

## **Special Meeting of Council Regarding the New OCP**

May 5, 2008

5pm- 9:30pm

Delegation from the V2A Steering Committee

Graham and Erin presented a summary of their thoughts. Paper presented with input from other steering committee members not on council (Ian and Donna)

SC would like to see more action language and less “consider” but understand the need to stay general. They recommend task groups to help implement OCP- very ambitious project. Suggest creating a diagram that shows how the SSP informs the OCP which informs the bylaws- include timeframe and other details. (5yr OCP 30 yr SSP)

Gord: How to find balance between strong action language, resources and remain flexible?

Mike: suggests keeping language general so as not to commit council to future, potentially costly actions.

Steve: Is OCP an action document?

Mike: Somewhat but based on resources and capacity.

Laurie: OCP gives general direction but terminology can be used to emphasize some issues over others. Even though it is meant to last 5 years not everything will be accomplished within 5 years. But at least we get started.

Jackie: an issue with monitoring. How can that be accomplished? It's easy to monitor some things but very difficult with most of the things listed in the OCP. Hasn't worked in the past.

Graham: There are lots of concrete suggestions in the SSP. It's the process of following up, set up what you want to measure, how it is now and how you want it to be.

Jackie: Hard to pick indicators.

Gord: very important that the SSP and the OCP are tightly coordinated. Much public consultation has gone into the V2A and SSP.

Gord (p35 sect 14) Does this mean we should be daylighting sections of lost streams?

Mike: yes- According to MoE we should be reestablishing areas for wildlife & fish especially during the freshet. We can always make our standards more stringent than the Prov rules, just never less. MoE would support any community being more environmentally proactive.

Graham: There is a group setting up spawning areas at the mouth of Murphy Creek they would be very upset if we reduced the water flow to them.

Erin: The SSP clearly indicates the community was concerned about protecting the fish population.

Jill: Are there maps that show wildlife corridors?

Mike: No, only high level maps but using other agencies we could probably piece something together or working with other groups. We need maps. Really what is needed is a biodiversity map for the whole city but that would be expensive.

Jill: That is what is missing. That is what CRD is getting at that we need baseline data. We don't have the information to make decisions on land use policies. Even general decisions are difficult.

Mike: These are huge issues: What species are out there? What do they need? What is here in remnants but is not robust? Can we bring them back? Comprehensive studies could go on forever: studies of the riparian areas that connect through corridors in the settled areas. We have covered a lot of our natural drainage too. Frogs and salamanders are the bellwethers of the health of the environment.

Larry Sect 14, Natural environment to support downstream fisheries...many CRD suggestions pertain to water quality. How many references to water do we need before it becomes redundant? It talks about flow, we've already acknowledged fish habitat. Do we need to reinforce it or is it covered adequately somewhere else? As long as it has the nuts and bolts...it becomes excessive and unwieldy.

Graham: I didn't see duplication on the fish issue but perhaps we all react to different things.

Larry: already lots of acknowledgment of water. Say what you want but if there isn't the will it won't happen.

Jill: I agree, too much redundancy and excessive policies. Cut them

Laurie: The consultant for the OCP said the format of the OCP was set up so that anyone could look at a section and see exactly what was required. They would not have to read the whole thing. Things that are important should be included in several places- Water should be included.

Larry: I went to the Miners Hall film and discussion and I really saw how a lot of people under appreciate the value of construction in the community. I am glad to see that sentence supporting the growth of local trades and jobs was added as an objective. Mike, didn't you work at over 1000 job sites when you were in construction?

Gord: Thanked Graham and Erin for presentation.  
End of delegation

Matters referred: Council discussion of OCP

Laurie suggested some word changes to conform to Prov act (approximate instead of appropriate in intro

Larry what does “approximate amount” mean in the context of growth? How many subdivisions is enough?

Mike: good question. Your OCP can speak to the pace of growth but it is best to use zoning as the mechanism.

