we see fit within reason.
- Leave areas alone and let owners do what they want with there land. Ppl move out of the municipality for this reason for freedom of the bylaws
- Current bylaws are sufficient
- People from the city moving to rural areas trying to turn the qathet district into the city with all its rules and regulations
- I lived in Clayoquot Sound (Tofino) for many years. All of these processes and their results pit neighbour against neighbour, often involve experts that don't have to live with the turbulence of the process or its results. All of the issues related to land use have the pros and the cons so the new "rules" become a tool for some and a weapon for others. Adding another layer of administration to the already existing ones will not end the conflicts. They will only heighten the emotion and pit people against each other while the process plays out (no winners). All RD's with land use bylaws, building codes etc. have added layers of administration (costs) including enforcement. Why do they need enforcement? Because they didn't solve the problems with increased rules. Costs will go up (a lot IMO) with no real cost benefit to most of the tax payers, development (privately or commercially) will be slowed due to administrative blockages so the area will gain little. I suggest the qRD consider finding alternative ways to solve the issues (if at all necessary) that are innovative, less onerous, less costly, and effective. Einstein once said that solving a problem by continuing to do things the same way expecting different results is by definition insane, I agree. will use the issue of collisions at intersections as my example. An accident occurs at an intersection and someone is severely hurt. The (political) solution is let's put up a traffic light. Collisions still continue because traffic lights can exacerbate the problem. Traffic circles/roundabouts on the other hand reduce the need to beat the light, maintain a flow of traffic, and reduce major incidents.
- More rules are not needed. This is a complaint-driven survey with leading questions designed to encourage respondents to agree with the idea of implementing additional regulations in the RD. Additional regulations would be meaningless even if they were wanted - there is no capacity to

enforce existing regulations. Adding more wouldn't accomplish anything. As well, there seems to be information missing from the meeting presentation. For example, the fact that any additional regulatory processes will mean more fees, more taxes and more people that we'd have to pay to keep track of everything. All for something that would make our lives here more complicated and less neighbourly. If we have a problem with how our neighbours' actions affect our own properties now, we speak to each other face to face and work it out. If a zoning or bylaws process were to be implemented it opens the door to frivolous anonymous complaints - neighbour against neighbour - an avenue for vindictive behaviour. This is what is happening in the City of Powell River right now and it's causing neighbours to view each other with suspicion and fear. I don't want that to happen to our way of life out here - we've worked too hard for a way of life that we love. If regulations and bylaws are brought in now, no one else will be able to experience the freedom of living and building the way that they want to, the way that brings us joy and satisfaction. I hope that you will be taking these survey responses seriously, not just paying lip service to the process.

- paper copy: Water use and potability
- Noise regulations should be added for horticultural endeavours on neighbouring properties ,air conditioning fans heat pumps etc detrimental to rural neighbourhood living
- Low regulation and low taxes are what make the RD most desirable
- Freedoms are continuously being stripped and cost of living keeps on skyrocketing. When does the simple life ever stopped being attacked?
- Retinal district should provide for services needed and refrain from land use regulation on private property.
- Leave the rural areas alone, we already pay too many taxes for too little service.
- For communities to maintain a sense of pride by not allowing junky, cluttered lots.
- Increased taxes to support increased regulation is unacceptable in the regional district
- I do not support zoning
- would like to see more spent on recent water flow pattern changes causing flooding in our area
- Enforcing any new regulations would cause higher taxes. This has only happened because the rich people living on the waterfront want these regulations to protect their little kingdoms. We do not need bureaucrats telling us what to do on our property. I'm fully against these changes you're trying to make.
- No
- I prefer to leave a good thing alone. We live in a unique area and have the freedom to build and live as we want to with relatively little red tape and crippling regulatory processes. If people move here because they love and appreciate our region that's awesome. If they then decide that they want to bring in changes to make qathet more like where they came from, then maybe they should go back there. I'm very happy with the way things are - we live in the best place on earth. Many of us moved to qathet for the freedom and opportunity to create our own piece of paradise in our own way without unnecessary restrictions. Bringing in additional bylaws and zoning restrictions will kill our community and the lives we've worked so hard to build out here. Please don't spend anymore time on this zoning and bylaws idea. It's just a waste of money and time.
- Less commercial business near residential properties. Such as cement plants and Gravel pits.
- Yes, to be submitted under separate cover.

- I think that present regulation works well and I oppose any new regulations or bylaws as proposed by Qathet
- I am concerned about industrial land use in residential areas. A perfect example is Bob Marqui having an active logging operation in a residential area.
- inadequate and poor quality of ditch and road maintenance
- Keeping taxation and regulation to a minimum should be priority
- our rural area should be quiet, not bothered by noise from industries or businesses that shouldn't be part of our area.
- Do you have a proposed budget showing what this is going to cost? Creating a zoning bylaw? Enforcing the bylaw? If you have a building inspector who OKs work that later fails or is shown to be deficient, will the Reg. Dist. then be open to lawsuits?
- the primary concern is the ongoing illegal and licensed grow up taking over homes and acreages for our region. The establishment of these "businesses" create more questionable traffic, use of water sources, dumping of chemicals on the land and water passage ways and destruction of homes. RCMP are aware, legal avenues are taken but these are ongoing and laws are broken. What can the regional district do to control, eliminate, or even ban these actions.
- Don't believe marijuana grow ops have any place in residential neighborhoods
- I would like it to not change
- no
- See previous concerns re: cannabis operations.
- paper copy
- I would like a full break down of the cost to implement, the cost to oversee, including staffing and admin. I would like to see strict bylaw enforcement and adequate penalties for non compliance. We are on our own water system, BBID and I would like this protected. I would like the RD to pay us for the fire dept use of our water and amenities. I would like to see restrictions on tree cutting especially for new developments.
- I am concerned about new residents, manly from cities, think they can do what they want on their new property without considering their neighbours or the area they have chosen to live. They clear cut their properties because they are worried about tall trees in storms, they build huge fences to protect their properties (and not from deer), and they speed up and down the roads (which are not 'streets'). Others, who have lived here for a while or have chosen to live outside the (Shucks I had mor
- The area is rural and should stay rural with rural taxes
- No changes thanks
- paper copy
- Other than drainage problems due to water running down Phillips Rd. and the ditch on the wrong side of the road for this, I see no reason for any regulations.
- No
- Unless you plan on running gas and water all the way out here you should not be regulating us.
- Businesses appear to develop and have risk of being developed beside residential properties without control despite so-called policies in place. policies in place
- We chose to live out of city limits to have the freedom to do as we wish with our land. We live without many city resources we should not have to live like we live in the city.

