

SALT SPRING ISLAND OCP REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

THE GANGES VILLAGE FOCUS GROUP

Genesee Village Tour Group, Final Report

CONTENTS

2-3, 19

- I. Group Members / 4
- II. Approach / 4
- III. An Overview / 6
- IV. Recommendations / 9
  - Governance / 9
  - General Planning Guidelines / 10
  - Multiuse Buildings/Building Heights/Affordable Housing / 14
  - Light Industrial Uses / 18
  - School of Fine Arts / 19
  - Recreation Centre / 19
  - Shorefront Property / 20
  - Greenbelt / 20
  - Noise Abatement / 21
  - Service Stations / 21
  - Safety and Pedestrian Friendliness / 22
  - The Alternate Route / 25
  - Public Pathway System / 27
  - Cyclists / 29
  - Parking / 31
  - Heritage / 36
  - Village Square / 37
  - The Look of the Village as Reflected in the Design Guidelines / 38
    - Harbour Views and Water Access / 40
    - Streetscape and Building Design / 41

Building Elements, Including Materials / 42

Colour / 44

Signage / 44

Lighting / 46

Landscaping / 48

Village Amenities / 47

Harbour / 48

Appendix: Notes on the Treatment and Disposal of Sewage  
Waste / 58

## I. GROUP MEMBERS

Judy Norget and Brian Le Lievre (Co-Chairs), Allen Cunningham, Shirley Davidson, Randy Hooper, Dee Kinney, Marshall Lindholm, Jeremy Moray, Les Ramsay, Tom Toynebee, Gordon Watts, Josette Whist

## II. APPROACH

The recommendations included in this report are based on:

- information obtained and opinions expressed at three public meetings held by the Islands Trust in November 1994: Ganges Village Core - the future; Ganges Village Harbour - the future; Upper Ganges Village - the future
- opinions expressed during personal interviews with a number of individuals who were particularly knowledgeable about one or more specific areas under discussion (e.g., the harbour)
- information obtained at a number of Trust-arranged special meetings with outside agencies
- ideas presented in a number of publications including:
  - . *Ganges Pedestrian and Traffic Circulation and Parking - Final Recommendations* (Islands Trust, Fall 1992)
  - . *Business Forum on the Future of Ganges - Recommendations* (Chamber of Commerce, February 1994)
  - . *Reinventing the Village* (American Planning Association)
  - . *Flexible Parking Requirements* (American Planning Association)
  - . *Better Downtown Parking*
  - . *Sustainable Road and Traffic Design at Bamberton* (Walter Kulash, September 1994)
  - . *Discussion Paper for the OCP Review* (January 1995)
  - . *Sustainable Salt Spring*
  - . *Towards Sustainable Communities* (Rosalind, National Round Table on Sustainability)
  - . *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction* (Christopher Alexander et al)
  - . *Report on the Task Force on Housing* (1994)
- information provided by the local Trustees and

professional staff of Islands Trust

- the current OCP
- the majority opinions of focus group members following extensive discussion (not surprisingly, not all recommendations were supported by all members) at approximately 20 meetings of the group as a whole, and many more meetings of the four subcommittees formed to focus on specific areas

Note that we have not attempted to limit our recommendations to those under the direct jurisdiction of the Trust. Even though some fall under other jurisdictions, their opinions are often influenced to some degree by the opinion of the Trust. Acting on a number of other recommendations will only be possible under some form of incorporation, or some other legislative change granting equivalent-to-municipality status to Salt Spring Island - Ganges in particular. We include these recommendations in this report assuming that this information will be valuable to those studying the issue of incorporation and in the hope that some body or bodies will be given the responsibility for acting on them.

A number of Ganges-related issues have *not* been addressed in this report. These issues relate to those studied in depth by other focus groups, the Environmental and Infrastructure groups in particular. On issues related to environmental impacts on Ganges and Ganges harbour and infrastructure issues such as the provision of water and sewage within Ganges, we defer to the greater knowledge of these focus groups.

### III. AN OVERVIEW

Ganges village is - and should remain - the commercial, social, cultural, educational, and health services centre of Salt Spring Island. Its central location by a scenic harbour, surrounded by farmland and parkland, and framed by forested hills is an ideal village setting.

Ganges is a special place to its residents, to most Salt Spring Islanders, and to its many visitors. A comprehensive plan for Ganges must be developed to ensure that the look, character, and qualities that are valued are protected and enhanced, and that future development actually improves the village.

The recommendations included in this report support the following general principles:

- that zoning changes that would result in a net increase in the projected population under the current plan be avoided
- that no lot in Ganges be downzoned from the previous OCP
- that the needs and wishes of islanders should be given priority in planning, while recognizing the economic importance of visitors
- that the upper and lower villages and the area between should be planned as a cohesive area, with distinct, but complementary functions
- that the village should be compact, with all key elements - shops, restaurants, services, schools, and residences - within walking distance of each other
- that "leap-frog development" in the village should be avoided
- that there should be a residential component in the village core and upper village as well as in the surrounding areas
- that the provision of affordable and special-needs housing in the village should be encouraged
- that there should be no clear distinction between residential and non-residential areas in the

village core

- that wherever possible, single-family dwellings outside the core should be on small lots on extensions of streets from the core
- that there should be a variety of building heights in Ganges with some three and three-and-a-half storey buildings permitted in a limited number of locations, chosen so that they do not obstruct views, *but only when the third and gable levels are for residential and studio use only*
- that multiuse buildings should be allowed and encouraged within specified areas of the village
- that land-intensive and industrial uses should be located outside the village boundaries
- that a village square should be created in the hub of Ganges
- that pedestrian friendliness should be emphasized in the village through such means as satellite parking and an eventual shuttle service, public pathways and sidewalks, the completion of the seawalk, the completion of the proposed alternate route and its possible extension to link with Long Harbour Road, slowing down of traffic - and many others
- that parking problems should be resolved by providing satellite parking lots and limiting all parking within the core to a maximum of two hours
- that a green belt should define the village boundaries
- that landscaping in keeping with the desired natural island look be given a high priority in planning the village
- that the design guidelines be modified to include both contemporary and traditional architecture and to make requirements even more specific
- that designs of new buildings and renovations to the exteriors of existing buildings be compatible with, rather than conform to, surrounding buildings (The intent is to allow architectural variety but ensure an overall cohesive character.)



- that some mechanism be developed very quickly for the preservation and adaptive use of heritage buildings and landscaping elements
- that views and access to the harbourfront should be promoted in every way possible
- that Ganges harbour should include a variety of recreational and traditional maritime commercial and light-industrial activities that do not degrade the environment.
- that sewage pumpout facilities should be provided in the harbour
- that a harbour plan should be developed to improve the use and safety of the harbour
- that no additional fill should be dumped into the harbour below the high-tide level nor should any additional dredging take place except for navigational purposes
- that a safe anchorage area should be provided for a limited number of commercial vessels
- that wake control should be required in the harbour
- that the noise created by planes in the harbour should be reduced
- that one or more of the islands in the harbour should become a marine park

#### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

##### GOVERNANCE

1. **RECOMMENDED:** That Salt Spring Island immediately proceed to stage two of the study dealing with a new form of governance, whether that be incorporation under the Trust or under a similar "preserve and protect" mandate.

**RATIONALE:** Under our current form of governance many decisions are made for Salt Spring by jurisdictions that, or people who, are not fully aware of the wishes of most islanders. There is a singular lack of coordination between the parts and many gaps that cannot be filled by any government body. Even when there is some jurisdictional responsibility for a particular area, it is often difficult to determine exactly what (or who) is responsible and accountable for correcting a compliance infraction. All this is particularly true in Ganges where such basic requirements as maintenance, sidewalks, parking, landscaping - and many others - are completely uncoordinated.

As well, a number of key recommendations that follow, such as the provision of satellite parking lots and a town square, are almost impossible under the current governance where the Trust cannot purchase or administer land.

It seems clear that some new form of governance is required - and soon. But the options must be carefully explored so that islanders have a clear idea of their choices.

2. **RECOMMENDED:** That the Trust make every effort to persuade the Minister of Municipal Affairs to give Ganges access to the grant programs to which every municipality in B.C. is entitled.

**RATIONALE:** It is suggested that this step be taken immediately - en route to incorporation - so that we are able to obtain provincial grants for such purposes as those noted in the rationale to recommendation 1 above.

## GENERAL PLANNING GUIDELINES

3. RECOMMENDED: That no new satellite commercial areas be established on SSI unless:

- they will not affect adversely the economic viability of businesses within Ganges
- growth in Ganges becomes so large that its "seaside village" character begins to diminish

RATIONALE: It is essential for the well-being of the Island to keep Ganges prosperous and inviting. New commercial enterprises should add to the charm and character of the island without jeopardizing the survival of existing financially viable businesses. On the other hand, a village can only absorb so much growth before its character is adversely affected.

4. RECOMMENDED: That any zoning changes that would result in a net increase in the projected population under the current plan be avoided. Exceptions to this policy should be few and minor and only for the purpose of achieving goals specified in the OCP.

RATIONALE: This emphasizes the wish not to allow the maximum population of the Island to exceed that which is possible under current zoning by-laws.

5. RECOMMENDED: That no lot in Ganges be downzoned from the previous OCP, but that upzoning that supports the recommendations in this report be implemented.

RATIONALE: It is recognized that property owners have a large investment in their properties and deserve a stable environment for their holdings. The planning intent is to encourage population growth near services, thus density transfers should be into Ganges, if at all, and not out.

6. RECOMMENDED:

a) That for planning purposes upper and lower Ganges and the area between be considered a single area.

b) That the upper village should predominantly provide residential housing, special-needs housing for seniors and the physically challenged, health-related and

government services, and retail stores including those requiring relatively large amounts of floor space.

c) That development in the Ganges core be such that main floor store-front space is predominantly retail (shops and restaurants) with service functions located in less visible areas of buildings.

**RATIONALE:** The upper Village has developed in such a way that it provides services that are complementary to the Ganges core area rather than functioning as a separate village. The different growth and land-use patterns of the two areas are beneficial and should be allowed to continue, but in a controlled manner. The upper Village has sufficient land available to permit retail stores requiring larger square footages, such as furniture, appliance, paint, and floor-covering stores.

