



Making a difference...together

**Notes of a Meeting of the Shirley/Jordan River Citizens' Committee  
Official Community Plan Review – Meeting #6  
Held April 23, 2014 at Shirley Community Hall, 2795 Sheringham Point Road, Shirley BC**

---

**PRESENT:** Sonja de Wit, Frank Limshue, Ron Ramsay, Margaret Johnson,  
Brenda Mark, Fiona McDannold  
**Staff:** Tracy Olsen, Project Coordinator, Emma Taylor, Planner

**ABSENT:** Wayne Jackaman, Dom Bernardet, Claire Denesovych, Pascale Knoglinger

**PUBLIC:** 2

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

**1. Introductions**

**2. Review of Agenda**

Accepted with the addition of Privately Managed Forest Lands (PMFL) under Item #6.

**3. Review of Notes of March 26, 2014 Meeting**

Accepted.

**4. Review of Notes of April 9, 2014 Meeting**

After the notes were accepted, Emma Taylor explained that staff had wanted an opportunity to discuss the Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory (SEI) further with the Committee before asking Madrone Environmental Services to complete the project. She asked committee members if they had other follow-up items, clarifications or specific field verifications that were needed. One Committee member noted that the consultants recommended detailed mapping of all the creeks in the Plan Area be done in the future but appreciates that both Swallow and Elida Creeks have been mapped as far as possible within the scope of this contract. Emma asked if the Committee felt that the rating system developed by the consultants matched the community values in terms of ecological priorities and if anything was missing.

Committee members agreed that a development permit area for sensitive ecosystems should be included in the OCP. Emma advised that the consultant will be making recommendations for transforming the SEI into the justification and delineation of a development permit area and guidelines.

The concept of having greenways between sensitive ecosystems to support the migration of fauna and providing sufficient habitat for large mammals was discussed by the Committee. There is only one polygon of the terrestrial herbaceous ecosystem within the Plan Area and it is at Sheringham Lighthouse. A Committee member wondered about the relative value of this type of ecosystem when compared to other regions of the Province. While it is unique within the Plan Area, this ecosystem might be more abundant elsewhere lowering its relative priority rating for protection or does its' uniqueness to the area make it more important to protect. Emma added that there could be specific development permit area guidelines for different types of ecosystems. Staff will ask the consultants for advice on this matter.

Emma noted that the mapping of the riparian areas done by the consultants was not just limited to 30 metres from the creek bank as the riparian habitat can extend further than that. Tracy mentioned that the Riparian Area Assessment boundaries are actually 30 metres from

the high water mark but for narrow ravines, it is 30 metres from the top of bank and for ravines wider than 60 metres, it is 10 metres from top of bank. In the revised OCP, the SEI mapping of the riparian areas will be used to delineate development permit areas instead of relying on the province's mapping as it does not show the correct location of the creeks.

**5. Status of Any Action Items**

Tracy Olsen advised Committee members that a shifted mapping layer had resulted in the maps showing the ALR boundary transecting several properties. Because it is immediately adjacent to the ALR boundary, the Farmland Protection Development Permit Area also ran through the centre of these properties. The mapping layer is now corrected and properly shows the ALR boundary running along the perimeter of the properties. It was noted that buffers for farmland protection can only be applied to adjoining and reasonably adjacent properties, not the subject property itself.

**6. Completion of Agenda Items #7 and #9 from March 26, 2014**

Tracy reminded members that changes to the OCP have not started yet. The changes will be tracked and based on discussions with Committee. The Committee suggested a contact who could confirm if the penstocks at the Jordan River Power Project are underground. Committee members thought the geography of the Plan Area was not conducive to tidal power generation and did not need to be addressed in the OCP.

A Committee member brought up the need for supportive language in the OCP to allow testing for wind power generation. Before a business case can be made for a wind power project, extensive testing using metrological towers is needed but this type of use was not contemplated by the current Zoning bylaw. A temporary use permit must be obtained but can expire before the testing is completed. Having several test sites on different parcels of property means multiple permits are also needed.

Concerns were expressed about the potential impact of wind turbines on eagle and bat populations but Committee members did not feel that metrological testing would have a negative environmental impact. The Committee agreed that there should be supportive language around testing for alternative energy with the suggestion that section 316 could be revised to include "research" for alternative energy. Staff will research how *Utilities Commission Act* applies to Independent Power Projects on private lands.

Tracy explained the proposed policy statements supportive of the Community Action on Energy and Emissions Program including one specific to the Shirley Community Hall. A member asked Green House Gas (GHG) Reductions would be handled in the OCP. Tracy advised that policies would first be developed specific to each theme. Any policies relevant to GHG Reductions would then be cross-referenced in the GHG Reduction section but there would also be additional policies in the GHG section not related to a particular theme.

The first section of the revised OCP will be the Goals and Objectives. This section will be written after all the themes have been discussed with the Citizens' Committee. Administrative Structure will be the second section of the revised OCP. While reorganizing the OCP, Tracy noticed two administrative policy statements regarding the boundary between the Otter Point and Shirley-Jordan River Plan Areas which are now on page three of reorganized OCP. Committee members wondered if any problems would arise if there are substantial differences between the OCP land uses and policies at the boundaries of the two Plan Areas. Other members thought that the boundary of Shirley is at Anderson Road. For fire protection purposes, a member observed that the boundary is Muir Creek. Another

Committee member noted that Timber West owns properties on both sides of the creek. Tracy said that the boundaries are only for planning purposes and since the Otter Point OCP is already in the approval process, the same boundaries as are in the Otter Point Plan would be used. Emma noted there is a small tweak at the mouth of Muir Creek in the draft Otter Point OCP which is different from previous boundary between the two planning areas.

