



# North Peace Fringe Area - Official Community Plan

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Advisory Committee Meeting No. 4<sup>th</sup>

### MINUTES

---

Date: June 3, 2008  
Time: 6:00 pm  
Place: Northern Lights College – Rm. 139/140, Fort St. John, B.C.

Present: Staff: Debbie Kunz, Assistant Manager of Development Services  
Carla Eaton, Senior Planner

Advisory

Committee: Larry Houley, Director of Electoral Area 'C'  
Karen Goodings, Director of Electoral Area 'B'  
Wayne Hiebert, Director of Electoral Area 'D';  
George Tyler  
Lloyd Gibson  
Jim Collins  
Katherina Keuth  
Maurice Fines  
Arlene Boon  
Rick Koechl (joined at 6:30 pm)  
Brad Filmer (joined at 7:20 pm)

Public James Gladysz

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:30 pm
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND MINUTES
  - MOVED by Maurice Fines, SECONDED by Jim Collins, that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Advisory Committee of June 3, 2008 Agenda be adopted. CARRIED
  - MOVED by Lloyd Gibson, SECONDED by Katherina Keuth, that M-1 May 21, 2008 Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes be adopted. CARRIED
  - MOVED by Katherina Keuth, SECONDED by Lloyd Gibson, that M-2 May 21, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Minutes be adopted. CARRIED
3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
  - MOVED by Wayne Hiebert, SECONDED by Karen Goodings, that the following correction be made to the M-1 Advisory Committee Minutes dated May 21<sup>st</sup> on Page 3 of 4, as follows:  
Delete the statement: "All Non-farm use applications should be reviewed and considered by the Regional District" and Replace with; "That the Regional District defer to Agricultural Land Commission on all Non-farm Use Applications". CARRIED
  - Katherina Keuth stated that "there should be some land designated in the OCP for All-terrain Vehicle Use". This use should not only be dealt with in the proposed 'Parks Master Plan', but rather

provisions for this land use should be included into the North Peace Fringe Area OCP.

- Maurice Fines asked what is the Master Parks Plan. Lloyd briefly describing that this is a proposed future plan to be developed after the adoption of the OCP, which will provide for planning of parks and recreation opportunity for the area.
- Jim Collins noted that under Agriculture Protection, in the M-1 AC Minutes of May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2008, on Page 2 of 4, it is important that some Class 5 lands, such as Class 5C, having a 'Climatic' sub-class should also be protected for agricultural use. Jim briefly described the Soil Capability classification; Class 1 is the highest class of agricultural lands, while Class 7 is the lowest class of lands. Each class is then divided into sub-classes which are based on different kinds of limitations, such as adverse climate, topography, stoniness, or shallowness to bedrock, etc. North Pine area generally is comprised of Class 3 and 4 lands, while the Prespatou area has alot of Class 5C lands. It may be appropriate to consider subdivision of land having a Classification of 5TP.
- Arlene Boon noted that sometimes even Class 6 lands can be used for grazing livestock.
- Discussion pursued in relation to the direction given by the OCP for the different Classification of lands. The committee was reminded that the OCP is a general guide, and that Soil Classification is one criteria that may be used when the Board is considering a subdivision. Under each designation there is a Criteria list which provides other measurements for the Board to consider; such as;
  - the location of the property in relation to existing utilities
  - the extent of topographical features of the property
  - the ability of the property to be an integral part of the existing farm operation
  - etc.

A subdivision proposal must be considered in light of all factors affecting the land parcel and surrounding area.

It was agreed that lands having Agriculture Soil Capability rating of Class 5C should be added to the list of agricultural lands to be protected within the NPFA-OCP.