The vibrancy of the core area is directly related to the variety and number of ground-floor retail operations within it. Service functions such as offices, some bank operations, and so on, are certainly required, but do not in themselves add shopping or browsing interest. Note that the emphasis here is on the ground floor, street-front areas of buildings. For example, three-quarters of the main level of a building could be used as a bank with only a small section of the front used for a shop or cafe. (See recommendation 17.)

Despite the fact that there is much interaction between the two areas they are not now linked together in a convenient or aesthetically pleasing manner. When planning for future development, these land areas and the area between need to be considered as a whole. Significant concern has been expressed regarding the safety of pedestrians walking between these two areas. This concern is addressed in subsequent recommendations.

Certain commercial uses should not be allowed anywhere in Ganges (perhaps anywhere on the island). These include any land-intensive uses such as large machinery sales and rentals. Others such as environmentally unfriendly factories, water slides, and mini-golf should not be located anywhere on the island.

**7. RECOMMENDED:** That the area in the vicinity of the hospital be considered as a health-care, seniors' care and services, and government offices zone.

**RATIONALE:** The Preliminary Health Plan for SSI (1995), predicts that there will soon be a significant increase in the number of residents aged 75 to 84 and an even greater increase in those older than 85. Given that the island already has a large proportion of retired people, the demand for services and accommodation for the elderly and the handicapped is sure to increase.

8. **RECOMMENDED:** That zoning within the Ganges area be simplified as much as possible in the new OCP.

**RATIONALE:** Current zoning appears to be unnecessarily complex and confusing. We believe that zoning, particularly that designated for multiuse and multifamily, could be greatly simplified if the recommendations within this report are followed.

9. **RECOMMENDED:** That the Islands Trust do everything possible to reduce the time involved in processing non-controversial rezoning applications that follow the new OCP and design guidelines and the regulations of other jurisdictions.

**RATIONALE:** When rezoning applications are in compliance with Trust regulations, there appears to be no reason why these should not be fast tracked. As it is our understanding that MOTM is frequently the holdup, every effort should be made to create a similar understanding with them.

10. **RECOMMENDED:** That divisions between differently zoned areas within Ganges (e.g., between residential and mixed use) be established at back lot lines, not along street fronts.

**RATIONALE:** Too often, these divisions are artificially created along street fronts, leading, for example to single family dwellings facing predominantly commercial-use buildings and having to share the resulting traffic, parking spaces, and noise.

11. **RECOMMENDED:** That the expansion of the area permitted for multiuse development be regulated on the basis of need rather than tied to time, for example, to a five-year review of the OCP. Allow multiuse development on land adjoining land that is zoned for multiuse buildings only after that land is 80 percent developed.

At such time as the land currently within the village boundary is 80 percent developed, consideration should be given to extending the village boundary to include the land to the west of the core, from Mouat Park in the south, to Atkins Road in the west, to Lower Ganges Road in the east. And if the alternate route is to be extended from Atkins Road to Long Harbour Road, consider extending the west and north village boundary to this route. Note: Some of the land referred to above is within the A.L.R., which would mean that it would have to be released before any expansion could take place in this area. Any request for release of A.L.R. land should include the proviso that productive earth in this area be transferred to other A.L.R. land.

**RATIONALE:** We want to avoid leap-frog development in Ganges to retain a compact village. At the same time, we do not wish to put barriers in the way of orderly, needs-based development. Although expansion of the village boundary may not be necessary within the lifetime of the new OCP, should it become necessary, the areas described in the recommendation are the most obvious for expansion. This is immediately evident in looking at the planning map of Ganges and understanding the topography of the village, in which the core lies between the ocean to the east and hills to the north and south.

12. **RECOMMENDED:** That low-impact, low-noise activities, such as lawn bowling, that retain open green space be permitted within Ganges.

**RATIONALE:** This recommendation is made with particular reference to the reputed wish for lawn bowling in the upper Ganges area in a location that is currently a field.

13. **RECOMMENDED:** That essential emergency services - police, fire, ambulance - be located in buildings that are deemed to be seismically safe in the event of an earthquake.

**RATIONALE:** As SSI is located in an earthquake zone, it is vital that emergency services are able to function following such a disaster.

MULTIUSE BUILDINGS/BUILDING HEIGHTS/AFFORDABLE HOUSING

14. RECOMMENDED: That the Island Trust facilitate an increase in affordable housing (or at least *more* affordable housing) in the village, provided that any increases in density occur only as a result of density transfers or amenity zoning and are contingent upon water availability and adequate sewage treatment capacity.

RATIONALE: Significant public support has been expressed for making it possible for a wide range of socio-economic groups and young families to live on the island. There is, however, a consensus not to allow any increase in the total population of the island beyond that already possible under current zoning. The above recommendation attempts to balance these wishes and constraints.

Note: Recommendations 15 to 18 are to be considered together.

15. RECOMMENDED: That a variety of building heights be allowed in Ganges, with areas carefully defined as to maximum heights allowed, the general principle being that higher buildings be located in areas where views are not obstructed (e.g., west of Jackson or against steeply sloping land such as that below GVM and the Upper Ganges Centre). Areas should be defined for two to two-and-a-half storey buildings and for three to three-and-a-half storey buildings. In each case the "half storey" is to be gabled as part of the roof structure. *When buildings are to be greater than two storeys, subsequent levels (including the half storey in a two-and-a-half storey building) are to be solely for residential and/or studio use.* Note: This focus group is submitting a colour-coded map of Ganges that suggests suitable areas for each height.

RATIONALE: We are in support of an increased residential component in the village, particularly within the core, and recognize the need for more affordable housing. Although we would prefer a maximum of two-storey buildings throughout the village, allowing some buildings that are higher will hopefully make the provision of a residential component more viable to developers. As the main intent is to increase affordable housing, maximum square footages for living spaces should perhaps be specified for a percentage of units (e.g., 450 sq. ft. for a studio apartment, 600

sq. ft. for a one-bedroom apartment). For those concerned about the look of higher buildings, compliance with the design guidelines will ensure that they do not appear too citified. Note that some studies suggest that a residential component be *mandatory* for new buildings in the core areas of villages. The Trust may wish to consider this.

A greater number of residents in the centre of the village should also increase its vitality, particularly in the evening; should act as a deterrent to crime and provide a greater sense of security at night; and should reduce the number of vehicles on the island.

16. RECOMMENDED: That site coverage for multifamily developments be increased to 33 percent when provision is being made for seniors or special needs housing. Multifamily developments in areas designated could be as high as three-and-a-half storeys subject to the same conditions.

RATIONALE: We understand that there is a great - and growing - need for one-level housing for seniors and others with special needs. Increased site coverage appears to be reasonable for these purposes. It is suggested that housing above the first level be restricted to the smaller 25 percent site-coverage footprint unless it includes elevator service.

17. RECOMMENDED: That multiuse buildings be allowed and encouraged within specified areas of the village (e.g., the village core and the commercial area of the upper village). Main levels should be used for predominantly retail, service, and workshop purposes, with a minimum of 60 percent of streetfront space used for retail (shops, restaurants). Second levels should be used for offices, retail, service, workshop, and residential purposes. As noted in recommendation 15, any space above the second level should be restricted to residential and studio use. No single use should occupy more than 6000 sq. ft. unless a real community need is being answered.

RATIONALE: The inclusion of more multiuse buildings in Ganges will add to the interest and effective functioning of the village. We have already referred to the advantages of a residential component in the village. The intent of the emphasis on retail uses of streetfront space is to increase the interest of the streets to pedestrians - both residents and visitors.



The square footage limitation on use is to encourage small-scale buildings and businesses in keeping with our island and our village.

18. RECOMMENDED: That when a multiuse building is immediately adjacent to a residential area, one third of the main level facing the residential area may be used for residential purposes, with the same square footage limitations as in the rationale for recommendation 15. Whenever possible, apartments included on the second levels of multiuse buildings should face residential areas.

RATIONALE: This recommendation supports the need for more housing in the village and suggests a way of providing a comfortable transition from one use to another.

19. RECOMMENDED: That development guidelines be relaxed for those proposing to construct multifamily residences under special community-supported circumstances such as:

- providing single-floor, barrier-free housing for the elderly or the physically challenged
- retaining a heritage building on the same property
- retaining a specific area of natural beauty on the same property

RATIONALE: When a developer is prepared to answer a particular wish or need of the community, it should be possible to bend the rules to some extent, if necessary, to make this possible. The extent to which rules should be relaxed would have to be decided separately on the merits of each case. It is not being suggested that fundamental principles be ignored. An example suggested as appropriate might be an operator of a seniors' residence, such as Abbeyfield-type housing, who is prepared to provide meals to the residents but who must have an appropriately sized restaurant in the building to make the provision of food services financially viable.

20. RECOMMENDED: That there be new building footprint/parking/roads/landscaping to lot size ratios established that allow for sufficient landscaping.

**RATIONALE:** Currently, if a developer chooses to use the maximum footprint allowed for building and follows the guidelines for roads and parking, there is almost no land remaining for landscaping purposes. We assume the problem may be with unreasonably wide road standards, which may require cooperation from MOTH.

## LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES

21. **RECOMMENDED:** That consideration be given to establishing a light industrial zone on both sides of that portion of Atkins Road (which will be part of the alternate route) between Mouat Park to the south and the BC Hydro substation to the north, assuming that such developments adhere strictly to the design guidelines.

**RATIONALE:** We do not support any land-intensive light industrial or commercial functions within the village, yet recognize that zoning must provide for these functions somewhere. Location on the alternate route, outside of residential areas, appears to be reasonable.

22. **RECOMMENDED:** That there be no industrial zoning within Ganges, but that other, more appropriate, island areas should be designated for industrial use, areas that can be visually screened from public roads and residential areas.

**RATIONALE:** As above. *Note:* This will require rezoning of existing industrial areas within the village; however, current non-conforming uses should be allowed.

## SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS

23. RECOMMENDED: That rezoning, if necessary, to permit a school of fine arts, including accommodation, should be seriously considered should such a request be made.