- If some residents want the regional district to be regulated like the city then maybe they are better off living within city limits
- I do not support increased taxes or rules of how I can utilize my private property
- Should catchments be allowed to implement new or additional bylaws or regulations to their specific areas, they should shoulder 100% of the associated costs.
- The RD is empire building and needs to calm down. We already have too many expenses. Go back to your office and leave us alone.
- I am against proposed land use bylaws
- If I wanted to be regulated, I would have purchased my house and moved within the city limits
- With the pressure for development in our region, I feel it is essential for the qRD to update the OCP and add Zoning to increase protection for riparian areas and increase green space / parkland in our region. The water front areas should have a space above the tide line that is for public use. We don't want private owners to block access to the water!
- I would like to see action on establishing parks and green space especially foreshore lands in area C. (ie. Stillwater Bluffs, Lang Creek Estuary) I would also like to see a green corridor along the foreshore wherever possible.
- We should follow the OCP plus. Major concerns for me are, water and industrialisation ditches not taking away the water enough
- Please consider creating a consistent water connection to all in area C
- I have owned property in this area since 1970 and lived in this area from 1975 onwards, and everything seemed to work fine. What has happened it seems to me is that all that is happening is that the Qathet Regional Board is trying to make it more difficult for people and increase staffing resulting in higher taxes.
- paper copy
- We certainly don't need more bureaucracies there is already more than enough regulation if it's used
- The regulations that we have are enough if there used such as two builds on one property using the same water system is a community system and should be regulated as such
- Leave the rules in town
- Please do not regulate land use and bylaws. We live here because we like the freedom it offers our family.
- Nope
- We should be looking at having a regional water district
- Didn't attend the public meeting because of Covid concerns but did review the online information. Hope meetings and information provided needed background to help citizens make informed choices, not rely on the old wild west mentality and old boys club myth of free for all in the regional district. Thanks for bringing the planning process into a clear focus. and realize that there is a need for improvements in land use.
- Advertised Publication of all applicable land use bylaws and plans
- paper copy
- No
- I tried to attend the meeting on Monday for electoral area C but was already at limit in the hall. Perhaps during Covid should have more than one night of meeting for each electoral area.

- we need more land set aside for Regional Parks eg Stillwater Bluffs
- I live out here to get away from rules and regulations, no changes needed
- paper copy: #6 "I tried to attend but was sent away because of too many people 50 people max; In force current bylaws and see how that works. Then if that doesn't work modify in the future.
- yes. as I have stated in the other questions there have and is still bylaws in place for ALR land use out in the Kelly Creek area as well as surrounding area yet in 30 years none of it has been enforced. Land Owners that are on ALR are putting up multiple dwellings for renting out and creating more noise, increased traffic and speed, unsavoury people as tenants ie: drug users. ALR is for farm use only, PERIOD. the district is not complying with nor enforcing the ALR regulations landowners must adhere to. Because of property owners having multiple tenants there is more noise (there is no noise bylaw out here) water and septic regulations and all the issues that having tenants brings with it. as well as commercial use of selling/manufacturing products such as lumber, machinery etc. ALR land means just that and should be protected. This regional district has done nothing about this in over 30 years to protect the fading farm land. we are not in the municipality, we moved out here for a reason and that is the beauty and peace and quite of living here.
- While I am open to talking about regulating very broad land uses, such as whether an area should be residential or commercial, and the intricacies of subdivision I am concerned that once we bring in new rules more will be added over time until it becomes a burden on all of us, therefore I think we should stay as is.
- Regulatory enforcement and high taxes have no place within the regional district
- Development management has never been a top priority for our Regional District. There have been many studies, meetings and time spent on what areas A, B, & C require. Residents know it has been the 'wild west' for many years. Perhaps another meeting with all our neighbours in a bigger hall will allow us to take another step in this process?
- I'm great with the existing status of regulations
- I don't see a reason to change anything. We have creek protections etc... past that, I think people live in Area C to be free to do what they want on their land (within reason).
- There could be a guideline for what types of industry are suitable on what size of property and in what proximity between houses. But generally I think that home based businesses are good for the local economy, I think that our rural community is better off for having the opportunity to start a business and hire local workers. We need to continue to educate newcomers on sustainable shoreline development, native plants, etc. We need to ensure that the environment is being protected from polluters.
- People in the rural area appreciate the low taxes and freedom to run home based businesses. As the region grows, perhaps needing an inspector or method for the OCP to be enforced to ensure reduced conflicts could be a good thing. Too much regulation would be very harmful. We need to ensure that large developments go through public hearing or approval process to ensure environmental sustainability and suitability. Our natural environment and protection of our natural resources and biodiversity is the most important thing.
- Tonight's public meeting was well done. I suspect there would be more interest in zoning if you gave some examples of controversial developments in other regional districts. I also think people don't realize how long it will take to implement zoning so you can't wait until there is a proposed development that you don't like to then request zoning.