The Committee returned to the topic of PMFL as one member wondered if policy statements were needed for lands leaving the program. A member noted that if land changes hands, then the new owners have to reapply for PMFL status. While land is in the PMFL program, it is exempt from any local bylaws that are not compatible with forestry. When land leaves the PMFL program, if it is being developed then the current zoning bylaw would apply. There can be policies in an OCP that speak to community values like having buffer strips or connectivity if a rezoning is being sought. Tracy gave the example of including a policy statement speaking to the community wishes to acquire parkland in the area of Muir Creek if there is a rezoning. It was agreed to raise this topic again when the Settlement Theme is discussed.

## **7. Policy Review for Parks & Trails Theme**

Tracy explained that to fulfill the requirements of section 941 of the *Local Government Act*, developers must be given a reasonable expectation of what might be required in terms of parkland dedication. New policies have been written for the revised OCP based on the current regional and community park plans. The Committee members preferred to have the two Committee members that reside in Jordan River comment on possible parkland acquisition in that community.

It was recognized that Muir Creek is a priority area and that the Creek and the adjacent waterfront can only be accessed by trespassing over private land. The nearby highway right of way is too steep to be useable. Muir Creek has sensitive ecosystems as well as fossil beds. The Committee wants OCP statements around the importance of Muir Creek.

One member felt people from outside the community are attracted to local parks leading to problems such as littering and parties. There is a need to improve existing parkland and for better enforcement. The Committee was not aware of any specific waterfront accesses that are needed but felt they should still be taken at the time of subdivision. Legal access to Priest cabin should be secured. Staff confirmed that the wording in OCP indicating the type and location of parkland the community is interested in acquiring at the time of subdivision or rezoning including as an amenity contribution must be fairly specific. General statements like public access to sandy beaches can be used to give guidance to the Approving Officer.

Committee members are supportive improving community connections between the Plan Area and the Regional Trail Network shown on Map 4 of the Regional Parks Strategic Plan. Generally speaking, the Committee feels acquisition of parkland for multi-use trail development should be a priority with an appreciation for item 323 (H) to acquire the environmentally sensitive areas providing they are intended as natural parkland or included a suitable buffer to accommodate a trail.

Tracy read over the three policy statements related to Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEAs) and stressed that trails in SPEAs will not be supported nor will the dedication of SPEAs as parkland as they can be protected by other means.

Tracy explained the intent of policy statements 323 (L) and 323 (M) is to develop a network of community trails around central nodes in each of Shirley and Jordan River. Committee members were supportive of this concept and suggested looking at a way to connect the bottom of Kirby Creek with the surrounding neighbourhoods through the Girl Guide Camp to Priest Cabin. Securing access to the Matterhorn Trail from Tieulie Place was also suggested as a priority. There is also the potential for a trail link between the neighbourhoods on either side of Kirby Creek but unless a new bridge is built, the existing bridge will be the only crossing point. A Committee member noted that there is a sandy beach at the mouth of Kirby Creek which would be desirable to gain public access to if there was development in the area.

The identification of Highway #14 through the Plan Area by the Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan as a priority project for a separated on-street bikeway was noted. A Committee member wanted clarification if we were just considering trails for recreation or could other purposes be looked. Emma explained that trail connections are most often acquired as parkland dedication at the time of development but the trails could then be used for other forms of travel than just recreation. In addition to being used by cars, Highway #14 will be a non-motorized connection between Shirley and Jordan River.

One Committee member had looked at an old railway map that labelled the beaches moving east from Sandcut as Lovers', Grandpa's, Pebble, Fossil, Potlatch and Fossil Cliff but was not sure if they were just fanciful.

#### **8. Policy Review for Environment Theme**

Tracy explained that the rest of the content for the Environment Theme will be written once the SEI is completed. When questioned about invasive species in the Plan Area, Committee members noted that broom and in Jordan River, grouse were invasive species. Due to the similarities between cow parsnip and hogweed, members were not sure what type of plant is currently growing along Highway #14 and suggested that Madrone confirm this. No local initiatives are underway for invasive species removal but interest in having broom bashes was expressed. Restoration of Jordan River for salmon habitat was discussed but more local knowledge and information is needed to complete this section.

Committee members felt that "marine" could be added to item 327 (A) under Environmental Objectives. Staff noted that most of the policy statements are from the existing OCP and asked Committee members for comments. It was felt that Fishboat Bay or Muir Creek were not suitable locations for commercial marinas and should be removed from Policy statement 318 (I). There was a discussion around how to enforce items 318 (I) and (J) when there is no marine zoning. The Committee wants to discuss this point further at a future meeting.

#### **9. Guideline Review of Development Permit Area No. 2 – Foreshore and Marine Shoreline Areas and Development Permit Area No. 3 – Watercourses, Wetlands, and Riparian Areas**

This item was postponed until the next meeting.

#### **10. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting will be Wednesday, May 28<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. at the Community Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.