RATIONALE: It is believed that such a facility would correspond to the wishes of the community and improve the year-round economic health of the island. The facility should include accommodation, which could be rented separately when not in use for fine arts groups. An ideal location for this facility would be in the vicinity of the ArtSpring building.

## RECREATION CENTRE

24. RECOMMENDED: That, in the event that a recreation centre for community use be approved for SSI, the area in Ganges across Rainbow Road from GISS be considered for this purpose. It is further strongly recommended that no part of Mouat Park, or any other park property, be used for a recreation centre or for any similar use. Note that the recommended location would require release of some A.L.R. land.

RATIONALE: If there is public support for such a facility it should be located close to where youth normally congregate. We believe that parkland should be preserved intact and used only as a park. The location must have the backing of the Parks and Recreation Commission.

It is suggested that no rules or regulations should be specified, at the time land is requested to be removed from the A.L.R. that would interfere with the possibility of private or corporate funding as long as community use is the priority. It is also recommended that any topsoil removed from the A.L.R. be kept in productive use, by using it to upgrade other A.L.R. land.

The recreation centre should provide twice the normal amount of required parking so it can also be used as a public satellite parking area.

## SHOREFRONT PROPERTY

25. RECOMMENDED: That any development along the shorefront beside the Lower Ganges Road require significant landscaping improvement (i.e., "parkifying") that maximizes harbour views from the road. This should include the entire area between Lower Ganges Road and the harbour.

RATIONALE: The shoreline property on the east side of Lower Ganges Road between Rainbow Road and Upper Ganges Road is very important to the appearance of the village, yet it is unkempt, neglected, and screens particularly lovely views of the harbour from pedestrians and motorists.

26. RECOMMENDED: That the Trust continue to limit the height of buildings along the harbour to a maximum of 25 feet from the high water mark.

RATIONALE: This recommendation supports the principle of maximizing harbour views.

## GREENBELT

27. RECOMMENDED: That the greenbelt ("green arc") along the village boundary be retained. As it may become necessary to extend the village boundary to the alternate route in the future, it is further recommended that a greenbelt be retained along this route (and its possible extension to Long Harbour Road), particularly to the west of Atkins Road from Mouat Park to Lower Ganges Road. Note that if light industrial zoning is created along this route, as recommended, the greenbelt should be immediately to the west of this zoning.

RATIONALE: The village should be planned and contained within a defined area. A greenbelt indicates clearly where this area begins and ends.

28. RECOMMENDED: That parking along the side of Lower Ganges Road closest to the harbour be limited to public use and, as much as possible, to parallel parking.

RATIONALE: Cars and rental vehicles are now dominating this part of Lower Ganges Road, which should rightfully be one of the most attractive areas of the village.

## NOISE ABATEMENT

29. RECOMMENDED: That more specific standards be adopted to limit noise emissions from heat pumps, air conditioning units, refrigerator trucks, and similar equipment.

RATIONALE: We understand that problems exist with excessive noise from these sources at some commercial locations and believe that our bylaws should be similar to those adopted by neighbouring municipalities within the CRD. It is suggested that Sidney's bylaws be consulted in this regard.

These regulations should apply to all zones and should include reference to stationary refrigerator trucks that are in place for more than five minutes when they are parked in, or next to, a lot in a residential or multifamily zone.

## SERVICE STATIONS

30. RECOMMENDED: That any new service stations be located on the periphery of Ganges, and that both new and existing service stations and garages be subject to strict environmental guidelines, including the prevention of oil and other pollutants from entering storm water drains. New service stations and garages should be required to follow the design guidelines.

RATIONALE: In keeping with the concept of pedestrian friendliness, we do not wish to draw additional cars and other motorized vehicles into the village for fuel and servicing. Although we do not want to affect the rights of current service station owners, we wish to prohibit the addition of new stations within the village. We understand that Sidney has a good by-law regarding service stations, which you may wish to refer to.

31. RECOMMENDED: That any new, or existing, service station be limited in function to the needs of motorists only, with the exception of the existing courier depot in one station.

RATIONALE: The intent of this recommendation is to prevent the expansion of existing or new service stations into retail or restaurant operations as this

would lead to larger buildings and siphon off business from existing enterprises.

### SAFETY AND PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLINESS

32. RECOMMENDED: That every possible effort be made to continually improve the pedestrian friendliness of Ganges.

RATIONALE: There is general public support for a village in which walking is a pleasure rather than a hazard and people go about their business, or pleasure, by foot rather than by car. Note that a number of other recommendations (e.g., those related to the public pathway system, the seawalk, and parking) also support pedestrian friendliness.

33. RECOMMENDED: That a pedestrian circulation plan be incorporated into the new OCP, to include:

- the public pathway system
- provision for pathways or walkways that meet standards for the handicapped along all streets in upper and lower Ganges retail areas, streets leading to schools and proposed satellite parking areas, and all other streets with a significant volume of pedestrian traffic
- walkways to link up with paved shoulders on each of the following roads leading into Ganges: Lower Ganges Road, starting at Norton Road; Fulford-Ganges Road, starting at Drake Road, and Upper Ganges Road, starting at Churchill Road

RATIONALE: Incorporation of the pedestrian circulation plan into the OCP will indicate the priority that the Trust puts on pedestrian friendliness in Ganges and en route to the village and provide a greater degree of assurance that this plan is acted on.

34. RECOMMENDED: That all sidewalks and walkways be separated from streets and roadways either by raised elevation or by curbs.

RATIONALE: If pedestrians are to use the sidewalks and walkways that are proposed, they must feel somewhat

protected from vehicular traffic.

35. RECOMMENDED: That speed limits on all roads in Ganges, including Lower Ganges Road from GVM to Drake Road (just above Embe Bakery's current location) be reduced to 35 kph.

RATIONALE: A major traffic artery dissecting the busiest part of town is a major safety concern and does not contribute to pedestrian friendliness. A reduction in the speed of traffic would help improve the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers alike without adding significantly to the time required to go through town. (It is noted that, until the alternate route is constructed, the Ministry of Transport and Highways (MOTH) may not approve a reduction of speed on a road that they consider a highway.)

Reducing the speed limit through the village would also eliminate the need for a traffic light (or lights), something that is viewed negatively by most residents.

36. RECOMMENDED: That as many of the following "traffic calming" measures as possible be implemented in Ganges:

- painting slow-down stripes at village boundaries to alert drivers to the posted lower speed and the necessity to drive more cautiously
- creating "traffic knuckles" (similar to those used at the current Video Ranch location) at all key crosswalks and other locations where slowing down or directing traffic flow is desirable
- planting fast-growth boulevard trees that will "crowd" the street without impeding traffic
- increasing the use of pavers or other alternative materials to highlight crosswalks
- ensuring that white crosswalk stripes are repainted regularly so that they may be easily seen

37. RECOMMENDED: That a new crosswalk be located on the Lower Ganges Road directly across from GVM.

RATIONALE: There are many seniors, in particular, who take their lives in their hands crossing Lower Ganges



Road at this point. A crosswalk here is essential.

38. RECOMMENDED: That traffic knuckles or other such devices be constructed on Fulford-Ganges Road where it intersects with Lower Ganges Road.

RATIONALE: As there is no obvious narrowing of the Fulford Ganges Road at this point, visitors entering Ganges from the south have little indication that the main traffic artery through town swings to the left. This not only causes confusion and unnecessary traffic in this already congested part of town but also reduces the safety of pedestrians. We recognize that the road markings at this intersection are meant to direct traffic. However, these are largely ignored.

39. RECOMMENDED: That consideration be given to the closure of Fulford Ganges Road from the intersection of Lower Ganges Road to Purvis Road from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on days when the market is open. One lane for emergency traffic and for access to the boat launch would have to be kept open.

RATIONALE: This closure would increase the pedestrian friendliness of the village on busy weekends, giving pedestrians easy access to and from Centennial Park and shopping areas on the south side of Fulford Ganges Road. It would also allow for the expansion of the market onto the roadway should this be wished. When, and if, the proposed village square (see recommendation 76) is developed, this closure would be even more desirable as it would link the town square with Centennial Park.

40. RECOMMENDED: That the width of commercial streets with parking permitted on both sides should be limited to 36 feet. Residential streets, even those with parking on both sides, should not be wider than 30 feet.

RATIONALE: The pedestrian orientation of the village is dependent on narrow-width streets and slow-moving traffic. It is hoped that the Trust will continue to work with MOTH to develop an acceptable set of geometric standards for all roads and streets on SSI in keeping with the island character and lifestyle.

## THE ALTERNATE ROUTE

41. RECOMMENDED: That the completion of the proposed alternate route, extending from the Fulford-Ganges Road via Charlesworth to Atkins Road, be expedited as quickly as possible.

RATIONALE: Past studies and recent public meetings have enthusiastically endorsed the concept and proposed location of an alternate route (often referred to as "the bypass") skirting the village. There are a number of reasons for this including:

- increased pedestrian and vehicular safety in the village
- more effective emergency services with no need to drive through Ganges
- reduced danger of a runaway truck disaster
- improved flow of north-south island traffic
- the possibility of avoiding problems of ice and snow on Ganges hill
- the lowering of speed limits and other MOTH requirements on the main route through the village, as this would no longer be considered a highway (This assumes that MOTH may not agree to reducing current speed limits - see recommendation 35.)

42. RECOMMENDED: That some form of density adjustment (e.g., increasing the number of lots possible in a subdivision) be granted to landowners at time of development to expedite the construction of the alternate route, contingent on the developer paying the construction costs for the portion of the alternate route that passes through his or her property.

RATIONALE: As we believe that there is widespread support for the proposed alternate route, and as it will have significant positive impact on and ramifications for the village in particular, special effort must be made to complete it as soon as possible. As MOTH has indicated that no public funds will be available for construction of the alternate route, density adjustment may be the only means of ensuring that this road will ever be completed.

However, in the unlikely event that government funding becomes available for road construction, this would be preferable to granting density adjustment.

43. RECOMMENDED: That the granting of density adjustments to expedite construction of the alternate route not be considered as a precedent for any other road development on the island.

RATIONALE: The construction of the alternate route should be considered a special case based on the needs and desires of the community as a whole.

