

Summary of Feedback – Since 1st Reading

[illegible]

	fact that “agri-tourism” is a use regulated under the ALCA and its regulations, leads the ALC to assume that this goal is directed towards the use of ALR lands. As such, the ALC suggests that the wording of a portion of this subsection be revised in order to improve consistency with the ALCA and its regulations as follows: <i>Supports agri-tourism initiatives in accordance with the ALCA and its regulations.</i>			
	Section 4.2 The ALC is very supportive of the FVRD’s statement that the OCP will meet anticipated housing needs by utilizing lands outside of the ALR. • Policy 4.2.2 Second dwellings: The ALC appreciates that the FVRD has included language specific to Agricultural-designated areas. The ALC suggests the following minor revisions to ensure clarity: However, in AGRICULTURAL areas, farm use is a priority and residential uses are limited under the Agricultural Land Commission Act and its regulations. the regulations and policies of the Agricultural Land Commission. • Policy 4.2.4 Development land evaluation: The ALC is very supportive of the statement that “Residential development will be directed away from agricultural lands”.	Accept text edit – clarification of regulation names Suggest: 4.2.2 “....However, in AGRICULTURAL areas, farm use is a priority and residential uses are limited under the Agricultural Land Commission Act <u>and its regulations.</u> ” No edit recommended – ALC in support	Update per recommendation	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 4.6 The ALC notes that any proposal to construct new transportation and/or utility corridors in the ALR would require an ALC application. The upgrading and/or expansion of existing roads in the ALR may also require an ALC application unless specifically exempted under s. 18 of the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation. • 4.6.1(b): the ALC supports the FVRD’s statement that its support for any proposals would be contingent on minimizing the consumption of agricultural land and the provision for safe and unrestricted movement of agricultural vehicles and goods in agricultural areas. • 4.6.1(d): the ALC supports the FVRD’s statement that its support for any proposals would be contingent on the proposal not adversely affecting the drainage or productivity of agricultural lands. • 4.6.3 and 4.6.4: these sections speak to residential and commercial areas, but not to agricultural areas. If agricultural land is impacted by a proposal has the FVRD considered impact mitigation for agricultural areas and/or for the agricultural community? Please advise.	4.6 No edit recommended. See new policy about ALR referrals (1.7.6) 4.6.1(b) No edit recommended – ALC in support 4.6.1(d) No edit recommended – ALC in support Suggest - 4.6.3 – New or expanded major utility corridors and infrastructure (ie. Highway upgrades, powerline replacement or expansion) should mitigate impacts to developed residential, <u>commercial, and agricultural areas</u> , in accordance with the Crown-Community Interface policy * Crown-Community Interface policy not relevant here	New policy 1.7.6 No update No update Update per recommendation	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 4.7 The ALC notes that crown lands within the ALR are still subject to the ALCA and its regulations.	No edit recommended – ALR on Crown land in Area D is rare (~3 parcels) See new policy about ALR referrals (1.7.6)	New policy 1.7.6	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 5.1 ALC suggests that the text be amended as follows: <i>Situated between the Fraser River and the north slope of Mount Cheam, agricultural lands in Electoral Area “D” are unique in the Fraser Valley. They are located predominantly outside the Fraser River floodplain, and constrained by soil quality, drainage, and sunlight. The ancient Mt. Cheam land slide event over 5000 years ago deposited rock avalanche material, creating stony soils and challenging drainage conditions on today’s agricultural parcels. Nevertheless agricultural lands are productive in Popkum-Bridal Falls. With over 493 hectares of land within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), the ALR represents 24% of private lands of the Popkum-Bridal Falls land base. While ALR lands in Popkum-Bridal Falls only represent less than 1% of the regional</i>	Accept text edit for clarification. Grammatical edits for ALC Act and <u>its regulations</u>	Update per recommendation	Edited - Dec 4/19