- We have to allow multi generational residential homes on all properties. Times are changing. Grandparents, parents and children are finding it hard to find homes. We have to be able to build and supply homes for any family member.
- I bought land here thinking I could build on it as needed. I don't know what I would do if there was zoning or permits required.
- I do not support any increased bylaws and regulations in my area. I do not support increased bylaws in selected areas like Random Rd and Douglas Bay. I do not support paying for these bylaws in my taxes.
- I would like the OCP to be a vision and not just a map of existing use
- When it is unnecessary to make a law, then it is necessary to not make a law.
- I do not want any zoning bylaws or increased regulations in my area. I have lived on the same street (view) for 43 yrs and I am happy with things the way they are.
- I feel that without bylaws to back up its mission statement and land use guidelines, our OCP is a hollow document, leaving all landowners and residents wide open to land use conflicts between residential, commercial and industrial operations. As well, it leaves many of our wild areas unprotected. With the increase in the population, it is only responsible that we set up some kind of legally binding land use bylaws so that land use conflicts can be avoided and not in contravention of the OCPs own guidelines. We need to preserve our last remaining areas of wilderness for all those who will live here in the future
- If I wanted more regulation and taxation I would have settled within city limits
- There are already regulatory bodies in place for much of the listed concerns
- The reason people move to Powell River /Qathet is because of less red tape for land owners, cheaper taxes and MORE PRIVACY. I do not want you showing up at my property and telling me what to do with it, if that was the case I'd be living in a city. If you push for this I'll make sure you are not re-elected.
- Protect rural/agricultural neighbourhoods from over development and unsightly industrial usage. Protect trees and wildlife habitats by preventing people completely clearing forested lots back to bare earth. Be mindful of protecting adequate clean water supply in rural areas on wells by limiting development density and land use in these areas.
- Bad timing to start enforcing bylaws. This is the reason we live south of town and not in city limits
- paper copy
- I would like the District to put pressure on the dept. of Highways to fix the bridge over Lang Creek with a path for pedestrians. And also fix the grade of the road in front of my house so the rainwater flows away from it and not into it.
- I am very concerned about the negative impacts of grow ops in neighborhoods & our community.
- Please no changes to the only freedom we have with our land. Already have more regulations within city limits, this is why many buy or rent land outside of these limits.

Appendix G – Qualitative Responses for Electoral Areas A, B & C

1. Email #1 – Area A
2. Email #2 – Area A
3. Email #3 – Area A
4. Email #4 – Savary Island
5. Letter #1 – Savary Island
6. Letter #2 – Area C
7. Email #5 – Area C
8. Email #6 – Area not identified

Julia Dykstra

From:
Sent: November 25, 2021 8:19 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Land Use Zoning

Hello qRD,

I am a member of the Lund/North of town community and I just want to make it very clear that I do not support any new land use regulations and/or zoning by-laws in Area A.

Kind regards,

Julia Dykstra

From:
Sent: November 24, 2021 4:13 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Lund Zoning

On Wed, Nov 24, 2021 at 16:09 wrote:

Hello...

I am a longtime resident of the area, Finn Bay Road, north of Lund. This section of the Lund Community Settlement Plan features large lots, most in the four plus acre range. We who chose to live in such low to medium density areas did so for many reasons. One of them is the ability to conduct home based occupations that might bother folks living on 2X4 lots in town. Please don't take that away from us. The area is growing, development is certain. But what kind, at what cost?

People from the city are moving here, for their own reasons I'm sure. I have talked with relatively new residents who seem to want the convenience of city living with lots of shops and other amusements the city provided. They want that kind of development in Lund? Coming from anywhere to relocate elsewhere only to ask your new home to replicate your last location it mind boggling. It's rude, inconsiderate and selfish.

Think about this when newcomers want you to turn Lund into their version of Disneyland.

Nor do I want local government telling me what I can or cannot do with my land. As a community member I listen to my neighbours. We decide these things and ask our representatives to support us. It should never be the other way around.

Best regards

Lund BC

From:
Sent: November 27, 2021 10:56 AM
To: Planning
Subject: land use points expanding survey responses

Hi planning people:

Thanks for the briefing at Lund. I responded to the survey but found the structure a little limiting although I recognize you need it to get people to focus. Thank you too for the open opportunity to contribute additional perspectives to the regional planning and land use discussion.

The numbered points are a summary of key things I'd like to see factored into regional planning directions. The points below give additional background. Hope the points make sense and resonate. I appreciate you considering them.

Regards;

1. Make more visible the long-standing positions and range of attitudes and experiences that area residents have had in relation to planning - codify it in a longitudinal way so the "legacy" nature of current planning considerations can be available to newer residents.
2. If a bylaw is absolutely necessary for the OCP to have any teeth or any resident to be accountable for following it, make it one that marries OCP vision and principles with area residents' desire to manage community affairs with minimal required supported government roles and functions. The communication role of the RD may be particularly important in a reconfigured compliance regime.
3. Introduce a bigger picture and longer-term time frame in planning and changes – climate change resilience and adaptation, active facilitation of reconciliation (e.g. Regional District planning measures to include mechanisms to facilitate return of Tlahamen lands to the nation). Reinvest in the Greenways Trail as an alternate transportation corridor and in the Sunshine Coast Trail – treat it all as a transportation *system* and take on more of the maintenance in a systematic way; establish an integrated trails system following “whole access” principles. Encourage all other levels of government to support citizens in the efforts they take on voluntarily to make this a better place to live (instead of opposing them as has been the experience e.g. with Ministry of Forests). The parks are great. Well done. More, connected by the alternate transportation system. And on a safety point of view, actively oppose the provincial government from promoting the Lund Highway as a bicycle access road – insane, given the narrowness of the road, wide trucks and wild drivers. Either invest seriously in safe bike paths outside the municipality as well as within it or stop promoting this option – it's not responsible.
4. As part of that bigger picture, develop strategic and practical measures to address the effect of big money and real estate pressure on the diversity of the community and accessibility to those without money - *plan and prepare* for that pressure, rather than have us all looking back sadly on what we lost because we weren't prepared and passively let it happen here as it has elsewhere.
5. In any update of the OCP and any associated regulatory or technical measures, elevate and amplify recognition of ecological values – apply the Great Bear Rain Forest management principles of *ecosystem management*, more than “planning management” or “transportation management” – siloes are problematic for many reasons. Rare and protected ecosystems - we have at least five of the provincially recognized ones on Malaspina Peninsula, and we can't protect them: educate people more