44. RECOMMENDED: That a study be made of an extension to the proposed alternate route from the corner of Atkins Road and Lower Ganges Road to Long Harbour Road, and that no additional development take place along this tentative route until such time as the study has been completed.

RATIONALE: The future construction of this extension to the proposed alternate route would further facilitate north-south traffic, traffic from the Long Harbour to Vesuvius ferries, and the movement of emergency services (e.g., fire, police, ambulance). Note that access to the hospital would also be improved with this extension.

45. RECOMMENDED: That a number of streets leading to Ganges's core extend to the alternate route, thus sharing the load of traffic entering the village.

RATIONALE: In keeping with the small town feeling, we do not wish to see only one or two streets becoming major traffic arteries into the village.

## PUBLIC PATHWAY SYSTEM

46. RECOMMENDED: That emphasis be placed on the development of a public pathway system throughout the entire Ganges-Upper Ganges area.

RATIONALE: Although there is already commitment to such a system, little progress appears to have been made. Certainly the development of a public pathway system is one way of making the village safer and more convenient for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as reducing the temptation to drive from parking space to parking space.

47. RECOMMENDED: That the proposed "linear park" be renamed "the public pathway system" and the paths themselves "public paths."

RATIONALE: Although the term *linear park* is generally understood by planners, it has little or no meaning for most of the general public, who, reasonably enough, expect something with the word "park" to be just that, a park. Public awareness of the proposed system will help to hasten its construction and ultimate use.

48. RECOMMENDED: That the pathway system be designed to connect all of the key components of the village including Mouat Park, the schools, the upper village, the village core, and proposed satellite parking areas.

RATIONALE: Easy pedestrian access to all parts of the village is essential if people are being asked to limit their use of automobiles within the village area.

49. RECOMMENDED: That, as in the existing OCP, land dedication for sections of the pathway system be tied to the issuance of development permits. Further, that the developer, whenever reasonable, be required to construct or cover the costs of construction of that section of the system.

RATIONALE: As public funds for purposes such as a public pathway system are becoming ever scarcer, this appears to be an effective way of obtaining the necessary land and covering construction costs.

50. RECOMMENDED: That some effort be made to obtain voluntary land dedication from current owners of land on the proposed system.

RATIONALE: Some current landowners are supportive of the public paths concept and may be prepared to dedicate land for this purpose. Rather than waiting for the future development of each property, the completion of the system would be facilitated greatly by voluntary dedication of land.

51. RECOMMENDED: On completion of significant sections of the pathway system, every effort should be made to inform the public, both residents and visitors, as to the existence and location of these paths, for example, by including them on the map of Ganges in The Gulf Islander tourist guide. Standardized "Public Path" signs should be constructed on all intersections of paths and off-street parking lots and sidewalks or walkways along public streets. (See also recommendation 57.)

RATIONALE: Public pathways are really of no value unless they are used. The use of the paths by many people would also increase the public's sense of safety on these paths.

52. RECOMMENDED: That the construction standards of the system be such that the paths can be used by both pedestrians and cyclists and that the pathways be sufficiently wide for both uses. If these criteria cannot be met, it is recommended that the pathways be for the use of pedestrians only, and so signed.

RATIONALE: It is almost inevitable that cyclists will make use of the system, thus it makes sense to allow for this at time of construction rather than to make after-the-fact repairs or adjustments. However, if the pathways are not sufficiently wide, pedestrians - particularly children and the elderly - will not be able to use them safely.

53. RECOMMENDED: That the seawalk be considered an integral part of the pathway system.

RATIONALE: This is already the case. However, this idea must not be lost. (See also recommendation 99 regarding the seawalk.)

54. RECOMMENDED: That a number of the previously developed Island Trust recommendations be adopted including:

- No parking stalls that obstruct travelled portions of roads be permitted.
- No parking stalls be permitted where they necessitate a vehicle to back into an intersection, crosswalk, or walkway.
- That a strategy be developed for the construction and maintenance of sidewalks, including landscaping, and that this be given high priority.

RATIONALE: The intent of these recommendations is to improve the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

#### CYCLISTS

55. RECOMMENDED: That efforts be made to make Ganges more "cyclist friendly."

RATIONALE: There have already been a number of accidents involving cyclists on the main route through Ganges, and only sheer luck has prevented a major tragedy. The proposed lowering of the speed limit through Ganges (see recommendation 35) would help improve the safety of cyclists, but even more needs to be done. It makes sense to encourage cycling, a non-polluting form of transportation, both for residents and for the estimated 150,000 to 200,000 tourists who come to our island each summer, many of whom bring their bicycles. Cycling should be promoted to reduce pressure on our already congested road and ferry systems. Increasing the ease and safety of cycling in Ganges would help this goal.

56. RECOMMENDED: That a cycle lane be delineated on the main route through the village (on Lower Ganges Road and Fulford-Ganges Road) and on other roads in Ganges where the road is sufficiently wide to do so.

RATIONALE: The main road through the village is the most hazardous part of the island for cyclists. Clearly delineated lanes would help reduce the potential for accidents.

57. RECOMMENDED: That proposed signage for public paths include a bicycle symbol if bicycles are to be allowed on these pathways. (See recommendation 52.)

RATIONALE: If the public pathway system is to be designed for cyclists as well as pedestrians, all signs should include a symbol of a bicycle so that pedestrians are not offended when cyclists share the paths with them.

58. RECOMMENDED: That the posting of "no parking signs" and the ticketing of cars illegally parked in the curbside traffic lanes used by bicycles be given a much higher priority than at present.

RATIONALE: Prohibiting parking and providing cycle lanes are of little value without the enforcement of parking rules.

59. RECOMMENDED: That the provision of bicycle racks be mandatory for all new commercial development in Ganges.

RATIONALE: As we want to encourage the use of bicycles in the village, it is important that cyclists have proper places to park them. Without the provision of racks, bicycles are apt to be left helter skelter, obstructing pedestrians and traffic and damaging adjacent structures.

60. RECOMMENDED: That a bike-loan system, similar to that used in a number of communities, be instituted in Ganges. With this kind of system, a number of donated bicycles are all spray-painted the same distinctive colour (e.g., yellow) and provided for anyone's use within the village area.

RATIONALE: We believe this would be an excellent addition to Ganges, one that might be used in conjunction with satellite parking areas. We do not know what, if any, ramifications there might be to a system such as this with the introduction of mandatory helmet laws. Perhaps a helmet (no doubt sprayed the same colour as the bicycle) would have to be left with each bicycle. If it were possible to institute such a system in Ganges, we believe the bicycle use should be restricted to the village.

## PARKING

61. **RECOMMENDED:** That satellite parking areas, with no time restrictions, be provided outside the village core, and that provision of land for this purpose be identified and incorporated into the new OCP. In the short term, these parking areas should be within five minutes walking distance of the core. However, in the long term, an additional satellite parking area(s) should be located on the alternate route, in conjunction with a shuttle service to the core.

**RATIONALE:** Limited parking in Ganges appears to be a major concern of many island residents. Problems with parking are, of course, exacerbated by the influx of visitors from May to October each year. As indicated in a number of the recommendations below, much of the problem lies with long-term parkers (employees, market vendors, car-poolers, boaters, and air travellers in particular).

A two-pronged approach involving (1) long-term satellite parking areas and (2) prohibition of long-term parking within the core (see recommendation 64) would do much to alleviate parking problems.

As traffic within the core would be reduced with the provision of satellite parking lots, the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in the village would increase. Another benefit would be a more esthetically pleasing core, in which every piece of available land is not paved and covered with vehicles.

Eventually, with the completion of the alternate route, the provision of satellite parking lots, and the availability of a shuttle service, it would be possible to restrict all but pedestrian, bicycle, handicapped, and emergency traffic in the Ganges core and to greatly reduce the amount of space in the core that is now devoted to parking. Needless to say, this proposal would require strong community support.

Note that the implementation of a number of other recommendations in this report, such as those dealing with pedestrian friendliness, are necessary if the public is to accept the need for and use of satellite lots.



62. RECOMMENDED: That with the provision of satellite parking lots, the majority of the parking requirements for commercial-use developments could be fulfilled off-site at the developers' expense.

RATIONALE: Responding to parking requirements in this way would create a more compact and appealing core area, not to mention a more pedestrian-friendly village.

We are uncertain as to how this recommendation could be expedited under the current form of governance for those developments that wish to fulfil their parking requirements off-site but that require only a few spaces. Presumably developers would be responsible for the costs related to land, construction, and maintenance of the off-site parking spaces, but somebody would have to be responsible for the initial purchase of land to be used in this way. Currently, this would only be possible through the cooperative effort of Ganges business owners.

The establishment of a traffic and parking commission would presumably be possible under incorporation. This body would be responsible for such things as:

- regulating traffic flow within the village
- signage regarding traffic speeds and parking
- enforcing parking regulations
- establishing and maintaining satellite parking areas
- ensuring compliance with the design guidelines

63. RECOMMENDED: That parking lots within Ganges be limited in size to a specified number of parking spaces (e.g., 30) and be separated by buildings or green space. (Satellite parking lots by or outside the village boundary could be larger, assuming the existence of a shuttle service.) All parking lots must be well landscaped, shaded, and screened from the public by plantings or fences. A minimum ratio of landscaped area to parking area should be specified and required. (See recommendation in the landscaping subsection of the section on design guidelines.)

RATIONALE: Although recognizing the necessity for adequate parking, we wish these areas to be as visually

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

unobtrusive as possible.

64. RECOMMENDED: That all public parking within the village core be limited to a maximum of two hours from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., seven days a week, except for those parking spaces designated for the handicapped, and that this be vigorously enforced. At the same time, owners of private parking lots should be encouraged to follow the same guidelines. Some parking spaces should be even more short-term (e.g., fifteen minutes).

RATIONALE: See rationale for recommendation 61. Vigorous enforcement, particularly during the busiest months, is essential if the desired effect is to be achieved. A number of fifteen-minute spaces for those doing quick errands would also ensure more turnover of parking spaces.

