



## *Pender Islands Parks and Recreation Commission*

PO Box 86, Pender Island, BC., V0N 2M0

Email: [penderparks@crd.bc.ca](mailto:penderparks@crd.bc.ca)

Website: [www.crd.bc.ca/penderparks/](http://www.crd.bc.ca/penderparks/)

The Pender Islands Parks & Recreation Commission (PIPRC) is a group of local volunteer Commissioners, with delegated authority to manage Pender Islands community parks of the Capital Regional District (CRD), and also allocation of some Recreation funding. PIPRC meetings occur monthly and are open to the public to attend.

**Tuesday, September 15, 2017**

**9:00 am**

**Pender Island Community Hall**

1. Call to Order, introductions
2. Approval of agenda with amendments
3. Review and approval of last meeting minutes, August 18, 2017
4. Delegations and Public Presentations
5. Maintenance Reports
  - a) PIPRC Shed
  - b) Improvements to Thieves Bay Park
6. In Camera – Personnel and property matters
7. Priority Items
  - a) PIPRC Support of Community and Community Organizations
8. Correspondence
9. Reports
  - a) Chairperson
  - b) Treasurer
  - c) Recreation
  - d) Communications – Pender Post
10. New/Other Business
  - a) Saturna Commonality Meeting
  - b) Fall Fair 2017 Report
  - c) September 23 Regional Trail Plan Review 11:30-2:30 CRD Driftwood Suite 31
  - d) GINPR Liason Meeting, Pender Island Tentatively Nov 2, 2017
  - e) Reprint of maps
11. Set Next Meeting: Friday, October 20/17, 9 am, Community Hall
12. Adjourn



Making a difference...together



# Pender Islands Parks and Recreation Commission

Fall Fair 2017

## Resident Questionnaire

PIPRC manages local parks for the benefit of Pender residents and visitors.

**Have you visited our parks or trails lately? If so which ones?**

Brooks Point, Peters Cove, Sandy Sievert, Thieves Bay, Craddock, Gowlland, Mortimer Spit, Magic Lake Swimming Hole, Enchanted Forest, Found Road, Blackberry Lane, #44, #45, Mumford, Boat Nook, Roesland, Capstan/Rope Rd Trail, Heart Trail, Disc Park, Gardom Pond, Oaks Bluff, McKinnon Rd, Medicine Beach, Bricky Bay, Bridges Road, #16, #64, Greenburn, Mt. Norman, Mount Menzies, Castle Rd (Lillias Spalding), Lively Peak, Tracey Rd. Disc Park. George Hill.

My summary: Not surprisingly, our variety of trails and parks are widely used both by visitors and residents.

**What were your impressions of the parks or trails you visited? Signage, parking, trail condition etc.**

Reactions were from “ok to excellent, great improvement”. Signage is great. Some get heavy use and suffer deterioration as a result. Perhaps at least a temporary closure to allow for restoration would be beneficial.

My summary: We’re doing the right things. This year’s extraordinarily dry summer has meant some wear and tear on the trails. This also means that usage is on the increase.

**Would you favour more family recreation facilities? If so, what would you like to see?**

Responses were: More picnic tables at Thieves Bay /Shingle Bay, for family outings/games. Gymnastic equipment, indoor public pool, No, absolutely – maybe more picnic tables, Interactive Centres, Garbage/recycling, picnic shelter, Kids park (Bridges Rd), No, No, No, Bike/playground, Dog Park, No, we are a small island community in The Trust area. It is inappropriate to expect urban style facilities. Prime concern should be preservation and protection of the natural environment.

My summary: We need to be careful with regard to “urbanizing” our parks. There is little appetite for many of the things that are found in city parks. We must keep our improvements low impact.

**Would you like to see PIPRC support efforts to link our centres with transportation routes when this is possible within its parklands and jurisdiction? Would you like to see a public discussion of this topic?**

Yes, bikeable trail, yes and always public discussion, Yes, Yes, just do it, get them off Bedwell Hbr Rd, Yes and yes, yes and no, yes and yes, yes and yes, no, yes and yes, no, no, yes and yes, linking trails alongside roads could be beneficial but CRD specs call for over-developed trails that are inappropriate here.

My summary: Several people I spoke with would support bikes on trails that “go somewhere”. In other words, trails that are part of the transportation network. To do that however, the trails would have to be wide enough for both bikes and pedestrians and adhere to CRD specs. There was very little interest in a “bike only” park.

**Do you think education of our children in natural history is important for the long term benefit of our forests and lands?**

Reactions were: yes, absolutely, instruction like at the aquarium and zoo, hands on = continued interest, a little, some, no,

**Would you like to see more educational emphasis in PIPRC actions? i.e. Nature Trails, Adventure Park, other. Would you like a public discussion of this?**

Some signage giving info on flora and fauna on some trails like Enchanted Forest would be okay but let's focus on keeping it natural, the Trail Book is excellent, no, yes and yes, yes and yes, yes and just do it, won't last, yes and yes, yes and yes, yes and no, yes and no, yes and yes, yes, labelled trails and no, yes -history signage and yes, Bike Trail, yes,

My summary: It appears people appreciate the signage for flora and fauna and would like to see mention of history in some areas (perhaps Bricky Bay for example). It is also clear that signage should be unobtrusive and limited in number.

