



## SOUTH PEACE FRINGE AREA OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

### Comments: Community Advisory Committee “One the Move” Focus Group (Bus Tour of planning area)

- With all of the various competing interests such as ALR versus non-ALR, an eroding land base and other issues how do we decide when and where to draw the line to what is acceptable and what is not. What is our acceptable threshold?
- The new sewer system legislation doesn't work for us up here in the Peace. These systems design are too large and shallow and freeze up easily in the northern region. The responsibility for these systems seems to fall between the cracks of different government jurisdictions.
- Need to establish clear measurable that deal with the agriculture versus industrial issues
- Need to identify large parcel of land in the region for protection
- Farming is and has been the cornerstone for this community
- Needs to be local representation for the Peace region as a Commissioner for the Agricultural Land Commission. We need a local representative.
- Identified the need to expand the South Peace Fringe Area OCP boundary to accommodate those areas covered with the building inspecting and fire protection boundary areas.
- There needs to be some sort of “industrial / commercial nodes” in the outlying region. Farmers often run all the way into town just to run all the way back out to the farm. Provide fuel, water, local conveniences, etc.
- With the ALR mandate of no-net-loss we really feel the crunch to protect lands that are classed 1 and 2
- Bear Mountain area is better suited for residential development due to steep slopes and lower classed agricultural soils.
- In this area it is the Provincial Government who has the authority for resource extraction development in the area. Local governments and residents have very limited and restricted powers.
- May need to investigate the possibility of using Development Cost Charges for certain areas in the Fringe Area.
- This OCP may consider looking at developing a regional growth management strategy.
- In this OCP process we need to address industrial buffer zones that may reduce conflict between different land uses.
- The Lakeshore Guide lines may need to be implemented into this OCP with possibly stronger wording.
- We could possibly look at incorporating Development Permit Areas associated with slope percentages in the area, in relation to any development around lakeshores, ie. Swan Lake.
- Bylaw enforcement is really needed within the Regional District. This area really needs to get up to speed on this.
- May need to consider creating the use of business licenses for the rural area.
- There are two proposed industrial secure landfills, for oil and gas waste sites to be located in this OCP area. There is one proposed for the Bessborough area. The other one is proposed

for the Tupper/Tomslake area, which is located within the Swan Lake watershed and could have environmental implications.

- Both of these land use proposals are subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Reviews, ALC approval if on ALR lands and OCP and Zoning amendment applications with the Regional District.
- Should be looking at developing more trails around the McQueens Slough
- Re: there is a residential designated area located west of Tupper, lying west of Hwy 2 - within this OCP is this the best location for future residential development. This area lies outside the ALR, on a hillside - is there opportunity to do a land swap with the ALC.
- We need to have better definitions on what is and what is not a home based business. There are some examples in this plan area that are out of control.
- What kind of support can we give home based businesses
- Are there needs to be pre-designated lands for heavy industrial?
- This OCP will need to consider identification of senior's facilities within the rural area.