65. RECOMMENDED: That all employees of Ganges businesses be required by their employers to park outside the village core, either in one of the proposed satellite parking areas, or in parking lots leased or owned by the businesses for which they work.

RATIONALE: In 1995, it is estimated that 200 employees of Ganges businesses park in Ganges each working day. As official studies document that each public parking space can have from six to nine vehicle turnarounds each day, 200 parking spaces taken up by all-day parking means limiting access to from 1200 to 1800 short-term parkers. The implementation of this recommendation would go a long way to solving the problem of limited parking availability in the village.

If recommendation 64 regarding maximum two-hour parking and strict enforcement is not accepted, then it would be up to businesses to determine an effective way of ensuring that their employees park outside the village core.

66. RECOMMENDED: That until such time as the maximum two-hour parking limit within the core area of the village is implemented and enforced, the PRC determine some way of ensuring that market vendors park outside the core after unloading their goods.

RATIONALE: As of summer 1995, there are approximately 100 market vendors in Ganges each Saturday. Using the same principle as that explained in the rationale for

the recommendation above, 100 market vendor parkers means limiting access to well over 500 short-term parkers, many of whom will be potential customers for the vendors. *Note:* We understand that the 1995 market coordinators are having considerable success in persuading vendors to park beyond the core.

67. RECOMMENDED: That a number of recommendations in the 1994 Trust Planning Department document *Ganges Pedestrian and Traffic Circulation and Parking, Final Recommendations* be adopted and included in the new OCP. These include:

- that existing off-street parking requirements should not be relaxed for new developments, renovations, or new uses of existing premises (*Note:* This assumes that some of the off-street parking requirements can be fulfilled by investment in the proposed satellite parking lots. See recommendation 61.)
- that all parking required of new developments should be in place before the issuance of temporary occupancy permits (*Note:* This would include both on-site and satellite parking.)
- that no on-street parking stalls or parking stalls on public property rights-of-way should be included in the calculation of parking requirements

68. RECOMMENDED: That the Trust and the Advisory Design Panel work with property owners of common-boundary parking areas to plan those areas cooperatively to ensure functional traffic flow and attractive landscaping that meets the standards of the design guidelines.

RATIONALE: Common parking areas, such as those behind Creekhous/Fat Rascal/Pharmasave, appear to be in constant flux. Some kind of coordination and authority is required over the planning of parking in these areas, the landscaping, and the erection of any fences and barriers between parking areas. Any changes to the initial agreed-upon plan would have to be brought back to the Advisory Design Panel.

69. RECOMMENDED: That additional landscaping be incorporated into the parking area between the post office and Mouat's. Further, that consideration be given to narrowing the vehicle aisles immediately in front of the post office to create a parking area with one-way aisles, angled parking, and additional landscaped areas with shade trees and raised planters. When and if satellite parking areas and a shuttle service are established, consideration should be given to reducing the number of parking spaces in the Mouat's/P.O. area and to using this space for more creative uses such as a market, street cafes, and so on.

RATIONALE: This large, minimally landscaped parking area in the town centre adds little to the attractiveness of the village.

70. RECOMMENDED: That every effort be made to educate the public as to the time limitations for parking and the location of long- and short-term parking areas.

RATIONALE: Public education must go hand in hand with any changes such as restricted parking times and the provision of satellite parking areas. Residents (including market vendors) and visitors must be informed through various visitor-information brochures, publicly posted maps, hand-outs illustrating long-term parking areas, and so on. Public education is essential if we are to avoid the necessity for parking meters.

71. RECOMMENDED: That tourist promotions through the Chamber of Commerce and others work toward increasing the number of visitors coming to the Island without cars (e.g., by private boat, ferry, water taxi, mini-tour bus).

RATIONALE: This would decrease the pressure on island infrastructure (e.g., roads, parking provisions), particularly in congested Ganges. Certainly, an island-wide bus service would help persuade visitors (residents too!) to leave their cars at home.

72. RECOMMENDED: That some sort of official body be created to ensure a greater degree of control over parking and over vehicular and pedestrian traffic in Ganges.

RATIONALE: We are uncertain of the best method of doing

this before the island becomes incorporated or adopts some other form of government. Perhaps a Ganges Village Business Association could be formed for this purpose. It is certainly in the self-interest of each village business owner to do so.

#### HERITAGE

73. RECOMMENDED: That the Islands Trust address the protection, preservation, adaptive use, and enhancement of the heritage of Salt Spring in the new OCP.

RATIONALE: Much of the heritage of Salt Spring - buildings, roads, landscaping - has disappeared. This is particularly true in Ganges village. It is essential that remaining, much-valued heritage be preserved and protected before it is too late. Among the available resources are a number of island residents who are particularly interested in and knowledgeable about heritage preservation, the B.C. Heritage Trust (part of Municipal Government Affairs), the Salt Spring Historical Society, and books describing the successful approach taken by Sidney, B.C.

The Trust may want to establish an Advisory Heritage Panel to work with owners/developers of heritage buildings, or they may wish to incorporate more detailed heritage guidelines into the existing design guidelines.

74. RECOMMENDED: That an advisory heritage advocacy group be established as soon as possible to determine the best method of setting up a heritage and historical preservation program for the whole island (not just Ganges village). The group should include the Trustees, knowledgeable professionals, a representative of the Salt Spring Historical Society, and a cross-section of people from the general public whose opinions are valued.

RATIONALE: As above.

75. RECOMMENDED: That until such time as an advisory body is in place and an inventory of those buildings and elements worthy of protection and preservation is completed, the Trust immediately place development restrictions or a development moratorium on any

heritage buildings already referred to in the Trust publication, *Island Heritage Buildings*, (pages 47 to 92), to ensure that there is no further removal, renovation, or demolition before guidelines are developed, assuming that these can be developed within a reasonable time frame (e.g., six months).

**RATIONALE:** As above. An alternative approach might be to require immediately at least six months' notice of demolition.

### VILLAGE SQUARE

76. **RECOMMENDED:** That the property in front of the current firehall (now used as a public parking lot and fire lane) be developed as a village square - actually more like a village triangle! - when (and if) the current firehall is relocated.

**RATIONALE:** The village currently lacks a central focal point, one that visually identifies the hub of the town and that can be used as an informal gathering place and for occasional community functions. The development of an attractive public space, well landscaped with trees and shrubbery, at this key location - one of the first sights of those entering the town from the south - would have great visual appeal, be functional, and would also add considerably to the pedestrian friendliness of the village, with its juxtaposition with Centennial Park and the provision of seating. It is strongly recommended that interlocking pavers be used in this area rather than grass.

77. **RECOMMENDED:** That when (and if) the current firehall is relocated, the land currently occupied by the firehall and firehall parking should be zoned to accommodate a two-storey, multiuse, architecturally interesting new development, or a suitable renovation of, and extension to, the existing firehall with uses compatible to the town square, such as a cafe or restaurant opening into the square, the tourist infocentre, a small museum, a film theatre.

If the Shell station should move to another location, this property could be developed in a compatible style with the new building replacing the firehall (or the renovated firehall).

**RATIONALE:** As above.

THE LOOK OF THE VILLAGE  
AS REFLECTED IN THE DESIGN GUIDELINES

78. RECOMMENDED: That the design guidelines be rewritten and reillustrated to reflect the new OCP and to state more clearly the purpose of the guidelines and the overall planning philosophy.

- The wording should be much stronger (e.g., replace "would seem to have many benefits" with "has many benefits").
- The wording should be directed solely at developers (or potential developers) rather than at Trust planners, Trustees, or members of the Advisory Design Panel (e.g., current item 4.3, makes reference to "allowing height relaxations. ..." Any statements related to negotiations with developers should be for Trust use only.
- The document itself should be professionally reorganized and rewritten to ensure that intended meanings are clear and that information is easily found and retrieved.
- The illustrations should be redrawn and be extended to include photographic examples of acceptable and non-acceptable design elements and architecture. As much as possible, the positive examples provided should be of existing buildings - or elements of existing buildings - particularly those in Ganges.

RATIONALE: As most are aware, the design guidelines are to be used by anyone requiring a building development permit. Although conforming to the guidelines is not compulsory, the issuance of development permits is facilitated if the developer's plans closely follow the guidelines.

Although the current package given to developers includes a great deal of information, the organization and presentation are most confusing, and the reproduction is poor.

Although the existing guidelines emphasize traditional architecture, we are recommending a more eclectic mix. Additionally, existing sketches (e.g., on page 11 of the current guidelines) will appear to most developers of commercial establishments to be unrealistically residential in character, with, for example, small windows on the front facade. These should be adjusted



to reflect current reality - most commercial and service establishments have large windows to draw potential customers inside and to allow for more natural light.

79. RECOMMENDED: That the design guidelines be extended to apply to all non-residential developments on the island, the one exception to this being that they also apply to any multifamily developments on the island. Note: It may be necessary to modify the design guidelines slightly for out-of-Ganges development.

RATIONALE: We are most anxious to avoid any development that is not in harmony with the rural ambience. Although the appearance of individual residences must be left to each owner's discretion, this is not true of non-residential development, which is usually in public view and which, if insensitively designed, can be visually jarring. This recommended extension of the application of the design guidelines is particularly important as the scale (size of buildings) of non-residential and multifamily development is usually much larger than that of personal residences.

80. RECOMMENDED: That the design guidelines continue to apply to all exterior renovations for which a building permit is required. As some exterior changes fall outside this category (e.g., painting an existing building), some way should be found to ensure that the design guidelines also apply in these situations.

RATIONALE: The extension of the design guidelines to renovations, for which no building permit is required, is essential if we are to get and retain "the island look" we desire. The current owners of commercial and multifamily buildings should be made aware of the existence of the guidelines, so that they do not make any exterior renovation that will have impact on the look of the village without first ensuring that they conform to the guidelines.

81. RECOMMENDED: That, as now, the design guidelines be given to all developers requesting development permit information, and that the Trust make every effort to obtain compliance with the guidelines before granting a development permit and before granting an occupancy permit.

RATIONALE: Compliance with the design guidelines is

necessary if Ganges is to retain the "island look" wished by most residents.

82. RECOMMENDED: That a clear mandate be given to the Advisory Design Panel that clarifies its responsibilities and appropriate communication channels.