Laurie: Demographic predictions are important to formulate plans for infrastructure needs. All projections in past have been overly optimistic. Need to be realistic. We need to make as accurate population predictions as we can then plan to meet the needs with housing and infrastructure. Need flexibility to meet the needs.

Larry: How much is enough? Do we have a quota of how many lots to develop?

Mike: On lands yet to be zoned you can limit. Once approved it there are major impacts. We've legislated most of the land already. We have several 100 lots zoned for single family houses.

Jill: Is there a saturation level? Isn't it all market driven?

Mike: An owner can develop to a permitted use. We can't make demands.

Laurie: But we can change the zoning to stage development. Focus on the downtown core, and as it develops move outwards. This reduces sprawl and reduces infrastructure. Need to follow it up with zoning by laws.

Larry: Thanks for the discussion. I look at Iron Colt and see it has had a huge impact on neighbors, with drainage issues, and still its half empty after 13 years. Black Diamond had made a lot of people unhappy. If all the peripheral land is developed and subdivided we lose our access to the undeveloped areas.

Mike: R1 zoning is tight around the perimeter of the core- its only 5-10 minutes to the wildlife areas. Not bad here at all. Don't want the OCP to be a zoning bylaw. Maps show areas where people live, other map shows what can be built on the ppty (single family, multifam, condos etc)

Mike: Happy Valley has been a struggle but want to keep it agricultural since food security has come up as an issue. It has great soil. Community spoke strongly to keep a

greenbelt around town. Keeping it R1RA (one house on 5 acres) preserves the oppty for some farming to happen now or in the future.

Jill: SSP very strongly supports greenbelt.

Gord: Could add some language to strengthen food strategy concerns.

Mike: Ron won't like this but...many European villages have a greenbelt around them that is absolutely protected- you will never see residential or commercial development in them. They place a higher value on agricultural lands. They have lived through food shortages, we haven't, we import all our food so such a greenbelt isn't a priority. But someday it might be.

Steve: Should we try to correlate comments from the SC and CRD?

Gord: hasn't read CRD paper had to work. Ditto for Jill. Delagation from SC was different. All public input will be summarized.

Gord, and others: No this is council's time to comment and staffs feedback. The public will have an oppty on May 13<sup>th</sup>

Jackie: The guiding principals don't include anything mentioned in the Climate Action Charter. (Energy reduction. Carbon neutral,. Environmentally friendly standards (LEEDs) Id like to see this included as a principal.

(No one was supportive- felt it was covered elsewhere in the OCP)

Laurie: mentions referral and public process- that section will need to be updated once that has actually happened.

Jackie: Historical context: she made some corrections and will rewrite some passages.

Jill made several style suggestions; didnt like the way the pages looked or the photos chosen.

Community Profile and Projections p17

Laurie: #s used are from old 2006 BC stats or Canada stats. New '07 BC stats will be more accurate. New #s show population as 3508 not 3278 as in the 06 Canada census or 3469 as in the 06 BC stats.

Laurie: tables need to be adjusted based on the corrected population numbers.

P18 assuming 303 houses without permanent residents, the average used for temporaty residents was 2.4 this understates true population because most of these houses have 6-10 people living in them during the ski season.

<<Long discussion about the merits of statistics and the need for accuracy and the difficulty of proper projections and the need for accurate projections to estimate capacity needs in infrastructure; sewage treatment, water etc..>>

Jackie: These figures should be updated every year to get accurate projections to estimate needs.

Gord: Visions for Small Schools met and Linda Gomez said that there are 175 kids under the age of 4 in Rossland now. Can we make any reasonable assumptions? What is an acceptable margin of error? Is there a guideline?

Mike: Standard deviation is +/- 3% of mean.

Gord: How far off can we be before we get into trouble with our decisions about infrastructure etc?

Mike: Who knows? Too many variables.