- Lloyd noted that this is the reason to only Exclude smaller portions of land from the ALR, in order to limit the possibility of subdividing good agriculture class lands.
  - It was asked if a 'short overview' of the minutes could be provided to the Committee Members for quick reference summary of what has been decided on by the AC, up until this time.
  - Further discussions related to soil classification, protection of Agriculture and exclusion from the ALR can be discussed under the Issues - working groups.
  - Karen Goodings noted that there is a problem with the last sentence on Page 2, of the May 21<sup>st</sup> Advisory Committee meeting minutes which states "Exclude lands from ALR if not being used for agricultural purposes (pay non-agriculture taxes)". This is a problem with the split class for tax purposes and we do not want to create further problems. It was noted that this comment was made in light of a proposed ALR Block Exclusion.
  - MOVED by Karen Goodings, SECONDED by Maurice Fines, that for clarification purposes the last line on Page 2 in M-1 AC Minutes of May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2008 be changed to read as follows: "Exclude lands from the ALR if not designated Agriculture or Small Agricultural Holding in the NPFA-OCP".
4. CORRESPONDENCE
- Debbie Kunz, noted that the Regional District has received copies of 6 letters from the Agricultural Land Commission addressed to 6 land owners with applications for Non-farm use and Subdivision,

located within the North Peace Fringe area. The ALC has informed these land owners that due to the planning process for the NPFA-OCP taking longer than anticipated, the ALC is prepared to proceed with a decision on these applications.

- Since it is not the AC's duty to review individual application related to the development of the OCP, this has been brought to the attention of the committee for information purposes. Once the ALC has made a decision on these ALR applications (4 – 6 weeks) it will be necessary to check the decisions against the direction of the 2<sup>nd</sup> OCP Draft.
  - The committee members briefly reviewed the 6 locations and land use proposals of the subject applications in relation to the draft OCP land use designations.
  - Maurice Fines noted that for clarification purposes a revised set of maps would be helpful for the next meeting.
  - Lori Ackerman was not present; however she had forwarded notes with the question related to the Technical advisory Committee Meeting of May 21<sup>st</sup> with the Ministry of Transportation.
    - Does MOT know or monitor what is in the trucks that use the Dangerous Goods Route? If trucks are hauling Dangerous Goods they are required to be marked as such.
  - Debbie Kunz, noted that MOT has provided an Air Photo of the Twinning project of the Alaska Highway between Fort St. John and Charlie Lake for the information of the Advisory Committee. (due to busy agenda schedule this photo was not reviewed)
  - Jim Collins noted that he has safety issue concerns related to the East By-Pass road where the city is allowing residential homesites to directly access onto the by-pass road. It was noted that this was a concern for both the city and MOT who are working on this collaboratively at the present time. MOT has applied to the province to change the By-pass road to a 'Controlled Highway Access', and are currently treating it in this manner. Currently MOT is working with the City to limit direct access on/off the East By-pass roads.
  - Maurice Fines stated that he would like to see representatives such as MOT and the City, from the Technical Advisory Committee, present at the working meetings.
  - Currently TAC meetings are being conducted separately from the Advisory Committee meetings, as per the Regional Boards recommendations. It was suggested that prior to inviting TAC representatives to a working meeting, the committee should have specific questions related to the OCP, in order that they may come prepared with comments.
  - The committee agreed that they would prepare a list of questions and asked that MOT be invited to attend the AC meeting when Services and Compact Development are being discussed. The following are some initial questions for MOT:
    - Are the East and West By-pass routes designated as a Dangerous Goods Route (DGR)?
    - Are the By-pass roads rated as 'Over height Routes'?
    - Are the trucks traveling on the By-pass routes, monitored or checked for content?
    - What are the details for a South By-pass route and is the City or MOT pursuing an alternate route?
    - Is there a setback distance off a DGR or a By-pass route for Residential development?
5. NEW BUSINESS
- Larry Houley had several items for new business, which were briefly discussed at the end of the meeting:

- Report on Servicing
  - Technical Advisory Committee representatives
  - Oil and Gas Committee representatives
  - Progress Report on how we are doing with this 2<sup>nd</sup> draft
- Report on Servicing
    - Urban Systems report on Sewer Servicing estimates may not be available for another 3 to 4 weeks.
    - Once areas for sewer servicing have been determined, this information will assist with finalizing the proposed ALR Block Exclusion areas.
    - A request for the number of vacant designated lots from the City of FSJ – has been obtained.
  - Technical Committee Representatives
    - some AC members are concerned about the correlation between the TAC and AC meetings (see above notes and resolve to invite an agency once questions are determined)
    - If TAC members are present at the working meetings then they can report back to their agency; the progress of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft
    - The AC was reminded that the Regional Board created two separate Advisory Committees.
    - Does the City of Fort St. John have a representative on the TAC? Yes, Horacio Galanti.
  - Oil and Gas Committee Representatives
    - James Gladysz currently works for OGC and he was in attendance to the AC meeting
  - Progress Report on 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft
    - Revised OCP Maps will be prepared for future meetings to illustrate AC recommendations to date
    - A Summary of proposed Policy Direction from past meetings will be prepared
    - The proposal to conduct a Study for potential Light/Heavy Industrial development site in the North Peace area will be listed in Section 13.13 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> OCP - Future Work-Plan
    - Regional Board Resolution No. RD/08/02/27 stating that 'lands within the South Taylor Management Area of the draft NPFA-OCP be designated "agriculture use" only', was brought to the attention of the AC, in order that it be included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Drafting of the OCP.
    - A question was asked; what happened to other recommendations made to the Draft NPFA-OCP, by the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC)?
    - It was noted that recommendations from the AC and the AAC made in 2007 on the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft were presented to Rural Directors, however a 2<sup>nd</sup> review of the Draft NPFA-OCP was requested.

## 6. ACTION PLAN AND TIME LINE

- Discussion pursued on the topic of evening or weekend meetings. It was generally agreed that we remain with evening meetings, but possibly with an earlier start time, in order to avoid a late finish.
- At the next AC meeting a brief review of the proposed Policy direction for Home Based Business and ALR Block Exclusion will be completed, with the following Issues still remaining:
  - Water Protection
  - Enforcement
  - Need for Services
  - Compact Development
  - Transportation Network
- Prior to the Next AC meeting committee members were asked to do individual site inspections of two areas proposed for future Industrial and Residential designations and also for ALR Block Exclusion:
  - Lands lying east and west of the 259 Road (Swanson Lumber Rd) (± 300 acres)

(Draft OCP Map No. 6 – generally South ½ Sec. 26 and SW ¼ Sec. 27 – Twp. 83, Rge. 18)

- Lands lying between the 269 and the Old Fort Roads ( $\pm$  350 acres of land)  
(Draft OCP Map No. 5 – generally SE ¼ Sec. 36 and NE ¼ Sec. 26 – Twp. 83, Rge. 19)

- Debbie will notify the Advisory Committee of the Date and Time of the next two meetings.
- It was noted that the City of Fort St. John has been absent from the last two AC meetings, and they should be encouraged to send a representative to the next AC working meeting.

7. **WORK CONTINUES** – the following Issues were discussed, by two working groups as follows:

### **ALR BLOCK EXCLUSION**

- Maurice Fines asked “What is an ALR Block Exclusion?”
- A Block Exclusion is when a Local government (ie. Regional District) submits an ALR Exclusion Application for the exclusion of multiple land parcels from the Agriculture Land Reserve. The local government is required to notify affected land owners of the ALR Exclusion application and it hosts a Public Hearing.
- In the 1<sup>st</sup> OCP Draft the Regional District identified 7 general areas to be included in an ALR Block Exclusions Application.
- Currently this Advisory Committee is proposing to Exclude from the ALR, all those lands designated for development, such as the areas designated Residential, Industrial, Commercial.
- The lands designated for ‘Agriculture and Small Agriculture Holding’ would NOT be included into the ALR Block Exclusion, but rather these lands are to remain in the Agriculture Land Reserve.