actively about invasive species and introduce significant penalties/fines for people who dump invasive species into undeveloped areas (for example, Browne Creek trail in Area A). Initiate small projects with youth and schools to address invasive species - and hold Ministry of Highways accountable (i.e. make them pay for local citizens' clean-up) because we didn't have broom on Highway 101 until that entity brought it in (other than on Savary Island, and what's on Highway 101 did not come from Savary).

6. Recognizing that the regional district is one layer in a multi-layered sandwich of different government entities with different mandates, I'd like to see the RD *lead* in relation to ecosystem management, ecological protections, climate change mitigation and adaptation and emergency preparedness, as well as an alternative transportation system based on "whole access" principles (as Greenways trails are/were) – supporting the community of independently minded citizens and protecting it from incursions of people without the same values (i.e. destruction of archeological sites? The Regional District can apply its own fines to the pathetically low ones in place from other levels of government - in partnership with Tlahamen.)
7. Economic as well as ecological sustainability – incubation centres, in partnership with VIU and relevant government entities? Incentivized coordinated support to area food production using new technology – “vertical gardens”, as well as tax support for those who *increase agricultural growing land* and increase food security for the region. Give incentives for the things that matter.
- 8.

I would like to see the Regional District doing “more” but not “more” in the relatively limited frame of official planning and regulatory options, important as those are. “More” includes:

- Providing more of an historical frame of reference and “here’s our story, here’s who we are” in communications about land use and planning – from Finola Fogarty’s “shire” based system to the current OCP, a desire to live in a certain way has shaped the region, the areas, the exchanges. Burning an effigy of a person who worked at the regional district when earlier efforts were made to bring in any kind of regulatory regime is an example of how fiercely some residents have held these views. The apparent need for a facilitator to manage fractious community interventions in such consultations speak to past experience – rudeness, low level of capacity to engage in public dialogue. A point made in previous consultations that area A residents *did not want* increased levels of planning, even when they were advised in consultation meetings that “they were already paying for the service,” is another bead on the chain of connection I’m trying to make here. In the meeting at Lund last week, a long-time resident noted that “the community looked after” a land use that challenged the OCP and values. On one hand, makes me proud to live here. On another hand, individual citizens on a volunteer basis run out of energy, oomph, volunteer time and in the end pushy developers or people familiar with the regulatory system who want to use it to benefit themselves will do so – the role of democratic governance institutions is to provide a buffer between individual citizens particularly those who conform to local norms and agreements and those who do not. I want the Regional District to represent and reinforce those values, strongly.
- I got a key message in the briefing – if you want any kind of teeth, you have to have a bylaw. That seems like the regulatory framework wagging the civic dog rather than the desires of the communities (forget the idea that there is “a” community) determining what type of *integrated regime* on regional district management we want. That’s land use, ecological protections, transportation, tax regimes, food security, housing, education, forestry, use of public resources ... the regional district mediates between the higher levels of government and how we live here, and I’d like to see more of an upward push and creativity in bringing the essential character of the area and region to the shaping of development and use protections. Specifically, “whole of region” approach would put ecological values central – how can we ensure our footprint is not harming? Carbon foot-print; how can we make

it neutral with fairly allocated tax burdens? Invasive species are serious, stop dumping them! An Area A / Malaspina Peninsula OCP and bylaw would be a unique package, which is what I understand from the consultation meeting is what the RD is exploring, inviting inputs from people. It sounds like a paradox but I support *minimal increased regulation* that both *expands the frame of reference* under consideration and *reinforces community capacity and resilience to protect its own values, set its own course*.

- I've lived here all my life, off and on. The flow of big money into the area is relatively new. If my neighbours are able to sell the property they developed at the current asking price, I will not be able to spend my sunset years on this property which has been in my family for 70 years, and my children are struggling to find/buy/make homes here. I consider this a strategic priority for the Regional District. We saw what happened in Vancouver – flipped real estate, uncontrolled purchasing, belated and weak responses with foreign buyer's tax (too little too late), rental constrictions and rent increases, steadily rising inaccessibility of Vancouver and the region as an affordable area resulting in steadily reducing diversity. Who's looking at the crystal ball for this jewel of an area, where real estate sales in the last two years of the pandemic are showing the trajectory for the future? Regional district needs to be. I see the scope of the challenges – I can't comfortably take my grand-daughter to Dinner Rock Park because people are living there year-round, and while the mini-community and mutual protection might be great for them, it's not great for those of us who feel access to precious area sites of meaning slipping away. People don't want taxes, question value. Blah blah. The *legacy* aspect of the Regional District's work could use more profile and emphasis; the *environmental / ecological* and *public good* dimensions could too.
- And speaking of neighbours, we have even newer neighbours on the other side of our property whose development has destroyed some of the Klahamen archeological sites on the previously Emmonds property. The fines are a joke, for a person for whom wealth matters more than the values those of us who live here care about and have tried to sustain. Talk about a lack of "teeth". Can provincial and federal regulations be seriously jacked up at the regional district level? "We care about *these* things so much that we are bringing in management measures to ensure that value is translated into policy and action". What can the regional district do to support identification and protection of these sites and values, apply big-time stiff penalties for destroying or threatening or failing to protect – not just fines, being listed on the "area a annual report / roster of people who have undermined the OCP". This sounds kind of facetious but directly considers lessons from international peacekeeping in which a managed evidence-based "shame" campaign is part of a collection of measures directed at changing lack of compliance with laws, policy or community values.
- This more "activist" role is not "more bureaucracy" – it's a redirection of the work of essential bureaucrats navigating and helping us as citizens navigate complexity. Partnership with civil society and small sustainable business development in the region could be possibilities in a creative strategy: why can't the regional district with Vancouver Island University and a private investor develop incubation centres for small scale wild crafting and harvesting, environment interpretation and guiding.
- The Sunshine Coast Trail and the Greenways sections of an alternate transportation corridor are both initiatives we have supported and worked on. It would have been great if the Regional District and other local governance bodies would have been more supportive of developing a "whole of access" alternative transportation corridor in the 1980s and 1990s – ahead of its time. The engagement of the Ministry of Forests was encouraging at first and then disappointing. There's still some scope to consider developing the inter-connected set of trails, committing to maintaining it *as a transportation system* – not just for recreation but as part of a diversified transportation network. Segments of this from Saltery Bay to Lund are in the regional district's influence and responsibility; others are in Klahamen's and others in the municipality's. I'd like to see the Regional District step up to help realize