Gord: We can suffer from paralysis from too much analysis. We make a plan and then in 5 years some external event happens that changes everything. Do we need to spend a lot of time on these stats?

Mike: No.

Laurie: looking out 20 years based on the development we've already approved we are looking at a peak population of 18-20k. Can we scale it back if it is too much?.

Jackie: I am thinking back to the horrific first 6 months of this council when we were trying to get an accurate population projection to determine infrastructure improvements. If the projection of 20k people was correct then we needed to set actual triggers for improvements. That I could live with.

Mike: Having a population of 20k at xmas will not impact our schools. But it will put demands on our water and sewer systems. We'll need ancillary systems – we can forecast those needs through the permit process. Stresses on capacity, development costs, holding systems for sewage to time release downstream will be required. Traffic jams and long lines at Ferraros will be an inconvenience but not a big deal. We'll build in the system to accommodate as we grow.

Gord: Rossland has a slow and steady growth rate. Got lost in the massive growth of Kimberly just the other night. It was incredible. Rossland is quaint.

Laurie: the sewage interceptor system and treatment plant; we have only one shot. Other things we can build incrementally.

Mike: Timed discharge might be necessary. 20k peak will be a challenge but we'll work with the RDKB.

Gord: If we build too big we run into other problems.( Many systems don't function well if they are under utilized)

Jackie: like our water oscillators.

Larry: 2001 #s were fluid, they are counting the total population but including the seasonal residents (Australian ski bums were here then). The current numbers aren't counting them. We don't have reliable data. Need to build a baseline now.

Jackie: When we were working with Ken about infrastructure he said the only numbers we really needed were population and projected growth.

Housing p20-21

Laurie: 45% increase in business is misleading. A lot of that rental units up at the hill. Jill and Steve aren't receptive to anything that indicates there hasn't been a huge increase in businesses in town.

Gord: suggests the business figures could be broken down a bit more.

Laurie: Average Red owner pays 2.2% more in taxes than the existing home owners. Misleading because avg house in town is \$244 average condo is \$402 that is a 65% more in value. Mike didn't know where numbers came from, Deb will be asked. Came from financial plan.

Regional Context p 22

Laurie made some factual comments (we are in Monashees and other details)  
Questioned that the economic drivers were minerals and tourism since stats Canada indicates that recreation and tourism is less than 5%

Land use p24

Laurie: Would like to limit sprawl and encourage higher density. Wanted to add protect and preserve natural environment-  
(didn't get any support for suggestions)

Ron: When OCP is complete policies will be added to the matrix.

Mike: Can't dictate density only suggest. Caldera has done a good job of grouping their houses- they are closer than they had to be. Could have been better but did a good job.

Laurie: 88 Creekside had a minimum and a maximum density. This encourages density close to the base area and allows for less dense development farther away from the lifts. Makes sense.

Ron: we should be setting minimum densities to increase density. If have it in the OCP then can put it in. (? I may have gotten this wrong. Much more discussion of density ensued).

Steve: I have no desire to put minimum density in the OCP

Larry: so the 2000 EU at the hill are 100 mid mtn, 1050 base core, 850 in the fringe area, like O'flanagans. So not all the EUs are Red's. True.

Laurie: The amenity migration seminar at Selkirk dealt with minimum density, Canmore was the example of a builder promising big development then renegeing after the city had spent \$14m on infrastructure improvements.

Ron: That city administrator should be looking for a job. Create mix of density including mins and maxs. Dev can go higher on smaller footprint.

Gord: How proscriptive do we want to be?

Jackie: I support somewhat proscriptive to achieve high density as it is the only way to get affordably housing (staff units, low rental etc) should really consider this.

Mike: You can do it through DCCs require it as apart of zoning. There are other incentives to look at.

Laurie Policy should include higher density but not specifics. That will be handled in the bylaws.