**Did you know we have a large shed that is presently used for maintenance purposes? Would you like to see this facility made available for community use if compatible with PIPRC needs? What sort of activity would you like to see the shed used for. i.e. storage for community organizations or other activities?**

Storage area for community organizations is certainly needed. Sure. Storage for community groups. No opinion. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Dog Park. Yes. Gathering place for Teens.

**Would you like a public discussion of this topic?**

Yes. No...just talk to Ptarmigan. No. No. No. Yes. No. Yes.

My summary: Most people were not aware of the shed. Once aware, they thought it a valuable asset for the community.

**There is a significant demand for memorial benches or plaques in our local parks. Are you in favour of this if there is no cost to PIPRC? If not, why not?**

As long as it does not become excessive. Benches are a great idea. Set physical standards to minimize maintenance and extend longevity. Yes, some as rentals. No. Yes, Sure, What is benefit to community? Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes if not funded by PIPRC, Yes, No...leave it natural.

My summary: Some support but concern that it not be overdone (again the reference to “urban” parks. Also important that costs not come out of PIPRC funds.

**Currently, bikes are not permitted on CRD or PIPRC trails (Bylaws CRD #1578 (15) and CRD #2129 (22). IF the Bylaws could be amended, would you support having bikes on specific trails provided they were separate from pedestrian traffic?**

Absolutely not! Bikes cause major erosion to trails. Riders can be tempted to go off trail. Bikes cause more disruption to habitat and other species who also live here and so on. If separate and where sensible. Yes. Yes. No! Not sure. Yes, for Gods sake! Get them off Bedwell Hbr Rd. Yes. Yes. Yes. No. Yes. Yes. Not certain – requires discussion. No. No – bike lanes on roadway only. Yes, if speed was low and abided by or have certain trails as “bike allowed” but not all.

My summary: Clearly a controversial issue. Some very strong opinions both for and against. Again, most of the support would be for trails that keep bikes off the road and on trails that go somewhere.

**Would you like to see a picnic shelter at the Thieves Bay Park? If not, why not? If yes, do you have any suggestion of size i.e. # of tables?**

If relatively small and well back from the foreshore. The maximum size proposed is ridiculously excessive. Yes, do it. Yes, small to discourage big parties. Yes. Yes – playground as well. Yes. Yes, 6-10 tables. Yes – 10 tables. Yes – 2 tables. Yes – 4 tables. Yes 3-4 tables. Yes – seat 30 people. Yes. Yes – 4 tables. Yes 4-6 tables. Yes – small.

My summary: Overall there is good support for this. The key will be to keep it small (4-6 tables).

**Would you like to see a picnic shelter at Shingle Bay Park? If not, why not? If yes, do you have any suggestion of size ie. # of tables?**

Same as above. Yes. No. Yes. Yes please and a playground and bike trail to the ferry. Yes. Yes 6-10 tables. No..too muddy. Yes -2 tables. No. Yes 3-4 tables. Yes seat 20 people. No – not needed. Yes – 4 tables. Yes – small. Yes!

My summary: Similar response as the Thieves Bay question but not quite as much support.

**Unleashed dogs are not permitted in Pender Parks. Would you like to see a dog park where dogs could be exercised and socialized? If not, why not?**

No, other than providing an enclosed area that doesn't infringe on public access to popular areas, perhaps a doggie-pot and access to water, no other facilities. If dogs are separate from the rest of us. Yes. Yes. In favour. Yes. Yes. Yes, separate from people. Yes, with fencing, shelter and water. No – concerned about disease transfer between dogs.

My summary: Good overall support for a dog park.

**If yes, do you have a preferred location and what facilities would you like to see there?**

Mortimer Spit – with washrooms. Mortimer Spit or Thieves Bay. By the Community Hall or Port Browning because of parking. By work shed near Firehall #2.

My summary: Most people when asked, would support the “works shed” location.

**Forest management practice is totally lacking in the Gulf Islands and this significantly increases our risk of serious wildfires. Do you believe this statement?**

No. Don't know. No. Maybe. Not sure. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes – cleanup demo.

My summary: Should have worded this question differently. Many people thought we were talking about logging or clear cutting. When we explained that it was an overall management of the forest including fire control, they were much more receptive.

**Do you think any or all of the following agencies should be promoting forest management,**

**PIPRC\_\_\_\_\_ CRD\_\_\_\_\_ Islands Trust\_\_\_\_\_**

Not by PIPRC, CRD or Islands Trust. Add FRS and BC Forest Service as agencies that promote forest management. PIPRC , CRD & Islands Trust. CRD. CRD. PIPRC, CRD, Islands Trust and Parks Canada. PIPRC and Islands Trust. PIPRC, CRD and Islands Trust. PIPRC, CRD and Islands.Trust. PIPRC, CRD and Islands Trust. PIPRC, CRD and Islands Trust. PIPRC and Islands Trust. PIPRC, CRD and Islands Trust. Requires public education. PIPRC, CRD and Islands Trust.

My summary: Again, once the question was better explained, people were more receptive but uncertain as to which level of government or agency should be driving it.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT