

## SHIRLEY/JORDAN RIVER ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Notice of Meeting on Monday, **June 7, 2021, at 7:00 pm**

Juan de Fuca Local Area Services Building, #3 – 7450 Butler Road, Otter Point, BC

---

### SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

1. Additional information received for the following agenda item:
  - a) Agenda Item 5 a) Bylaw No. 4412, “Land Use Bylaw for the Rural Resource Lands, Bylaw No. 1, 2009, Amendment Bylaw No. 8, 2021” and Bylaw No. 4413, “Juan de Fuca Land Use Bylaw, 1992, Amendment Bylaw No. 151, 2021” (Outdoor Recreation)
    - Gerard LeBlanc, Shirley
    - Brenda Mark, Shirley
    - Emily Anderson, Shirley

## Wendy Miller

---

**From:** Gerard LeBlanc  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 18, 2021 8:05 AM  
**To:** Iain Lawrence  
**Cc:** Wendy Miller  
**Subject:** Outdoor Recreation Bylaw Amendments

Good morning Iain. It looks like you have yet another significant challenge to deal with the outdoor recreation/low-impact wilderness camping uses.

Short of preparing an amending bylaw to establish provisions for the uses, the approach that has been selected to delete the definitions of the uses from Bylaws 2040 and 3602 is a reasonable way to proceed at this time. Undoubtedly there will be passive recreation activities which will continue such as hiking and fishing but hopefully none that are intrusive or affect public safety levels including wildfire, waste and sanitation and wildlife interface conflicts in both in remote areas or adjacent communities.

Gerard

*Gerard LeBlanc*

*Shirley, BC,*

Shirley/ Jordan River Advisory Planning Commission  
June 6 2021 Meeting

I support the proposed Bylaws Nos. 4412 and 4413 to amend Bylaws Nos. 3602 and 2040 and delete the Outdoor Recreation definition and permitted use from the RRL, RL and RL-MT Zones.

Because the definition of outdoor recreation is so open to interpretation, it seems best to delete it rather than trying to redefine it at this time, when situations that take advantage of an overly broad definition are already occurring. Wilderness Camping has come to mean cheap camping without the need to meet any kind of requirement whatsoever.

The concept of outdoor recreation is important to residents but the CRD needs to be able to control and regulate operations in zones. It doesn't mean that people cannot pursue their personal recreational activities outdoors on their private property.

Like most residents in Shirley, our property lies directly below the former WFP lands that were removed from TFL and are now on the real estate market. When these lands were used for logging in the TFL there were environmental and other protections in place. Now that many of them have been sold we are seeing the detrimental aspects of what are basically unintended forms of development.

Negative effects we have witnessed and are already experiencing, even before planned wilderness campsites are established on a recently purchased property in the RL:

- increased non-local traffic on previously little-used **unopened** roads bordering our property
- substandard non-permitted buildings being rented out on AirB&B without approved sanitary or other facilities
- threat to creeks with water licences by structures and activity nearby
- threat to wildlife with dogs uncontrolled
- potential for wildfire above us because of noncompliance with fire regulations and fire safety
- trespass on and disregard for our residential properties
- no on-site presence or supervision of any sort

There is also the horrendous potential for Raves in remote wilderness camping areas that are unregulated and unmonitored yet accessible. We've seen that happen in other areas such as Sandcut Beach prior to it becoming a CRD park, and it is incredibly destructive and dangerous.

Brenda Mark  
Shirley BC

**Wendy Miller**

---

**From:** Emily  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:38 PM  
**To:** Wendy Miller  
**Subject:** APC meeting June 7 notes:

## APC meeting

### June

### 7 notes:

From Emily Anderson

My apologies that I can not attend the upcoming meeting on Monday the 7th. I have read through the proposed bylaw changes and minutes from the May 18th 2021 meeting, and there are a few things I'd like to voice. I've put these thoughts into point form, I hope that's ok.

First, I am curious if the proposed bylaw changes are related to any specific legislation or potential legislative changes or activities, or is this more related to stakeholder concerns in terms of increasing volume in outdoor recreation?

Next, with regards to the existing bylaws 3602 and 2040, the minutes from the May 18 2021 meeting state that "regulation of outdoor recreation with no associated specifications for density is problematic." Instead of removing the wording regarding "recreational use" from the existing bylaws, could the existing wording pertaining to "recreational use" be expanded upon to clarify and quantify such specifics that are confusing or unclear, and could this be done collaboratively between the CRD and the parties in question (ie stakeholders like landowners or business owners with interests in expanding outdoor recreation in these zoning areas)?

Further, I do also support the concept of site-specific rezoning applications, as they can set positive precedence for future applications. Therefore, proposed bylaws 4412 and 4413 could be positive steps towards protecting our surrounding lands from unwanted uses/developments in terms of outdoor recreation.

At this point I feel like I need more information from the CRD before I properly weigh in one way or the other, and I apologize that I could not attend the current meeting due to other work commitments.

Sincerely, Emily Anderson