the vision for the region that so many community members have advocated for over the last four decades, including this one.

- It will be great to continue to use and reinforce Tlahamen names for places and greater protection for places of significance, whether on public/crown or Tlahamen lands. "qathet" is such a good example. Consultation is great, but as I recall not everyone who responded to consultation about that name change was in favour of it - that's where RD leadership has to be sustained and even be expanded. (And thank goodness the days of "The Cattlemen's Association" are over.) Good job!

Julia Dykstra

From:
Sent: November 26, 2021 5:23 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Savary Island Info Meeting Earlier This Week

Hello to the facilitators of the meeting earlier this week... I have been to a number of that type of meeting, usually on the receiving end of someone's concern or wrath. That was a lifetime ago for the City of Richmond.

That meeting was the best one of its type that I've seen in my life. You had a couple of big advantages with the meeting format. The biggest one was picking from written questions, dealing with them and moving on, leaving no time for bickering or balony.

The other big thing was the briefing before hearing questions. It provided a good summary of how the system works. The Q and A part simply filled in some of the blanks.

This type of meeting brings out people with firm and often poorly considered perspectives. None of them got a chance to derail the meeting. That, perhaps, was the best part of the evening.

Congratulations to you all. m

Port Townsend, Washington

Letter to qRD staff Regarding the Savary Island Zoom Meeting, November 24, 2021

Thank you for arranging this ongoing process and the good effort at finding out what the concerns are on Savary Island, in regard to land use, by means of the Zoom meeting held last night. I think all those who participated appreciated the opportunity to express their views or at least hear what the qRD feels are some possibilities to deal with the concerns.

(Technically, I think it would be good to do a run through of how communication can be enhanced in this kind of format by coaching in how to use the microphone on the computer to better advantage and how to be sure you are seated at the best distance from the screen in order to provide lip-reading possibilities for those having a hard time hearing. I know I was not the only one having a hard time in that regard, judging from comments on the chat bar.)

Our History

My wife and I have been owners/vacation visitors since 1966 and full-time summer residents for the past 13 years. That length of time has given us some perspective on the island and its relationship to the regional district. We came to Savary, like many others, because of the attraction of a remote (to us) island still in its natural state for the most part, with great beaches, lovely forests and amazing ocean vistas. I had read about it in the Vancouver papers since I was about 10 years old and then, in our first year of marriage, we saw a full-page ad in the Victoria newspaper offering lots for sale (\$1,000 to \$3,000).

We started building our cabin in 1972. In 2009 I opened my small art gallery behind the cabin to see if people might enjoy having my paintings of Savary to put up in their cabins or take home to remember the beauty of the place at their off-season homes. I create no environmental hazards and cause no social disturbance in the neighbourhood. Just a chance for people mostly holding ice-cream cones from the Sugar Shack across the lane, who want to see what the paintings look like and whether they might want one.

Things change over time as more people come and some have varied ideas of what they can enjoy or do to the island for their own pleasure or advantage. I don't think any of us should expect that the island can be kept in its pristine state forever. I have applauded and donated to the efforts of the Savary Island Land Trust in their efforts to keep green space and protect rare plants and Savary's beautiful, fragile sand cliffs.

The Problems

The main problem now is not how to keep people from coming, but **how to keep people from ruining the island in the name of personal or commercial interests or some other vision of life** that perhaps doesn't fit on a small fragile island. That is why the discussion on the Zoom meeting centred on how to implement some bylaws that will curtail or control this kind of thing. Some of those coming to Savary now seem to see it as an opportunity to tap into the growing tourist influx or the work-from-home trend created by Covid-19.

Here are the other problems as I see them: **Savary is becoming a vacation or day-tripper destination for many travellers to B.C. or from various parts of the province.** It has all the ingredients to become a tourist destination except that it has little or no infrastructure to accommodate the kind of influx that is happening and no rules - or facilities - to control behaviour.

Another problem is that **many are moving to Savary to live often without much knowledge of the issues regarding island life.** Those who are moving to it as part of the work-from home trend or just to live on a beautiful island are often intent on creating a home with all the bells and many of the whistles

they enjoyed where they used to live. How much of this kind of development can the island accommodate?

If there are no rules, people will obviously act out of what they think is *perhaps* “socially acceptable” but ultimately out of self-centred motivation. Where we live in Langley, B.C. there are some who declare that they will “do whatever they want on their property” – to each other’s faces, in some instances. As a result we have some who park on the lawns with their RVs and large trucks, and others who cut down trees to make room for these vehicles, etc. This happens in spite of having bylaws against these activities.

If this happens on Savary Island, we will all be the poorer for it. And it is happening already. People are cutting down many or all of their trees because they are in the way of their enterprise, home or vehicles and the leaves from the trees create a problem in the gutters or on their RV. It would only take a few years until Savary is mostly a denuded sandbar with some scrub plants and small remnants of the forest that once created much of its beauty and held its sandy soil together.

It will not take too many years until erosion of this denuded sandbar prevents any real maintenance of the roads and may cause the loss of homes perched on the high cliffs around the shores of the middle of the island. Keeping the roads passable now is a task that is not being done well. Future loss of forest and the addition of many large driveways and parking areas will rapidly result in the degrading of the island and only bring about louder and louder calls for the qRD and the province to turn Savary into a paved? and sorry-looking shadow of its former self.

Messing with the natural environment has massive implications as we are now seeing in the Fraser Valley and Fraser Canyon. At the beginning of this trend on Savary, we have the opportunity to mitigate the potential disasters and give the island and its inhabitants the chance to enjoy it for many more years. **This can only be done by the addition of bylaws and the resources and manpower to publicize and police those bylaws in an effective way.**

The Bylaw Solution

My experience in Langley is instructive in this regard. I have worked with the council and the bylaw office on these issues for three years now. We live in a township that has good bylaws, but insufficient resources to police them. They speak with odd pride of the smallness of their bylaw office and their requirement that citizens report violations in the absence of any patrolling of the area. The result is a general ignorance - and ignoring - of the bylaws on a large scale to the point where people do pretty much do what they want “within” the perceived limits of social approval.

I mention my experience in Langley because it points out the fact that bylaws that are not made known and enforced only set neighbour against neighbour and don’t result in control of behaviour that affects the area. The one thing they do though is make known what the expectations are for those who care to find out, and this is at least helpful. **Where there are no declared and publicized and enforced standards people will certainly do whatever they feel they can get away with.**

So, bylaws can help if they are well publicized and enforced. The threat and actual application of substantial fines are the only practical way to enforce them however. If they are not well publicized they create only friction between neighbours who don’t actually know what the bylaws say and argue over what they think they say - or should say. This is not that hard to do if the qRD has the will to do it. Previously, we have not always had a great experience of feeling that the region has our back.

We need to feel that this effort to find out what Savaryites need will result in some action in the short term before irreparable damage is done. It will be done by some of those now coming to the island with

little or no sensitivity to the island itself and often to those who have been there for many years. And, yes, we know that nothing is free and that any effort made to control damaging and socially unacceptable activity will come at a cost. It is a fact though that **writing and publicizing bylaws is not a hugely expensive enterprise.**

The real costs will come when it is deemed necessary to patrol or enforce those bylaws. Savarites will have to decide whether that cost is a better thing to incur than the havoc some are already wreaking on the island. If people are to not be allowed to do whatever they think they can get away with and their neighbours are to be restrained from trying to solve such issues by themselves, then **we have to pay the price for having meaningful bylaws and enforcement through limited patrolling and effectively large fines. All else is just pretending.**

Suggestions for Bylaws

First, we need to enshrine the existing covenant against cutting more trees than necessary for a reasonable footprint for a residence and outbuildings in a bylaw. This can be made known to every new purchaser, renovator or builder. This will prevent the environmental and aesthetic tragedies that are already happening on some lots on the island. This covenant has no real meaning unless it is enshrined in a bylaw or another form that can be enforced by actual authorities, not by suing or threatening of perpetrators by neighbours.

Second, there should be a bylaw requiring building permits which make the covenant on trees known and outlines the basic permissions needed to proceed, such as for placement of structures, environmental concerns regarding the cliffs and other natural features and proper sanitation facilities. Grandfathering will prevent this from becoming a nightmare of recriminations for past infractions. Some mitigation may be appropriate though for egregious past situations.

Third, whether by bylaw or some other instrument, business licenses should be required for all enterprises that intend to conduct business on the island. This is now necessary to prevent an onslaught of food trucks, bicycle, kayak and tool rental shops, camp grounds etc. If visitors are to continue to be free to come to Savary, then there must be places that provide the equipment they need on their visit. The bigger question is whether there must be accommodations for short term visitors, campers, etc. beyond what is now available.

Fourth, the other big question is how we can have washroom facilities in several places around the island. The question is not whether people will need washrooms facilities, but whether there will be any actual facilities for them to use. This is perhaps one of the hardest issues to deal with for obvious reasons. The other hardest issues have to do with eventual **zoning of the island and the provision of facilities for full-time residents in regard to meeting and recreation space.**

The visitors' washroom facility question is mainly a summer-time issue; the meeting hall need is a fall-winter-spring issue. The control of business ventures will soon be a year-round issue that will impact many of those already on the island as summer-time cottagers or full-time residents. ***These are issues that can't wait for another year or two.***

There are obviously environmental, social and business concerns in all of the above. The solution is to start with bylaws that will protect the forests, cliffs and aquifers and prevent the ruining of the experience of some owners who find themselves next **to a tent city rental enterprise, or perhaps soon, a fenced yard full of animals, chickens** and other components of a farm-to-you business. Or who are trying to enjoy the beauty of the island while a nearby food truck cooks up a slew of hot dogs, sends its music out into the surrounding forest and cabins and scatters its wrappers and drink cups along the roads and trails.

Zones, Licenses and Bylaws

Perhaps there could soon be a limited zone for full-blown business enterprises in “downtown Savary” near the businesses that are already located there.

Licensing for others throughout the island could be enough to control annoying aspects of the respective businesses if the requirements are well presented in the licensing forms and backed up by sufficiently large fines.

Only with sufficient fines and repeated fines for ongoing offenders can bylaws actually work effective. Ducking this essential requirement will result in an ongoing exercise in futility.

Thank you again for initiating this process and for reading my ideas. I will continue to advocate for immediate action before we suffer further degradation of Savary’s natural and social environment. The need is urgent and some steps need to be taken this winter to be in effect by spring.