Growth management p28

Laurie: Need another key objective" That the built environment does not compromise the quantity and quality of the communities watershed"

Jill: why would this be in the built environment? Its dealt with in the natural environment section.

Steve: Laurie, why don't you let CRD fight their own battles and just say what you think!

Laurie: This is what I think

Steve: No it isn't, you are reading it right off their paper.

Larry: Maybe he wrote it for them.

Jackie: What about views?

Laurie: What?

Jackie: Well, if you are going to include everything you have to include views too.

<<<Council becoming very hostile to Laurie (and to CRD ideas) Don't see the integration of water, the natural environment and the built environment within the OCP. Think water protection is handled elsewhere and don't want a lot of redundancy>>>

Laurie: consultant said each section should stand on its own. If it's important it should be stated, it puts emphasis on how important the issue is.

Gord: The matrix will list policy.

Stacy: why focus on just the watershed? Why not focus more generally on the environment.

Steve: Isn't the watershed in a DP that gets extra protection anyway?

Mike: yes. You don't have to make it redundant. You just have to say it once then it can be cited in the OCP.

Jill: Laurie, I don't disagree with you I just think it is covered elsewhere.

Gord: Do we have a recommendation? Add "without compromising the natural environment"

<<<agreed and then deleted in further conversation when it became apparent that just about anything would compromise the natural environment>>.

Gord: we know what this language is going to be used for; It will be used to fight the golf course issue, for or against.

Jackie: Well, I just won't agree to no development in the watershed. There have been so many advances in science.

Gord: We have to be practical; there are already so many activities in our watershed: skiing, mining, houses with septic systems. Lets face it, without a golf course proposal in front of us we wouldn't have groups in front of us with detailed lists of suggestions.

Lloyd: I've been reading about golf courses there have been so many changes in the last 10 years- lots of great advances.

Gord: we don't want a lot of overlap. We need flexibility and readability.

Steve: I don't want the OCP to be pro or anti golf course. The more times you read "watershed, watershed. Watershed" it will be read as anti golf course.

Laurie: If all you want to do is rubberstamp work done by staff and consultants why did you run for council?

Jill: ouch!

Mike: This year round tourism and recreation approach has been what the city has been trying to do for years. It is still prominent in the SSP and the OCP. If council or the community want to change the direction it can be done but it will take some work. That is

a choice. We need to discuss it. We were diversifying the economy into tourism. If we are taking a new direction that is away from golf that did not appear in the V2A or the SSP

Laurie: No one is anti-development we just need some economic diversity. Can't put all the eggs in one basket.

Gord: Laurie, you come across to many in this community as very anti-development. That motion to down zone the area to exclude golf is perceived as very anti-development. The Premier said the Province helps communities who help themselves. If we become anti-tourism the Prov won't help us. I caution you not to be anti-development. Growth here is manageable and controllable. Tourism won't be the "be all, end all" Protection of the watershed is handled in other sections doesn't need wording here.

:Laurie: A large portion of the community sees me as pro-watershed

Jill: you act like you are the only councilor who cares about the watershed. We all do.  
<<< People are tired and tempers flare>>>

Laurie: would like to have a working definition of cluster. Doesn't think caldera qualifies.

Mike: caldera is better than it might have been. Developer put houses closer than was required to. It reduced their infrastructure costs too.

Laurie: Smart Growth BC has some definitions.

Stacy: Definitions belong in the bylaws.

Laurie: just so we understand the definition, not to put in the OCP.

Laurie: P29 use "should" define growth boundaries.  
<<discussion of boundaries, ended up with municipal boundaries define town.>>

Laurie: would like to add a policy that limits development to that which can be accommodated by infrastructure capacity in place.

Ron : developers fees should pay for all the extra costs but just haven't here. Now will.

Laurie: can we capture that in the OCP?

Jackie: Laurie you say you aren't anti development but everything you suggest is a road block: water restrictions, down zoning, sewage and infrastructure limitations!

Gord: ok- this is taking way too long. We have to move along. People's attention is fading. Is there any support for adding this policy that Laurie is suggesting?  
No? lets move along.

P30 Some discussion about mitigating old hazards from mining.

Laurie: complicated because often the owner of the subsurface rights has abandoned the claim thus leaving the property owner on the hook.

Jackie: Who owns Red? Who paid when the garage fell in? (Cominco) therefore it's the subsurface owner who is liable. (She missed the part when the subsurface owner is absent)

Ron: owner can sell land that is contaminated: either fix the problem or sell it for less. Mitigation still has to be done by someone.

Laurie: Would like to prohibit any development on the lands above the museum for instance- too dangerous.

Jill: Who would want to build up there anyway- its all rocky.

Jackie: Cominco owns it and would never sell because of the liability.

Laurie: p 32 .3 delete everything about environmentally sensitive lands starting with "unless" (deleting the part where environmentally sensitive lands can be developed with mitigation)

Jill: What is the definition of environmentally sensitive lands?

Ron: To do it properly, an ESA should study the whole community and determine where the sensitive areas are and where the at risk species are. Then determine what can be repaired or mitigated. Mitigation can be a good thing. We don't have an overall study or policy but we are doing it site by site. I think that is how Sylvie Massey is doing it.

Jill: Laurie, you are just buying into that bag of non-development I am so sick of that.....

No support for Laurie's suggestion

Laurie: What map is being referenced? There is no Map 3

14.2 Laurie suggested stronger language pertaining to green standards and LEEDs. Some discussion but group felt it was handled in .7

Steve & Jill: In the Natural environment section. 14.2.9 Felt very strongly that .9 should say "require" rather than "encourage" provision of public access to key natural amenities when considering new development proposals.

Jill in 14.2.10 doesn't like "explore the oppty" to develop a base inventory and mapping program which includes green space trails and environmentally sensitive areas. Wants it more directive. Do it.

Jill 14.2.15 What does encourage reclamation mean?

Mike: fix it.

Jill: I understand that but what does it look like? Is this new? Have we ever done it?

Mike: There are lots of damaged areas that we can repair. Trail Creek is a classic. Its buried. Not new policy

Jill: Where has it happened?

Larry: It happened down at Redstone before Mike got here. 2:1 tree replacement and Sylvie identified specific trees etc.

Mike: its been done a little but now it is a policy.

Laurie; <had some other suggestions about avoiding culverts, daylighting creeks>

Jackie: if we repeat everything it will be a huge document to read and to copy. No one will ever read it.

Mike: yes, say it once and it can be referenced in the OCP. That is all it takes.

Laurie: 14.4.1In light of the situation in the world today I have a problem with alternative fuels- it sounds like bio-fuel.

Gord, Stacy: we thought it meant hybrids.

Jackie: Lets just change it to say "...that reduce the carbon footprint"

Laurie: brought up strengthening the language about creating an energy reduction plan since it is going to be provincially legislated anyway and since we signed onto the Climate Action Charter.

Gord: there may be regional plans in the making.

Jackie: I called Deanne Stevens today and told her there may be grant money for public transportation as a part of this initiative.

Larry: Street light reduction. Accept the language as revised by staff.

Jill thinks the section on harmonizing bears with agriculture is funny but stupid and wants it removed. Didn't get any support.

Mike: We need to figure out how to work out life with bears. You may get to grow the food, but not get to eat it.

Larry: The real problem is deer, rats with antlers. Head to Grand Forks and you see high fences with deer on both sides of them- real pests. Big problem in Golden. They really push his buttons.

Laurie: Wild turkeys are becoming a problem.

Gord: Ended meeting. Decided to approve minutes at next meeting. Only got to page 35 of OCP. Must meet again this week to finish it. Thursday at 5pm or early sat morning. Councilors are to report availability.

Adjourned to have closed meeting on another topic.  
Notes by K Moore