### **What is the Key purpose for ALR Exclusion?**

- to allow for community growth in both the rural and urban areas.
- Parcels are too small for agricultural production
- to provide certainty (clarity) for the public
- to allow for one regulating body of government to guide land use
- to limit urban and residential contact points having different uses
- to limit sprawl and to encourage compact development close to settlement areas
- to limit subdivision on ALR lands and avoid spot zoning
- attempt to achieve uniformity in the OCP (*decrease number of spot zones and infill will happen*)
- to limit the influence of subdivision affects on ALR lands (*development less likely to happen on ALR lands*)
- if development is only allowed by RD on NON-ALR lands, within the OCP designated areas, compact development will be encouraged and this will reduce infrastructure and servicing costs
- there will be tax implications, however as taxes increase, the mill rate will decrease

The two groups compared these points to those written in Section 13.10 of the DRAFT NPFA-OCP and noted that the general consistency to those reasons given for pursuing an ALR Block Exclusion

### **PRELIMINARY CHANGES TO ALR BLOCK EXCLUSION (MAPS)**

- Proposal is to Exclude all designated lands (coloured areas) from the ALR, except for Agriculture (green) and Small Agriculture Holding (yellow) designated areas.

The following Areas were confirmed to be included in the Proposed ALR Block Exclusion:

**Area No. 1** – Tea Creek North/South, except land parcels recently changed back to Agriculture as listed:

- Twp. 83, Rge. 20 (approximately 2 x ¼ sections)  
NE ¼ Sec. 35, NW ¼ Sec. 36
- Twp. 84, Rge. 20 (approximately 12 x ¼ sections)  
NW and SW ¼ Sec. 1, NE and SE ¼ Sec. 2, NW and SW ¼ Sec. 14, all of Sec. 22 except NE

1/4, and NW and SW ¼ Sec. 27.

**Area No. 3** – Fish Creek and North of City

**Area No. 4** – East of City, with the addition of part SE ¼ Sec. 7 – 84 – 18 that is within the ALR

**Area No. 5** – Airport Area and east side

**Area No. 7** – Baldonnel Overpass

**Area No. 8** – Old Fort area

The following areas have outstanding concerns related to sewer servicing, proposed land use designation, and agricultural capability: (not yet confirmed for ALR Block Exclusion)

**Area No. 2** – parts of Charlie Lake and Area are generally still in question:

Charlie Lake Settlement Centre and land covering the E ½ Sec. 18 – 84-19 (waiting for sewer costing)

O/S –NE and NW ¼'s Sec. 7, Twp. 84, Rge. 19

O/S –NE ¼ Sec. 12, Twp. 84, Rge. 20

O/S –Lands West of Golf Course – Lot 1, PGP35595, Sec. 36 & part NE ¼ 25, Twp. 84, Rge. 20.

**Area No. 6** – area Southwest of City

- until cost estimates are obtained for Sewer Serving in this area it is difficult to determine which areas should be finally designated for future development and included into the ALR Block Exclusion.
- There is a concern related to developing prime agricultural lands involving the following ¼ sections:
  - o SE ¼ Sec. 35, undeveloped parts of E ½ Sec. 26, and parts of SW ¼ Sec. 26, all of Twp. 83, Rge. 19.

**New Area proposed (requires more discussion)** – to designate ± 6 additional quarter sections lying East side of Charlie Lake and West of the 271 Road (OCP Map No. 3) If designated for future residential use, these would also be included into ALR Block Exclusion.

General concerns and comments related to designating these lands for future development included:

- close to the existing Rod Gun Club
- land area drains toward Charlie Lake
- land parcels could not be hooked onto the CL Sewer system, as the existing system is currently at its maximum capacity, therefore new lots would be serviced by conventional system (lagoon)
- this area could be used for trade-off of some LDR lands reduced in the Tea Creek area
- these lands have lower agricultural capability than some lands in the Tea Creek area

## **REFINE LIMITS ON HOME BASED BUSINESS (HBB)**

If allowed, how should HBB be managed; what should it include?