Yours,

December 4, 2021

Nov 30, 2021



To qathet Regional District Representatives:

Please see attached document.

I have attached a copy of what I wrote in answering question #10 of the 'Let's Talk Land Use' Survey. I used the 'copy & paste' feature to transfer my answer into a word document. The only alterations I made to what I wrote in the survey, was to italicize a few sentences and divide my answer into paragraphs for ease of reading.

I printed off a copy of my answer because, due to its length, I didn't know if the electronic survey format would print out my full answer to question #10, and I want to ensure my voice is heard. I have so many more questions, concerns & comments, and look forward to the opportunity to ask/discuss them with you during future meetings.

Thanks in advance for reading my answer,

A faint, illegible signature in yellow ink.

My lengthy answer to question #10 of the qRD's "Lets Talk Land Use" Survey:

I would like to comment on the format of the qRD Public Meeting I attended for Area C on Monday, November 15/21. Having arrived early, it was nice to be able to walk around and 'read the walls', review some hand-outs, and chat a little with other Area C residents and the RD representatives.

(Before I go any further, it would have been nice if the space I am typing in would expand to accommodate my typing instead of continuing with the ability to only view a single line. This will make reviewing my comments for clarity and spelling mistakes very difficult).

In my opinion, the meeting was well organized, but at the same time did not allow for active public participation. If we had any questions to ask, we were required to write them out on a recipe card and hand them in to the woman who grouped them together into 'themes' that she determined. Although this could be seen as an efficient way to maintain order during the meeting and keep us on track, many of us viewed this process as a means to control & limit the public's participation and our ability to ask questions or verbalize our opinions.

Even when we were permitted to ask a question, we had to confirm that the question was directly related to the 'theme' we were currently discussing, and we were reminded that we had limited time to spend on questions, since a spur of the moment decision was made to schedule an additional meeting at 6:00 pm due to over 50 people showing up for the 5:00 pm meeting. We were told that you didn't want to rush us, and that we could stay afterwards for additional questions, but we knew that our later questions would be delaying the presentation of the next meeting which started immediately after our 5:00-6:00 meeting.

Consequently, I did not stay to have my questions answered out of respect for the next group coming in. I felt rushed to leave, and it also felt rude to stay and delay the next meeting since those people had likely been waiting outside the building for the last hour when they were turned away once we reached our 50 person maximum capacity. I don't know how well attended the un-scheduled 6:00, or the scheduled 7:00, meetings were, or if they were granted discussion time, but the 5:00 meeting attendees were deprived of our 1 hr post presentation Q & A discussion period.

As such, the meeting ended up being simply a presentation of what the qRD wanted to say, and did not provide Area C Residents the opportunity to ask questions, comment, or express our concerns. I left the meeting feeling rushed, disappointed, un-heard & angry.

In the document titled "Consultation Overview", it states that;

"This is only a first step" and that "If, community members confirm an interest in having qRD do more to manage land use and development, these preliminary information meetings would be the 'first step' in a larger process with additional community consultation to determine details about proposed regulatory tools".

I trust that you will honour what is written about these meetings only being the "first step" in a larger process, and that further meetings will take place which encourage (rather than stifle) community consultation & interaction to take place. PLEASE..., do not simply review the survey results yourself, then inform us that you determined there was enough public support to establish Zoning, Building & Subdivision Standards Bylaws, and thus are moving forward with implementing/imposing these

additional rules & regulations. Many people view these types of 'presentation meetings' as simply a way for corporations/governments to impose their pre-determined agendas on the public, and later defend their actions by saying "well we asked for public opinion". The public's opinion was not permitted during the 5:00 presentation on Nov 15th for Electoral Area C. Hopefully our opinions are well represented in this survey, and that they are listened to by the qRD representatives. Please share the detailed results of the survey with all of us.

If I heard right at the 5:00 meeting on Nov 15th, there are approx. 50 property holders (on Douglas Bay Rd & Random Rd), out of approx 1,000 total properties in the qRD that have expressed an interest in establishing more bylaws in their designated areas. If these numbers are accurate, it means that a mere 5% of our Area A, B & C residents were expressing an interest in further regulatory options prior to these meetings. Apparently one of the concerns 'floating around' among residents is simply a rumour, and is not true. Some believe that if the residents on Douglas Bay Rd & Random Rd are granted the regulatory bylaws they have requested, these same bylaws will automatically be imposed of all residents in all 3 Electoral Areas. If this is not true, please clarify this misunderstanding during the next steps of your consultation with the community. At best, the concern is that once two areas have additional bylaws, it will simply be used as a stepping stone for the qRD to force the regulatory tools on the other 95% of us.

I look forward to hearing the results of the survey, and 'IF' the majority of our community members confirm an interest in having qRD do more to manage land use and development, then I look forward to attending additional meetings that allow & encourage community participation through adequate question & answer time allotments.

Thank you for reading & listening to my concerns.

As previously noted, the above discourse is the answer I gave for question #10 in the "Let's Talk Land Use" Survey. From my current understanding of bylaws, I do **not** want more of them, and my answers to the other survey questions clearly indicate this. I plan to continue doing my own research into the implications of having the qRD do more to manage land use and development in our area, so that when we meet again I will have a broader knowledge base of both the pros & cons of implementing these bylaws.

Many Thanks,

Julia Dykstra

From:
Sent: November 29, 2021 3:58 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Let's talk land use
Attachments: Lets talk submission.pdf

Laura

Attached please find my written submission to supplement the survey.

Thanks -

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Let's Talk Land Use

Submitted by

I support all of the land use regulations proposed in the Let's Talk documents. I will elaborate below why these measures are of importance, and introduce some other concerns I have.