RATIONALE: We understand that members of the design panel have, on occasion, communicated directly with tradespersons employed by developers. We believe that any communication should be directly between the developer (or his or her designated representative) and the Trust and that this should be made clear to panel members.

83. RECOMMENDED: That conflict of interest with panel members be avoided by disallowing any involvement of a panel member regarding a project for which he or she has submitted, or proposes to submit, a tender.

RATIONALE: The panel must be seen to be scrupulously fair or its credibility is greatly reduced.

#### HARBOUR VIEWS AND WATER ACCESS

84. RECOMMENDED: That development and any associated landscaping in Ganges maximize harbour views and access to the waterfront by:

- making the most of public water views when siting new developments or making additions to existing buildings
- protecting all existing sea views through careful planning
- prohibiting any development that diminishes harbour or seascape views
- orienting all commercial buildings that front the water toward the harbour through such means as the placement of windows and patios, the provision of roof-top decks overlooking the sea
- providing public waterfront views and access by

pathways between buildings

providing public seating by the waterfront

- retaining all docks, wharves, and buildings with character that are located on the waterfront
- encouraging a mix of views from different sites and levels

**RATIONALE:** The waterfront and the harbour are the essence of Ganges unique character, and must be preserved and enhanced for the pleasure of residents and visitors alike.

### STREETSCAPE AND BUILDING DESIGN

**85. RECOMMENDED:** That the design guidelines encourage a mix of traditional and west coast contemporary architecture that is compatible with the character and historic appeal of the village. In building design, compatibility with neighbouring buildings rather than conformity should be emphasized. Further:

- Simple, clean lines should be used for new developments and renovations, reflecting historical building shapes, such as the traditional "salt box" design.
- An eclectic mix can be achieved by combining simple elements and adding interesting accents and colour.
- Buildings should be modest in scale (see also recommendation 17) and sited very close to the street with varied setbacks.
- The width of buildings should not be greater than 2.5 times the height, and larger buildings should be sited in such a way that their narrowest dimensions parallel the street.
- Where appropriate, buildings should be connected with arbours, courtyards, and pathways.
- Where appropriate, adjacent buildings should have common roof lines.
- Underground wiring for all purposes should be mandatory.

- The use of irregular shapes for buildings in encouraged.

**RATIONALE:** Ganges could lose its unique and charming character if developments are not carefully designed within the context of an overall plan for the town.

Development in the past few years has led to what someone at one of the Trust's public meetings referred to as "creeping sterility," with much similarity in the design of some of the larger developments (e.g., Grace Point Square, Creekhuse). And some areas of the village - those around GVM - include the same kind of commercial strips that we wish to avoid. Carefully thought-out and communicated guidelines will help preserve and enhance the look we wish to achieve.

Note that the width of Ganges's streets are already well over the suggested maximums suggested in references we have read (see recommendation 40). Thus setbacks should be minimal to obtain the compact village we wish.

#### BUILDING ELEMENTS INCLUDING MATERIALS

86. **RECOMMENDED:** That the design guidelines continue to specify appropriate building elements, including materials that are in keeping with the island look desired by most residents, and, whenever it is useful, note inappropriate elements and materials.

These include:

##### Exterior Walls

- materials/colours: wooden shakes/shingles/siding/ (horizontal, vertical, board and batten, clapboard, barnwood) or modern alternatives; limited areas of plaster (white and earth tones only); stone; no vinyl siding, stucco, bricks, or concrete blocks (except for brownish, heavily textured concrete blocks for firewalls - no greys)

##### Roofs

- materials/colours: cedar shakes/shingles or fibreglass or asphalt imitations; copper or traditional-style corrugated steel in colours that conform to the recommended colour palette (e.g., red, green, brown, and earth tones; no blue, turquoise)

- traditional roof styles (minimum pitch 7:12): hip, barn, gabled, dormer, and extended gables, no mono-pitched or flat
- use of skylights is encouraged, as is the use of wide overhangs to cover walkways (though not so low and wide as to create dark interiors)
- all roof-top mechanical equipment (e.g., satellite dishes, air conditioning) must be screened.

#### Windows

- materials: wood or metal with baked-on finish in colours that harmonize with the building and conform with the recommended colour palette; no vinyl or uncoated metal
- to be in a scale and proportion that is visually balanced with the building design
- extensive use of mullions and transoms, corner windows, bay windows, dormer windows (no large expanses of glass unless softened by mullioned windows above or to the sides); windows that open; windows that are large enough to allow sufficient natural light into the interiors
- generous detail on surrounds, sills

#### Awnings/Canopies

- materials: good quality canvas or low-shine vinyl fabric in solid colours or stripes (no floral prints), wood (as for a trellis or arbour); no metal, vinyl (other than fabric), or corrugated fibreglass

#### Covered Sidewalks

- materials: same as for roofing
- wherever possible, covered sidewalks should be incorporated into the building design

#### Doors

- materials/ colours: wood or wood and glass (e.g., wood with glass sidelights and/or glass transoms, carved wood) or metal with baked on finish in colours that conform to the recommended colour

- palette; no all-glass or uncoated metal
- accent features, such as distinctive hardware, are encouraged
- main entrances need not be located on the front facades of buildings but could instead be at the sides, or corners, or recessed

#### Railings/Porches/Balconies/Decks

- materials: wood or wood and safety glass (where views would be obstructed); no wrought iron
- the use of porches, balconies, and decks is encouraged to connect buildings to the street and to the community

**RATIONALE:** As mentioned previously, the design guidelines should be as specific as possible so that developers have clear knowledge of our expectations and so that we get the kind of developments that will enhance the appeal, character, and function of the village.

#### COLOUR

No recommendation regarding the use of colour is included in this report as words describing colours mean little without accompanying colour chips. As the effective use of colour in the village is vital to the island look we wish to achieve, it is the intent of the Ganges Village Focus Group's subcommittee that is dealing with "the look of Ganges" to submit at a later date a colour palette of recommended colours and applications (e.g., for walls, trim, doors). Although earth tones will continue to be suggested, the recommended colour palette will be broadened to include other compatible colours.

#### SIGNAGE

**87. RECOMMENDED:** That there be a diversity of signage within the village to prevent a drab institutional look. Commercial and informational signage should be:

- in keeping with the scale and architecture of the village

- creative, in either a contemporary or heritage style, either free-standing or attached flat against or projecting from the adjacent building (only limited use of roof signs)
- imaginative and handcrafted of materials such as stained, painted, and/or carved wood, metal, stone, etched or sand-blasted glass, and stained glass (no billboards or moving/flashing/audible/backlit/plastic/neon signs)
- limited in location and distribution to ensure safety (e.g., no sandwich-board signs that obstruct pedestrian or vehicular traffic) and to prevent visual clutter
- lit, if desired, by floodlighting

88. RECOMMENDED: That standardized informational signs using the above criteria be provided at suitable locations. This signage should include maps showing public parking, public washrooms, the public pathway system including the seawalk, boat launch areas, and so on. See also recommendation 51 regarding signage for public paths.)

*Note:* Directional signs to commercial establishments (shops, restaurants, etc.) on the same street should be clustered, perhaps on a single pole or stand (as in European-style signposts).

#### LIGHTING

89. RECOMMENDED: That relatively vandal-proof and aesthetically pleasing lighting in Ganges should be provided where necessary for safety and to make Ganges an attractive and inviting place at night. Lighting should also be:

- of low intensity and on low lamp standards or, wherever possible, on the fronts and sides of village buildings
- in keeping with the scale and style of the village and village architecture.
- consistent along the seawalk

**RATIONALE:** Village lighting should be compatible with and complementary to all other village features including buildings, landscaping, pathways, and so on.

### LANDSCAPING

**90. RECOMMENDED:** That, as now, creative, detailed landscaping plans be included in the plan for any new development or renovation submitted to the Advisory Design Panel. This landscaping should:

- as much as possible, preserve and enhance existing landscape features that are of aesthetic or ecological value, including not only growing things such as mature trees but such natural features as rock formations, streams, and so on
- blend with existing and neighbouring landscaping
- not obstruct ocean views
- use indigenous plants and trees
- be contained, where necessary, in raised and curbed beds and planters
- be used to maximize the visual pleasure of any area in the village, however small, that is not built on or paved
- be used to create "vest pocket parks" and small gathering places
- be used for mandatory screening of refuse containers and service areas
- be incorporated in parking lots through the use of shade trees and landscaping buffers to screen the parking lots from the street with a, to be determined, ratio of landscaping to paved areas (see also recommendation 63)
- be used to soften corners, screen visual eyesores, accent building features, guide pedestrian traffic, slow vehicular traffic (see recommendation 36), and add to the general attractiveness of the development - and the village
- include the use of arbours and trellises, where appropriate, to create shade, enclose small



resting areas, cover walkways, and enhance buildings, porches, and entranceways (arbours and trellises should be constructed of painted or stained wood, not of concrete, metal, or plastic - and planted with climbing ivy and vines)

- for pathways, patios, decks, refuse enclosures, and so on, use natural materials as much as possible (wood, flush flagstone and brick, gravel) and interlocking pavers rather than concrete paving
- be informal in design (e.g., using meandering rather than grid-like pathways and plantings)
- include attractively designed and well-located street furniture, fences, and planters
- follow professional landscapers' guidelines regarding suitable low maintenance plants, shrubs, trees, and so on (The use of indigenous plants and trees is encouraged.)
- include the use of raised edges along sidewalks and pathways to prevent the spill of mulch or earth on the walkways

**RATIONALE:** Richly detailed landscaping is a crucial factor in the appearance of any town, softening its buildings and paved areas, screening parking, lending shade to resting places, and helping to create an attractive, welcoming, and casual ambience. As development in Ganges takes place, we want to ensure that its existing landscaping is retained, and even improved, and that new landscaping be given high priority.

## VILLAGE AMENITIES

91. RECOMMENDED: That street furniture, such as seating benches, be well-designed; in character with surrounding buildings and "the village look"; use natural all-season materials such as wood with aggregate concrete supports; be built with permanence and vandal-proofing in mind; and as much as possible be locally constructed.