It is recommended that the OCP needs stronger language to support Changes to the Zoning By-law Regulations in order to better manage Home Based Businesses in the rural area.

Zoning Regulations must be amended to include measurable controls that can be used to enforce the regulations, and avoid impacts that HBB often cause for the subject property and surrounding parcels, such as the following effects:

- |   |                         |           |
|---|-------------------------|-----------|
| - Noise levels  | - Air Emissions (fumes) | - Parking |
| - Traffic volumes   | - Safety issues         |           |
| - Hours of Operation  | - Aesthetic             |           |
| - Environmental impacts ie run off form storage tanks, etc. |                         |           |

If measurable controls are not used, it is difficult to enforce the scale of Home Based Businesses.

Home Based Businesses must be limited in size, in order that larger scaled industrial/ commercial uses are NOT encouraged in Agricultural areas, but rather directed to appropriate designated areas.

Businesses that should NOT be allowed in Residential (HDR, MDR, LDR) Designations are as follows:

- Mobile Oil Field Contractor
- Taxi or Currier Service
- Trucking Contractor
- Repair and Services, of light trucks, automobiles, farm equipment, etc.
- Metal Fabricating (Welder)
- Oil Field Contractor
- Logging Contractor
- Construction Contractor

It is recommended that the above listed businesses, be allowed in the Agriculture and/or Small Agriculture Holding designations, **provided** business does not exceed 2 business related vehicles.

In order to further strengthen the concept of infilling and reducing sprawl, it is important that the OCP direct all Industrial or Commercial businesses to the appropriate designated areas that will further support the required infrastructure and tax base.

The intent of a Home Based Business must clearly demonstrate that it is a secondary use to the principal use of the property.

Generally the group summarized the HBB use as follows:

HDR / MDR / LDR ( <i>residential designations</i> )	AGRICULTURE and SAH
<i>Only allow HBB in these designations if:</i>	
<p><i>On parcels less than 1.8 (4.5 acres)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Business is conducted <u>inside</u> Dwelling or Accessory building;</li> <li>- <u>no</u> outside storage area allowed associated with business;</li> <li>- <u>only 2 vehicles</u> associated with the business allowed;</li> </ul> <p><i>ie.</i> Barber, beauty shop, Gunsmith, Taxidermy, Art Studio, Business office for accountant, Home tutoring, Daycare, Retailing associated with catalogue or telemarketing sales, locksmith, printing or graphic studio, food beverage or catering away from premises, shoe repair shop, meat cutting, and Construction Trade Contractor (not exceeding 2 business vehicles and contained in dwelling or accessory building)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- entire list of HBB samples given in Zoning By-law be allowed in provided <b><u>ONLY 2 vehicles associated with the business are allowed</u></b></li> </ul> <p><i>*concern with allowing Trucking, Repair and Servicing Contractors, etc, on Agricultural lands, having more than 2 trucks or business related vehicles</i></p> <p><i>ie.</i> Greenhouse or nursery, Repair &amp; services of household appliances, mobile mechanic) 1<sup>st</sup> Aid Field Contractors (not exceeding 2 business vehicles)</p>
<i>On parcels equal to or greater than 1.8 ha (4.5 acres)</i>	
<p><i>ie.</i> Processing of sale of food grown or reared or raised on parcel, greenhouse, or nursery, repair and service of household appliances, <u>mobile*</u> mechanic or mobile 1<sup>st</sup> aid Field contractor (not exceeding 2 business vehicles)</p>	

\*Mobile contractor – the business intent must be to operate the business off-site, in addition to it operating indoors, no outside storage and not exceed 2 business vehicles.

8. **NEXT MEETING** – To Be Announced

9. **TERMINATION** 9:10 pm

---

Carla Eaton, Recorder