Zoning

General Comments

While Area C does have an OCP, without a zoning bylaw it is only a statement of intentions. Development will continue to be haphazard and, in many cases, totally contrary to the OCP. Its like expecting drivers to obey traffic laws without enforcement officers on the roads. It could be argued without zoning in place, the OCP is in fact a waste of taxpayers' money.

Permitted Uses.

There are many examples of the need for this in my neighbourhood. We have steel fabricating businesses and saw mills in residential areas. These enterprises prevent residential property owners from the quiet enjoyment of their properties.

The growing number of B&B establishments in our community is rapidly growing due to our attractive environment and proximity to Metro Vancouver. There is no provision for this use in the OCP, this gap should be picked up by the zoning bylaw.

Size of Buildings.

Under the current building boom we are experiencing, some houses being built would fit into the "monster house" class that has developed in Metro Vancouver. At a time when we should be building compact, efficient homes, the size of houses should be controlled. A reasonable maximum house size would be a most welcome approach to this problem.

Number of Buildings Per Property

The OCP outlines how many houses can be built on a property relative to the size of the holding. There are many examples in my neighbourhood where these limits are

exceeded. As a result, demands exceeding the capability of the well water supply and the ability of the land to be used for septic systems are made.

Height of Buildings.

A quick scan of real estate ads in Powell River shows how an ocean view from a property adds value to a listing. Even the claim to have a "peak-a boo" view adds value. With the bulk of development strung along the coast, the coveted ocean view is becoming ever harder to obtain. One response by home builders and developers is to construct higher and higher buildings. When this happens occupants of existing homes can lose their views to new buildings between them and the ocean. For this reason, many local governments in other areas have height limits on buildings through zoning.

Setbacks for Buildings.

Setbacks are required to give neighbours breathing space between each other. Depending on the situation they also provide some fire protection between neighbouring properties. For corner properties, consideration for special setbacks to provide vision at intersections should be applied. Given the prospect for rising sea levels, setbacks from the ocean should be determined by vertical elevation above existing high tide levels. Buildings constructed today will need to be sited to protect them from the high-water mark expected 50 years in the future.

Site Coverage for Buildings.

The need for control of percentage of site coverage will depend on the zoning in question. The denser zoning areas will need to be considered with respect to septic system requirements, domestic well water supply and natural drainage considerations. Depending on the nature of the land, it might be useful to require that a second site for a septic system be identified should the first fail.

Onsite Parking Requirements.

Residential projects in single family home situations may require no parking requirement specifications. The parking requirements for dense uses such as multiple residential, commercial and institutional will requires specific requirements determined by the use and size of the development.

Protection from Hazards.

Without zoning regulations regarding drainage, flooding will occur on properties and roads. At present, property owners tend to direct water from their properties to the properties of their neighbours. This water finds its way to municipal ditches, stream and rivers. As a result, under high precipitation conditions, flooding will occur on private properties and roads. This flooding will erode slopes and carry soil and debris onto roads and neighbouring properties. All efforts must be made to preserve and enhance the natural infrastructure provided by wetlands and ground cover. In some cases where this is not possible rainwater retention systems may be required.

Subdivision Standards

Bringing subdivision standards in house is a good common sense measure to help to shape development towards reflecting the aspirations of the community.

Building Bylaw

While building code compliance is mandated for the entire province, without enforcement many builders in the qRD will operate under the radar. The main reason for the code is to ensure that a building meets a minimum in life and safety standards. Another emerging reason for code compliance is role buildings play in the fight against global warming. Other provincial land use requirements such as the need for Registered Practitioners for septic systems and Vancouver Coastal Health approval for water systems are presently being avoided by some builders. With no building permit and inspection requirements, this avoidance can not be controlled.

Without building code requirements, many forms of substandard accommodations are used in our community. RVs are being installed as second or third homes. "Tiny houses" are also appearing. Most of these units are served by waste water systems that would not meet the required standards.

Tax Fairness

As no building permits are required, many properties are over developed. In my neighbourhood many properties, some of an acre or less have multiple houses on

them. BC Assessment lists these properties as having only one house. With the lower assessed value, the owners of these properties will therefore be paying less than they should. With a building permit process in place, the qRD would be submitting reports to BC Assessment, thereby notifying them of properties that should be reviewed.

Housing Affordability

At the Area C meeting I attended housing affordability was discussed. This has become an important issue in the discussion of development in our area. The qRD has provided for secondary suites in most areas of the OCP. This in itself should provide some needed room to meet demand.

It should be noted that the tight housing supply and shortage of affordable rentals can not be solved by the qRD. The situation has developed over the last few decades due to the policies of senior levels of government. Rather than lowering standards to encourage more housing, the qRD should be lobbying those senior levels of government to support cooperative housing and cohousing.

The Cost of Regulation

The cost of implementing land use regulations was raised at the Area C meeting. On the building permit side of things, qRD staff explained that the cost of permits and inspections would be covered by permit fees. With respect to zoning, the increased cost of planning staff could be met all or in part by the increased tax revenue realized with up-to-date BC Assessment information. If there is a marginal increase in the tax rate, it would be more than compensated by a reduction in land use conflicts, environmental impacts and threats to water supply.

Time to Move Forward on Land Use Regulations

The cost of delay on moving forward on this issue is high. With the increasing rate of development in the qRD, and what has already been built here, land use regulations a vital to preserving and enhancing the quality of life for the residents of Area C.

Julia Dykstra

From:
Sent: November 25, 2021 3:55 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Regulatory bodies. hierarchy of precedence?

I have just skimmed through the zoning/ regulation meeting agenda and background info. ...very interesting. I wonder if there is a clear hierarchy of, I guess, "precedence"?

For example, does Federal trump Provincial that trumps local regulation? ... when you say that in the absence of *local* regulation around building, provincial regs are taken to be in force ...would local regulation have precedence, *if* we had them?

Yours,

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows