

Electoral Area H



Official Community Plan Review

Public Submissions on Draft V.3

October 8 – October 23, 2017

From: [MARGARET HEALEY](#)
To: [Bill Veenhof](#)
Cc: [Simpson, Courtney](#); [Thompson, Paul](#)
Subject: Re: sewer, second access road and boat trailer parking for Deep Bay.
Date: Monday, October 09, 2017 1:07:01 PM

Hi Bill. I am happy you had a nice summer as It sounds like you will have a busy fall at the RDN. As you know we in Deep Bay would appreciate you supporting a sewer for Deep Bay for those who wish to hook up. And of course the 1400 or so residents in our Deep Bay Improvement District may want to hook up to sewers as well. We know for a fact many residents in the improvement district of Deep Bay have over 40 year old septic systems. Some have already failed at a cost up to 30,000. to replace. Some of those replaced already have problems. Our main industry in Deep Bay is the multimillion dollar shellfish business and needs to be protected. The next thing we need in Deep Bay is a second access Road into and out of Deep Bay. If we have a natural disaster there is only one way out. Also, in summer we can barely get down our streets in Deep Bay as boat trailers are parked on both sides of the street from people who come as tourists that help our economy. Boat trailer parking off the streets would be much safer.

As you are our representative, only you can make this happen. I am sure you have heard these requests from many of our residents. Please consider supporting our residents for a safer well managed community.

Sincerely, Margie Healey.

[REDACTED] 45 year property owner area H)

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Dick Stubbs](#)
To: [Simpson, Courtney](#); [Bill Veenhof](#); [Garbutt, Geoff](#); [Thompson, Paul](#); [Carlyle, Phyllis](#)
Subject: Area H OCP Review, Version 3
Date: Monday, October 23, 2017 1:24:11 PM

Courtney and others...

Can you please circulate to the Working Group...

What with being away and a number of other commitments, I finally got to Version 3 on Thursday and have to say that I am deeply disappointed. The number of changes, additions and deletions are considerable and yet the document went to EASC only 4 days after being released to the public. The timing was blatantly insufficient to provide meaningful comment and smells of last minute insertions ...enough said but I am sure you get my drift.

Content concerns...

1. Repeatedly, over a number of years, secondary suites have not been considered by staff to be part of density discussions. Was the RGS amended when Greg did the project that brought secondary suites in the Bylaw? All of a sudden, secondary suites are part of the BSI discussion and considered equal to a dwelling unit..
2. The OCP review despite being 13 years in the making, was billed as a "targeted review" and yet a number of the targets have been removed from the draft. Now, the Horne Lake/19 and Faye Road proposals have been reduced to the point that they are on the same footing as a number of similar unknown projects that might come forward in the future, despite their proponents spending considerable amounts of time and energy and the community looking favourably.
3. The residential use of the Horne Lake lands is now "supported" pending a review of the pros and cons! The word supported is very strong language. Residential use in the watershed of our biggest salmon bearing river for 400+/- non-residents who knowingly bought recreational properties, is a cause for concern. There is no mention, that I could see, that this change would require an amendment to the RGS.
4. Why would we remove the Resource lands as possible density donor properties when we are fundamentally trying to discourage residential development on these lands? Yes they might have a number of associated densities but they are now recognized as being in the wrong location and should be moved.

As writers of the OCP, there is no question that staff will recognize needed changes and additions. But you have completed 2 drafts, since the working group last met...surely it would have been a good idea to have convened the group to explain/rationalize why the changes are important...after all, at the end of the day this OCP supposedly belongs to our community.

A number of people are muttering about the "Power of the Planner" and are wondering whether our OCP is a product of community consultation or whether it could have been written by senior staff 18 months ago. The public process appears to be flawed, we are now to all intensive purposes done, after 1st and 2nd reading the opportunity for positive change is relatively small. Once again the process pits the community against the RDN staff, all very unnecessary.

Again, it would appear that a number of staff are not aware of how humans properly communicate with each other...all very unfortunate but it makes me wonder if I will continue to be involved. I have many other things where my energies and time can be better spent.

On a personal note, I have enjoyed working with you during this process. Your openness and candor are to be commended and I appreciate that this was not an easy task. Thank you.

Dick Stubbs

--

"Pedal on...Ride for Your Life"