92. RECOMMENDED: That many more waste receptacles and recycling bins for public use be placed throughout the village, particularly by benches, take-out food outlets, parks, the seawalk, marinas. These should be simple, non-obtrusive, and functional in design and as much as possible be locally constructed.

93. RECOMMENDED: That more public restroom facilities be constructed within the village, perhaps in conjunction with the recommended public parking areas. All public restrooms should include facilities for the handicapped.

RATIONALE FOR AMENITIES RECOMMENDATIONS: A number of factors other than layout, buildings, and landscaping help create a functional and attractive village. As long as SSI remains unincorporated, there is no body to administer the purchase, construction, or maintenance of these amenities. Some sort of a "body" should be formed to assume these responsibilities.

## HARBOUR

94. RECOMMENDED: That, since the environmental health of the harbour is absolutely vital, someone be responsible for monitoring the environmental aspects of harbour activities and for notifying the appropriate authorities of violations.

RATIONALE: The quality of water between Moby's and Grace Point is not adequate for the storage of live crabs for commercial sale. Every effort should be made to improve the water quality in this important part of the harbour. Note: It is believed that the level of environmental monitoring and enforcement on the island generally (e.g., septic bed effluent quality) needs improvement and this recommendation should be viewed in

this wider context.

95. RECOMMENDED: That Ganges harbour continue to develop as an active "working" harbour in which a variety of recreational and traditional maritime commercial and light industrial activities that do not degrade the environment are permitted to occur.

RATIONALE: This is an important issue since it affects subsequent recommendations. The terms "commercial" and "industrial" sometimes mean different things to different people. Here "commercial" and "light industrial" activities refer to those activities that are of value to the community and that do not pollute the environment by noise, chemical, or atmospheric discharges, etc. It is true that all activity has the potential to affect the environment to some extent so that everyone using the harbour will have to be more careful in this respect in the future than they have in the past.

96. RECOMMENDED: That the discharge of sewage wastes from boats into the ocean be prohibited in Ganges harbour and around the island generally to the full extent permitted by provincial and federal legislation. The Islands Trust should adopt a pro-active position on this matter.

RATIONALE: As discussed in Appendix A, the discharge of sewage waste comes under The Canada Shipping Act of Transport Canada. To implement this recommendation the local waters have to be included in Transport Canada's "Pleasure Craft Pollution Prevention Schedule."

All boats entering designated waters would be required to have holding tanks or approved self-contained waste treatment devices. (U.S. federal legislation prohibits sewage discharge within three miles from shore.)

97. RECOMMENDED: That a sewage pumpout facility (or facilities) be provided in the harbour for boat wastes.

RATIONALE: The discussion given in Appendix A indicates that the provincial government is also studying this possibility. If pump-out facilities are provided, regulations will be required concerning the maximum length of stay at docks and marinas to avoid creating long-term live-aboard communities.

If provincial grants become available to municipalities for this purpose then they must be claimed on an equal basis by the I.T. for Salt Spring Island.

Sewage from recreational vehicles is similar to that from boats in that it may contain chemicals that could affect the efficiency of septic tanks at local resorts. It is therefore suggested that provision of a dumping station for recreational vehicles also be considered. This suggestion, however, should not be construed as wishing to encourage more RVs to the island.

98. RECOMMENDED: That the Liquid Waste Management Committee, or some other appropriate body, be asked to liaise with the provincial government to determine how boat sewage can best be treated and to provide recommendations as to the type, size, and location of the required treatment facility.

RATIONALE: Sewage from boats and recreational vehicles can contain chemicals used to reduce odour. Such wastes cannot be treated at the present Ganges treatment facility mainly because it is too small an operation to accept any significant quantity of chemicals that could kill off the bacteria necessary for their process. Professional advice is required on this matter.

99. RECOMMENDED: That the current proposal to change the operating conditions of the Ganges sewage treatment plant be limited to what is described in Appendix A as Stage 3 and provided that a comprehensive testing program is undertaken to monitor the degree of contamination of the bottom sediments and the surface micro-layer as well as to test for other possible pathogens. It is further recommended that the whole question of sewage treatment for Ganges be reviewed in the light of the results of this testing and the recommendation to provide treatment for boat and RV wastes.

RATIONALE: The rationale for this recommendation is given in Appendix A. It is also possible that advantage can be taken of new technologies, currently being developed, to achieve higher efficiencies in future treatment plants.

100. RECOMMENDED: That provision be made in the OCP to reserve land for future sewage treatment facilities.

RATIONALE: This provision is a natural consequence of the preceding discussions.

101. RECOMMENDED: That the seawalk:

- be considered an integral part of the public pathway (linear park) system (see recommendation 53)
- should be completed by connecting its different sections to a small section of the Lower Ganges Road (access being gained through easements along the property lines of agreeable landholders) and by withholding development rights along any portion of the foreshore until affected owners incorporate it into their developments
- portion in front of Grace Point be extended to the end of the rock breakwater

RATIONALE: The concept of the seawalk is enthusiastically endorsed by almost all islanders and visitors, and the failure to complete its construction has been a matter of - to say the least - great frustration. Some solution, even though not ideal, must be found. (See also recommendation 102 below.)

102. RECOMMENDED: That upzoning to commercial of the land adjacent to the harbour at the intersection of Upper and Lower Ganges Roads be favourably considered provided that development plans include an extension of the seawalk along that part of the inner harbour.

RATIONALE: An extension of the seawalk to Moby's and the marina at the north end of the harbour is not only desirable from an aesthetic point of view, but would also reduce the current danger to pedestrians who now have to walk beside one of the busiest roads on Salt Spring if they wish to go from/to the village core to Moby's or beyond.

103. RECOMMENDED: That an official harbour plan be developed to improve the use and operational safety of the harbour. It is further recommended that someone be given the necessary authority and responsibility to ensure compliance with the plan.

RATIONALE: This plan would include, among other items, taxi-ways for floatplanes and would show specified

mooring areas for visiting boats. Visiting boats wishing to anchor in the harbour would be required to moor in these specified areas.

It is understood that Ganges is not an official harbour and therefore cannot have a designated harbour master to coordinate its operation. However someone, regardless of title, should have this authority and responsibility.

Since the inner harbour area is, in a sense, an airport, it is also recommended that the harbour plan be used to regulate the speed and operation of all boat traffic in this area.

It is suggested that the I.T. should point out and emphasize the need to regulate the safety, noise, and environmental concerns of the harbour to the federal authorities and ask for their assistance to set up some management structure within the federal marine regulations.

104. RECOMMENDED: That existing legislation regarding the prohibition against dumping fill into the harbour below the high tide level be vigorously enforced.

RATIONALE: Existing federal legislation prohibits such dumping. It is believed that construction activities in the harbour should be more closely monitored. (Refer to recommendation 94). In no way should the benefits of non-compliance outweigh the penalties. It is further recommended that, in the event that any further development be allowed to extend over the water at high tide, such construction be supported on piles rather than on fill.

105. RECOMMENDED: That existing legislation regarding dredging in the harbour be vigorously enforced. (Refer to recommendation 94). If such approval is given, then requirements for containment devices to prevent contamination of the surrounding water should be enforced.

RATIONALE: As indicated in recommendation 104, there is a need to monitor these activities more closely. It is common practice in other jurisdictions to use plastic curtains to contain the "dirty" water from the rest of the area. Such techniques or other variations should be used as a matter of course.

Bestihsqz 4022 2112 222 2222222222 222 2222-1222

106. RECOMMENDED: That clear guidelines be posted and widely distributed for the containment of toxic wastes and fuel spills at marinas, sailing clubs, and so on, and a program developed to ensure that the boating public is continually made aware of these requirements.

While voluntary compliance is the main objective, some form of enforcement and regular monitoring should also be carried out.

RATIONALE: The intent here is to prevent continuing low levels of contamination from washing, painting, and repairing on tide grids, docks, marina yards, as well as minor spills from fuel docks. An ongoing program of education and official enforcement is required. It is imperative that someone be given the authority and responsibility to manage this program. Local stores should be strongly encouraged to stock only environmentally friendly marine products.

107. RECOMMENDED: That provision be made for disposing of conventional garbage as well as toxic wastes at Fishermen's Dock for the use of the boating public.

RATIONALE: A need was identified at all marinas to provide some form of garbage disposal at dockside. No doubt any such facility would be subject to misuse, but it is believed that the benefits would outweigh nuisance costs. Hopefully, some type of charge system, such as coin-operated dumpsters, could be put in place to offset costs.

108. RECOMMENDED: That dinghy docks be provided for boats at anchor in the harbour.

RATIONALE: There is a lack of such facilities at present.

109. RECOMMENDED: That a safe anchorage area in Ganges Harbour be established for a limited number of environmentally acceptable commercial vessels owned by or providing a service to islanders.

RATIONALE: This topic is known to be controversial and the Island Trust has delayed consideration of this problem until the OCP review is completed.

Given the strong support for Ganges to be a "working harbour," it follows that a safe anchorage area for

vessels providing a service to the community should be provided. Two areas can be considered, namely Burgoyne Bay and Ganges harbour.

The area immediately south of the SSI Sailing club is the preferred anchorage location for the crab storage barge since the water there is clean and has good flushing action. This use should be permitted.

Ideally, anchoring in this area should be limited (see the recommendation above). However, as the anchoring of boats is a right under the Navigable Waters Act, the Islands Trust can only use zoning to regulate uses. It is recommended then that this area be zoned to limit its use to the storage of live seafood and anchoring of vessels owned by the adjacent property owners. Although we believe in extending this right to others (see the recommendation), we have been unable to identify a legally acceptable strategy.

Burgoyne Bay could be used for the long-term mooring of such commercial vessels and barges as pile-driving barges, but is not generally convenient for vessels and barges in active use.

Decisions on this question may depend also on recommendations to be made by the Environmental Focus Group regarding the protection of sensitive areas. Proposals to identify, protect, and preserve environmentally sensitive marine areas are strongly supported.

110. RECOMMENDED: That shoreline areas that are subject to significant erosion be identified and a specific process established, involving the appropriate government departments, for the approval, prior to construction, of any erosion control measures.

RATIONALE: The shoreline between Walter Spit and Grace Point is composed of interbedded sands and clay and is therefore subject to erosion from groundwater seepage effects and wave action. In this particular area the main cause of erosion appears to be the effects of groundwater seepage.

The design of protective rock filter drains at the shoreline to properly control groundwater seepage to prevent erosion is a complicated problem, which if not properly done can easily aggravate the condition. Such measures require professional engineering design and approval by the appropriate government bodies. Under no



circumstances should approval be given by unqualified personnel.

Currently, approval is not required for any construction above the high tide line. However, since reflected wave energy can contribute to beach erosion, approval should be required for any structure that can be reached by storm wave action.

111. RECOMMENDED: That a wake control zone be established from Grace Point to Walter Bay Spit.

RATIONALE: Given the soil conditions which exist along the shoreline at this location and the exposure of the SSI Sailing Club to wave action it seems reasonable to make this recommendation. The distance involved is approximately one mile which can be covered in 10 minutes at 6 knots or in 2.5 minutes at 24 knots. A 7.5 minute difference should not represent a significant delay to most boat operators. It is emphasized that wake size is the important factor and not speed, even though legislation usually refers to speed control.

112: RECOMMENDED: That Ganges not be designated as a Port of Entry.

RATIONALE: With the recent streamlining of customs clearance through a phone-approval system, this recommendation may be irrelevant. It also seems probable that no federal funding would be available for this proposal. However, in the event that this issue is raised in the future, it is believed that it has not yet been demonstrated that the anticipated economic benefits outweigh the potential environmental risks.

In 1994 approximately 8000 vessels and 400 aircraft cleared customs at Bedwell Harbour and the totals for Bedwell, Sidney, and Nanaimo were about three times that number. Approximately 12,000 vessels visited Ganges in the same period. It seems likely therefore that a significant number of vessels which cleared customs at Bedwell continued on to Ganges, although no data has been quoted on this. If this were the case there would be little additional economic benefit for Ganges in being a Port of Entry.

With Ganges Harbour as a port of entry, there would likely be some increase in air traffic, which would aggravate an already busy situation.

113. RECOMMENDED: That provision be made in the OCP for the eventual relocation of the bulk material handling facility from Ganges harbour.

RATIONALE: Given the relatively low frequency of occurrence of this activity this is not seen as a major problem at present, particularly when the use is arranged to occur at non-business hours and if it could be further restricted during July and August. However, future growth will make it advisable to move this facility from Ganges village.

A new off-loading location would not require much preparation. All that is required is deep water access to a reasonably good roadway. The Ganges location does have the advantage of a short haul to the concrete batch plant. Other locations would probably result in more truck traffic on the highway and higher transport costs for users. Consideration could be given to developing a bulk handling facility at Burgoyne Bay, particularly for south end users.

114. RECOMMENDED: That all commercial float planes be required to use three-bladed propellers to reduce noise during take-off.

RATIONALE: Current noise abatement procedures during take-off seem to work quite well to restrict the duration of high noise levels, but further reduction is desirable. It is understood that the cost per plane for this propeller change would not be unduly expensive.

115. RECOMMENDED: That the IT/CRD take more active roles in ensuring the provision of oil-skimming devices where required to prevent oil contamination in storm water drain runoff.

RATIONALE: The installation of such devices has been required at some locations by provincial agencies. However, it is believed that an increased awareness of the importance of such devices is needed.

116. RECOMMENDED: That at least one additional boat launch ramp be provided somewhere other than Ganges inner harbour.

RATIONALE: An additional boat launching site (or sites) with space to park trailers and vehicles is badly needed for boats from 12 to 20 feet long. If only one

is to be constructed, it is most needed on the west side of the island.

This facility should be limited to day use only (no long-term parking). Boat cleaning, repair, and maintenance should be prohibited.

The Grace Point launching site is satisfactory, but the adjacent parking is inadequate. The use of satellite parking in Ganges would be inconvenient. Moby's launching site also has very limited parking and has tide constraints with larger boats. The Long Harbour ramp is difficult to use and also has a very small parking area.

All other launching sites shown on the SSI map are either non-existent or too shallow to be useful. Further study is required to determine a suitable location outside of Ganges inner harbour.

117. RECOMMENDED: That the Island Trust pursue the possibility of securing one or more of the islands in Ganges harbour for a marine park.

RATIONALE: A recent provincial government announcement indicated that funds are to be available to purchase land for parks. The Trust should endeavour to take advantage of this proposal, as well as any other possible means such as benefactors to preserve these islands as a public asset.

APPENDIX: NOTES ON TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF SEWAGE  
WASTE

(A) GENERAL

The following notes are based on the references listed below. Much of the text has been taken directly from these publications.

1. *The Shared Marine Waters of British Columbia and Washington, Report to the British Columbia/Washington Marine Science Panel, Aug. 1994.*
2. *Managing Wastewater in Coastal Urban Areas, N.R.C. (USA), April, 1993.*
3. Save Georgia Strait Alliance, Private Communication, Jan. 30, 1995. (Beyond the Border: Environmental Management in British Columbia and Washington).

One of the principal objectives of the B.C./Washington Marine Science Panel report was to determine which types of human activities, e.g., discharges or spills of toxic compounds, nutrients, pathogens, physical land modification, etc. need the most management protection.

In assessing the relative importance of these influences, it was necessary to attempt to evaluate both the probability that harm to the environment would occur and the amount and seriousness of the harm that may result. A key factor considered in assessing the seriousness of the harm was whether the damage was permanent and irreversible or whether it was such that, given time, the environment would eventually recover.

Their recommendations, in order of importance, based on their perceived reversibility of harm, were:

1. Prevent estuarine habitat loss since once lost it is usually lost forever.
2. Establish marine protected areas to be set aside from most, or all, human activities.
3. Protect marine animals and plants - primarily by curtailing the harvest of declining species.
4. Prevent large water diversions which have severe adverse estuarine effects.
5. Prevent toxic chemical discharges into the marine

environment from both point and non-point sources.

6. Prevent large oil spills. The surprisingly low evaluation given to this impact was largely due to the belief that although the environmental harm from this cause could be very great in the short term (20 years) most components of the eco-system would be expected to recover in the long term.

With regard to sewage waste disposal, the report determined that due to the excellent mixing characteristics of most parts of the shared waters (between Vancouver, Seattle, and Victoria) the contaminants from this source do little harm to the environment except in local cases where effluent is discharged directly into areas of poor flushing and mixing ability. The report was essentially of the view that funds spent on sewage treatment should be decided on a site-specific basis and that in many areas, such as Victoria, it was not necessary to commit large resources to their management.

Having said that, however, the report went on to say that caution is required and more monitoring should be done, since gaps remain in the knowledge of processes, such as the impact of viruses and pathogens on human and marine life and the importance of the sea-surface micro-layer as a source of contamination.

*Managing Wastewater in Coastal Areas* notes that while concentrations of coliform bacteria higher than conventional standards indicate unacceptably high risk of exposure to human bacteria, those below the standard do not reliably predict safe levels of pathogens. In other words, coliform counts should not be the sole criterion used to assess effluent quality.

In the case of the Ganges Sewage Treatment Plant facility, the proposed operational changes (see addendum attached) seem very alarming at first sight, but their oceanographic studies show that, given the current outfall location in the main channel, and the resulting good mixing in very cold water, the coliform counts everywhere, including Ganges harbour, are not expected to exceed (1/100 ml) and for swimming (200/100 ml). This argument forms the basis for the proposal to change the Discharge Permit requirements.

The studies appear to have been very competent and it may well be that the proposed changes are environmentally acceptable. However, given that coliform counts are the sole criterion used, it would

be prudent to proceed with caution and to monitor the degree of contamination of the bottom sediments and surface micro-layer before proceeding with the final phase (Step 4) of the proposal. This opinion was expressed at the public information meeting held at All Saints Anglican Church and appears to be sound advice.

Some additional comments made at the public information meeting were:

1. Heavy metals cannot be treated by this plant. They remain in the sludge which is removed to the composting site. However, so far the heavy metal content is low. The best approach is to eliminate the source.
2. Cold seawater is also effective at killing bacteria.
3. The Island Trust has no jurisdiction over regulations for runoff storm drains. Municipalities do.

#### (B) PLEASURE CRAFT DISCHARGES

The following information has been taken from Reference 3.

Regulations concerning recreational boat discharges have been in place in the U.S. since 1987. However, control relies mostly on education and voluntary compliance. Washington has stepped up efforts (1992) to fund projects to make holding tank pump-out stations more accessible in Puget Sound. B.C./Transport Canada have a Pleasure Craft Sewage Pollution Prevention Regulation (PCSPPR). A letter from Moe Sihota to Laurie McBride (April 1994) states:

1. The (PCSPPR) regulation states clearly that no craft (pleasure or commercial) shall discharge sewage into any body of water described in the regulations schedule, whether or not they have a head.
2. The provision of onshore toilets and pump-out facilities near designated water bodies and on government wharves is under consideration (April 1994).
3. The provincial and federal governments are working

together to compile information for a boater education program.

4. It is hoped that water bodies most severely impacted by pleasure craft sewage will soon be protected.
5. All municipalities in the province are required to upgrade their sewage facilities to secondary treatment.

To prohibit sewage discharge in Salt Spring waters, it seems necessary then to have these waters included in the PCSPPR schedule.

#### ADDENDUM

#### Ganges Treatment Plant Permit Changes Requested:

1. Existing Requirements
  - 5 day BOD 25 mg/l
  - Total sus. solids 25 mg/l
  - Max. flow 410 cu. m/day ebb tide only
  - Discharge quality 70 fecal organisms/100 ml
2. Proposed Requirements (Step 3)(Permit requested for step 4)
  - 5 day BOD 30/45 mg/l
  - Total sus. solids 30/45 mg/l
  - Max. flow 615 cu. m/day cont. discharge
  - Discharge quality 5000 fecal coliforms/100 ml
3. Step 4 Requirements
  - 5 day BOD 30/45 mg/l
  - Total sus. solids 30/45 mg/l
  - Max. flow 1090 cu m/day cont. discharge
  - Discharge quality 5000 fecal coliforms /100 ml