	<p>ALR inventory, they ALR and provide an important economic component to the community. Active farming occurs on 60% of ALR lands, and Popkum-Bridal Falls ranks 5th in the FVRD for utilization of farm land, just behind the City of Abbotsford with 67% utilization. The ALR shapes the rural character and establishes a boundary around the existing Popkum neighbourhood core along the east and south edges. The Plan designates Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) lands in Electoral Area “D” are as AGRICULTURAL. In recognition of the challenging soils, drainage, and sunlight conditions in Electoral Area “D”, the AGRICULTURAL designation policies support flexible options that are supportive of farming and farm compatible uses, such as agri-tourism while still providing protection of farm land for agriculture. The Agricultural Land Commission Act, <u>its</u> regulations, and Orders of the Commission take precedence on matters of land use and subdivision in the ALR. The Act and <u>its</u> regulations generally prohibit or restrict non-farm use and subdivision of ALR lands, unless otherwise permitted or exempted. The Regional Board assists in the administration of the ALR lands by commenting on reviewing applications for subdivision, non-farm use, inclusion and/or exclusion of land in the ALR, and exclusion of land from the ALR <u>and by making determinations as to whether or not applications should be forwarded to the ALC.</u> The policies established in this Plan will provide guidance for future Regional Board comments reviews of ALC on these applications.</p>	<p>Suggest: Add</p> <p>Popkum ALR lands are primarily used for lower intensity agriculture including grazing, hay, and dry cow operations. This type of agriculture helps to support the more intensive agriculture that is prevalent in the other areas of FVRD. ALR lands in Popkum also provide opportunities for small scale and start-up farming operations</p> <p>Accept addition of the underlined text: “...The Regional Board assists in the administration of the ALR lands by reviewing applications for subdivision, non-farm use, inclusion and/or exclusion of land in the ALR, <u>and by determining if an application should be forwarded to the ALC.</u> The policies established in this Plan will provide guidance for future Regional Board comments <u>review</u> of these applications.</p>	<p>Update per recommendation Edited - Dec 4/19</p>	
	<p>Section 5.1</p> <p>5.1.1: The ALC supports this policy in principle but suggests it be slightly re-worded for clarity as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Agricultural lands in Popkum-Bridal Falls shall be preserved by preventing the subdivision of farms, supporting AGRICULTURAL land uses <u>in accordance with the ALCA and its regulations</u>, minimize minimizing conflicts between agriculture and other land uses, and avoiding the development of rural residential subdivisions in the Agricultural Land Reserve. • 5.1.3: The ALC is unsure how this statement as worded will be used to guide the decision-making of the FVRD Regional Board. • 5.1.4: The ALC requests that this policy be removed as the exclusion of agricultural land for other uses is not an agricultural policy. Furthermore, inclusion of this policy implies that the FVRD is in support of exclusion applications. Please see the ALC’s comments on section 6.3 for additional concerns with this provision. • 5.1.5: The ALC is supportive of this policy and suggests the following minor edits for clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Regional Board supports the efficient and clustered siting and size of residential uses in order to provide more space for farming uses. • 5.1.6: The ALC is unsure of the intent of this policy. The introduction to Section 5.1 implies that the policies will be used to guide Regional Board comments on applications; however, this policy does not fit within the ALC application review framework unless it is the FVRD’s intention to submit its own applications, or to engage in a broader planning review exercise outside of this Bylaw with both the ALC and the Ministry of Agriculture. If it is the FVRD’s intention to work with the ALC and the Ministry of Agriculture on “flexible options”, this should be done at this stage of the Bylaw review process and the ALC would be interested to understand what kinds of “flexible options” are contemplated. Furthermore, ALC staff are not statutory decision-makers and cannot support uses of ALR land that are not expressly permitted under the ALCA and its regulations, nor do ALC staff make recommendations to the ALC Commissioners as to 	<p>Suggest: 5.1.1 Agricultural lands in Popkum-Bridal Falls shall be preserved by preventing subdivision <u>fragmentation</u> of farms, supporting AGRICULTURAL land uses <u>in accordance with the ALCA and its regulations</u>, minimizing conflicts between agriculture and other land uses, and avoiding the development of rural residential subdivisions in the Agricultural Land Reserve.</p> <p>5.1.3 No update. Policy sets the stage for valuing agriculture.</p> <p>Suggest: 5.1.4 – Remove policy.</p> <p>Suggest: 5.1.5 The Regional Board supports the efficient and clustered siting and size of <u>on farm</u> residential uses in order to provide <u>more space</u> for farming uses. <u>The Regional Board may wish to consider options for a Farm Home Plate Bylaw.</u></p> <p>Suggest: 5.1.6 Intent of the policy is too work with the ALC on individual applications that adhere to the ALC act and its regulations.</p> <p>5.1.6 The Regional Board will work with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Agricultural Land Commission to provide for support a broader range of agricultural opportunities and uses which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> are supplementary and ancillary to farm use; support value-added activities that improve farm viability; are consistent with the environmental policies of this Plan; and will not jeopardize the long-term productivity of farmland. <u>adhere to the <i>Agricultural Land Commission Act</i> and its regulations</u> 	<p>5.1.1 - Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.3 – No update</p> <p>5.1.4 - Remove per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.5 - Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.6 - Update per recommendation</p>	<p>Edited - Dec 4/19</p>

	<p>whether or not an ALC application should be approved or refused. Although the ALC appreciates that the FVRD has attempted to define the kinds of uses that would be supported by the Regional Board, it notes that items “a” through “d” are very general and could conceivably allow uses completely unconnected with agriculture which would require ALC applications. If the current wording is not changed, it is conceivable that a Bylaw reader may labour under the false impression that the ALC and/or the Ministry of Agriculture has sanctioned uses that fall under the criteria set out in items “a” through “d” and that therefore approval of any ALC applications would be guaranteed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1.7: The ALC is very supportive of this policy. • 5.1.8: The ALC is very supportive of this policy but requires the following edits in order to reflect the recent legislative changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o AGRICULTURAL areas may be extended or created through Plan amendment where additional areas suited to farm production are identified through an application process or pursuant to the Agricultural Land Commission Act and the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation, the ALR General Regulation, and the ALR Use Regulation. • 5.1.9: The ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that the reference to s. 23(1) of the ALCA is correct and that no updates are needed to reflect the recent legislative changes. Regarding the re-designation of ALR lands that have been either excluded or found to be exempted as per s. 23(1) of the ALCA, the ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that any proposed re-designation of ALR lands should still be referred to the ALC for review and comment. • 5.1.10: The ALC has concerns with the list of uses as some of them are not permitted under the ALCA and its regulations and/or require approval from the ALC through an application. Given that the AGRICULTURAL designation is specific to ALR lands only, the ALC requests that this policy be amended to specify that AGRICULTURAL areas shall be used only for uses permitted under the ALCA and its Regulations or for uses permitted by and Order of the ALC. Alternatively, if the FVRD wishes to retain the list, the ALC requests that the uses be amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Farm use; b. Conservation use, including park and park reserve; c. Park and park reserve use in accordance with the ALR Use Regulation; d. Single family residential use in accordance with the ALR Use Regulation; e. Natural campground use in accordance with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use use, subdivision and Procedure Regulation; f. Agri-tourism use in in accordance with the Agricultural land Reserve Use use, subdivision and Procedure Regulation; g. Associated rural residential use in accordance with the ALR Use Regulation; and h. Accessory farm employee dwelling if permitted by an Order of the Agricultural Land Commission. <p>The ALC also wishes to clarify whether the “associated rural residential use” referenced in (g) refers to an additional residence (not permitted unless by way of an Order of the ALC), or whether it refers to ancillary residential uses. Please clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1.11: The ALC requests the following minor edits for clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o AGRICULTURAL areas in the Agricultural Land Reserve are subject to the provisions of the Agricultural Land Commission Act, the ALR General Regulation, the ALR Use Regulation, and the regulations and the orders of the Agricultural Land Commission. 	<p>5.1.7 – ALC in support. Suggest addition: <u>with the exception of areas in the Fraser River foreshore or in Cheam Lake which are designated as conservation. One Crown owned parcel in the ALR that is planned for a park expansion that is also designated as conservation</u></p> <p>Update to regulation names Suggest: 5.1.8 - AGRICULTURAL areas may be extended or created through Plan amendment where additional areas suited to farm production are identified through an application process or pursuant to the Agricultural Land Commission Act and the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation <u>and its regulations.</u></p> <p>Suggest: 5.1.9 – No edit recommended. See new policy about ALR referrals (1.7.6)</p> <p>Suggest: 5.1.10 – AGRICULTURAL areas shall be used only for <u>the following if in accordance with the ALC Act and its regulations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Farm use; b. Conservation use, including park and park reserve; c. Park and park reserve use; d. Single family residential use; e. Natural campground use in accordance with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation; f. Agri-tourism use in in accordance with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation; g. Associated rural residential use in accordance with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation; and h. Accessory farm employee dwelling <u>if permitted by an Order of the Agricultural Land Commission.</u> <p>5.1.10 (g) – no further edits recommended. “Associated rural residential use” is a defined term, which is not related to additional residences.</p> <p>Suggest – Update to regulation names, 5.1.11 AGRICULTURAL areas in the Agricultural Land Reserve are subject to the provisions of the <u>Agricultural Land Commission Act and its regulations.</u> and the orders of the Agricultural Land Commission.</p>	<p>5.1.7 - Update for greater clarity</p> <p>5.1.8 - Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.9 No update</p> <p>5.1.10 - Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.10 (g) No update</p> <p>5.1.11 – Update per recommendation</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1.12: The ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that any zoning amendment applications affecting ALR lands (either directly or adjacent) should be circulated to the ALC for review and comment, even if the zoning amendment application is related to an ALC decision. • 5.1.13: The ALC requests the following edits in order to achieve consistency with its new regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The removal of soil or placing of fill on land in AGRICULTURAL areas shall be undertaken in accordance with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation ALCA, the ALR General Regulation, the ALR Use Regulation, and the bylaws of the Fraser Valley Regional District. • 5.1.14: The ALC requests the following edits in order to achieve consistency with its new regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Agri-tourism uses may be supported provided that parking and servicing needs can be met on-site, where required a Special Events License is obtained, and the use is <u>in accordance with the ALCA, the ALR General Regulation, and the ALR Use Regulation</u> meets the requirements of the Agricultural land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedures Regulation. • 5.1.15: The ALC is unclear why this policy is needed in light of policy 5.1.14, unless the intention is to support agri-tourism uses that exceed what is permitted by the ALCA and its regulations. Please provide further clarification as to the intent of this policy. Furthermore, the ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that any zoning amendment applications affecting ALR lands (either directly or adjacent to) should be circulated to the ALC for review and comment, even if the zoning amendment application is related to an ALC decision. • 5.1.16: The ALC requests that this policy (allowing the Regional Board to consider accessory secondary dwellings unrelated to farm use) be removed from the Bylaw in order to achieve consistency with the ALCA and its regulations. As per s. 25(1.1)(b), the ALC must not grant permission for an additional residence unless the additional residence is necessary for a farm use. • 5.1.17: The ALC suggests making a minor edit to this section to reflect the new ALCA and its regulations; specifically, changing (a) to refer to “use” instead of “non-farm use” in order to encompass the full range of possible use applications that could be considered by the ALC (non-farm use, non-adhering residential use, soil or fill use). The ALC also wishes to advise the FVRD that any proposed Temporary Use Permits affecting ALR lands (either directly or adjacent to) should be circulated to the ALC for review and comment, even if the Temporary Use Permit is related to an ALC decision. • 5.1.18: As per the comment above, any proposed Temporary Use Permits affecting the ALR (either directly or adjacent to) should be circulated to the ALC. • 5.1.19: The ALC requests that this policy be amended in order to achieve consistency with the ALCA and its regulations given that seasonal farm labour accommodation structures (i.e. residences) would require ALC applications for a non-adhering residential use (see definition of “non-adhering residential use” s. 1(1) of the ALCA). This could be done by adding an additional sub-section that states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The seasonal farm labour accommodation use has been approved by an Order of the ALC. 	<p>5.1.12 – No edit recommended. See new suggested policy 1.7.6 for ALC referrals.</p> <p>5.1.13 – Update to regulation names the ‘Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation’ to ‘<u>Agricultural Land Commission Act and its regulations</u>’</p> <p>5.1.14 – Update to regulation names, same as 5.1.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal approvals are required. Refers to non-accommodation agri-tourism <p>5.1.15 – Suggest: Add</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. adheres to the <i>Agricultural Land Commission Act</i> and its regulations • Policy is distinct from 5.1.14 as additional FVRD & ALC approvals are required • See new policy 1.7.6 for ALR referrals <p>5.1.16 – Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALC policy allows for secondary suites within a principle residence. FVRD considers this a second dwelling, which is not permitted in our zoning. We may consider changes in the future. • In order for a property owner to apply for a ‘non-adhering residential use’ for farm help, the application must be considered by the Regional Board. <p>Option 1 - Remove policy. Option 2 – Keep policy. No update</p> <p>5.1.17 – Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Agricultural Land Commission Approves the non-farm use <p>5.1.18 – See new suggested policy 1.7.6 for ALC referrals</p> <p>5.1.19 – Suggest: Add clause to comply with new ALCA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. The seasonal farm labour accommodation has been approved by an Order of the Agricultural Land Commission <p>1.7.6 – Suggest: Add Policy: All applications for zoning amendments, plan amendments, and temporary use permits on ALR lands, or directly adjacent to ALR lands, shall be circulated to the Agricultural Land Commission for review and comment.</p>	<p>5.1.12 – No update</p> <p>5.1.13 – Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.14 – Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.15 – Update per recommendation. See new policy 1.7.6</p> <p>5.1.16 –Option 2, No update</p> <p>5.1.17 - Update per recommendation</p> <p>5.1.18 – No update</p> <p>5.1.19 - Update per recommendation</p> <p>1.76 - Update per recommendation – new policy</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

	Section 5.1 The ALC does not have any concerns with the policies as drafted, although it suggests that an 8 ha minimum parcel size throughout the AGRICULTURAL designation would be preferable and would reduce confusion; however, the ALC appreciates the inclusion of the disclaimers in policies 5.1.24 and 5.1.25 regarding the ALC’s discretion to approve or refuse subdivision applications regardless of the minimum parcel sizes indicated in the Bylaw.	5.1 - Option 1 – No edit required to minimum parcel sizes (8 ha in floodplain, 4 ha outside) (Recommended – pre-existing condition) Option 2 – Remove clause b. with reduced min. parcel size outside of floodplain areas	No update	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 5.6 • 5.6.5: The ALC appreciates the inclusion of (a) stating that RURAL designated lands are located outside the ALR. However, ALC mapping appears to indicate that a portion of PID 013-105-787 is located within the ALR and designated as RURAL. Please clarify whether this discrepancy is the result of a mapping error, a historical designation predating the ALR, etc.	No edit required. Designation follows ALR boundary. Portion of the property is in ALR & a portion is outside.	No update required	
	Section 5.7 5.7.4: The ALC appreciates the inclusion of (e) stating that Suburban Residential lands are located outside the ALR.	No edit recommended – ALC in support	No update required	
	Section 6.0 6.1.4 Agricultural Buffer: The ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that any proposed rezoning applications for residential development along the ALR boundary should be forwarded to the ALC for review and comment. Further, the ALC suggests that this section should be reviewed with the Ministry of Agriculture to ensure consistency with the Guide to Edge Planning: Promoting Compatibility Along Agricultural - Urban Edges.	6.1.4 – Suggest Add clause E. Includes AGRI comments a. House design – <u>Orient patios</u> away from ALR lands b. No change c. Landscape buffer <u>and separation of uses</u> in accordance with <u>the BC Ministry of Agriculture’s Guide to Edge Planning</u> d. Remove clause e. <u>All rezoning applications adjacent to ALR lands shall be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for review and comment</u>	Update per recommendation	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 6.3 • Boundary Review: The ALC has concerns with the FVRD’s inclusion of this section in the Bylaw. As currently drafted, this section <u>suggests that landowners are advocating for the exclusion of their lands from the ALR, despite a lack of support from the FVRD evidenced in the Bylaw by statements</u> such as: “the rationale for exclusion and development of ALR lands in Popkum is unclear”; and, that both residential and wastewater servicing needs can be accommodated on existing undeveloped lands outside of the ALR. Although it is currently possibly for an individual landowner to submit an ALC exclusion application, the ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that this may not be possible in the near future. Bill 15 – 2019: Agricultural Land Commission Act, 2019 (“Bill 15”), which is currently before the BC Legislature, is proposing to remove the existing provision in the ALCA that allows an individual landowner to submit an ALC exclusion application. Should Bill 15 be adopted, s. 29(1) states that the only persons able to submit ALC exclusion applications would be the Province, a first nation government, or a local government. Given that the FVRD does not appear to support the exclusion of ALR lands, the ALC suggests that the FVRD consider deferring adoption of the Bylaw until the question of Bill 15 has been dealt with by the BC Legislature. <u>Should Bill 15 be adopted, the ALC recommends that the FVRD remove this section from the Bylaw and reword the introductory paragraph outlining the history of boundary reviews and exclusion applications to be more supportive of agriculture and the ALR. The Bylaw could then be re-referred to the ALC for further review and comment.</u>	Bill 15 has been adopted. Land owners can make an exclusion application to the ALR, but application may not process unless authorized by a resolution of the local government Suggest 6.3 – Reword to be more supportive of agriculture/ less supportive of exclusion applications Draw attention to ALC conclusion from boundary review with bullet points. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALR lands have good ag capability, and • Substantial land is available outside the ALR to meet development needs Remove wording that plan policy will guide boundary reviews and provide an opportunity for applicants to demonstrate merits of ALR exclusion. There is no community benefit to excluding ALR lands for residential development. Ag lands contribute value to Popkum and to the greater region. Ag lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports food security in the region • Provide opportunity for farm businesses and economic development 	Update per discussion	Edited - Dec 4/19

	<p>Should Bill 15 not be adopted and/or should s. 29(1) of the draft Bill not be incorporated, the ALC requests that the FVRD re-refer the Bylaw to the ALC for re-review; the ALC will then provide the FVRD with more in-depth comments on this section of the Bylaw.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Expanded Land Uses: The ALC has concerns with the current wording of this section as it implies broad ALC support for “tourism uses” and other uses that are not permitted without ALC application (e.g. “food and beverage services” implies a restaurant use). It is the ALC’s experience that the general public’s conception of “tourism uses” often contemplates uses beyond what are permitted in the ALCA and its regulations and that this can lead to a large range of issues including the construction of non-compliant structures and the operation of non-compliant uses in the ALR. Furthermore, local governments have the ability to regulate and even prohibit some agri-tourism uses, which can be advantageous as it results in more clarity for landowners and reduced compliance and enforcement issues. As such, the ALC recommends that the FVRD consider re-wording this section to ensure both clarity and consistency with the ALCA and its regulations as follows: <p>Expanded land use options for ALR lands was were identified by residents as an opportunity to maintain and sustain the rural – agricultural community in Popkum-Bridal Falls. <u>The use of ALR land is regulated by the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC), and such expanded land use options may require ALC applications.</u> The Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) supports many tourism uses outright provided they are accessory to a farm use. This could include farm retail sales and accommodation uses, and subject to ALC approval carriage home uses. <u>Although some agri-tourism uses are permitted by the ALCA and the ALR Use Regulation, others require review and approval by the ALC.</u> Ensuring sensitive application of expanded agricultural uses will be important in avoiding conflicts between neighbouring residential uses. Expansion of Agri-tourism uses may provide interested farm operators an opportunity to complement and grow their farm business with a range of accessory tourist activities. Popkum offers an attractive tourist destination given its picturesque agricultural setting between the mountains and close proximity to Bridal Falls. In nearby Agassiz and Chilliwack, there are a diversity of agri-tourism businesses highlighted in the Circle Farm program including cheese and honey producers, farm stay accommodations, and many more. The success of the Circle Farm program highlights the growing consumer trends towards locally produced foods and direct farm-to-consumer retail. The Agricultural Land Commission supports many agritourism uses outright provided they are accessory to a farm use. Other More intensive activities where conflicts may occur with nearby land uses may require ALC and local government approval. The <u>Any proposed expansion</u> of agri-tourism uses will need to be sensitive to nearby farm operations so that holiday-makers and agriculture practices can beneficially co-exist. The Plan provides policy which supports a number of agri-tourism uses accessory to a farm operation including natural campground, farm tours, and food and beverage sales farm retail sales. Expanded agritourism uses may require rezoning and/or approvals from Agricultural Land Commission.</p> <p>As an additional note, the ALC has not reviewed the operations highlighted in the Circle Farm program to determine whether or not they are all operating in accordance with the ALCA and its regulations. The ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that the Bylaw’s reference to this program could potentially result in the FVRD inadvertently suggesting support for uses that contravene the ALCA and its regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Policy 6.3.1 Boundary Review: As per its previous comments, the ALC suggests that inclusion of this section may be premature given the progress of Bill 15 in the BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Serve as a development boundary to contain growthContribute the rural-agricultural landscapeDo not constrain efficient development <p>Suggest new policy -</p> <p>6.3.0 Housing need and residential development can be accommodated outside of the ALR for the life of the plan. The Regional Board will not support ALR exclusion applications which use residential development as a rational for the application.</p> <p>6.3.1 ALR Exclusion Applications. Proposals to exclude ALR lands or to undertake a boundary review <u>must be comprehensive, community based, and demonstrate a sound rational supported by professional review.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Remove bullets about community benefit opportunities and merit of exclusion. <p>6.3.1 Boundary Review Application requirements. Proposals to exclude ALR lands or to undertake a boundary review in Popkum must be comprehensive, and must demonstrate a sound rational supported by professional review. Applications must address the following:</p> <p>—a. Phase One – Assessment....</p> <p>—iv.”Suitability of non soil based activities agriculture must also be considered”</p> <p>Suggest – Add underlined text 6.3 Expanded Land Uses</p> <p>Expanded land use options for ALR lands was were identified by residents as an opportunity to maintain and sustain the rural – agricultural community in Popkum-Bridal Falls. <u>The use of ALR land is regulated by the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC), and expanded land use options may require ALC applications.</u> The Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) supports many tourism uses outright provided they are accessory to a farm use. This could include farm retail sales and accommodation uses, and subject to ALC approval carriage home uses. <u>Although some agri-tourism uses are permitted by the ALCA and the ALR Use Regulation, others require review and approval by the ALC.</u></p> <p>ALC concerned Circle Farm tours may not adhere to ALCA</p>	<p>REVIEW</p> <p>Add underlined text</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>Legislature. The ALC suggests that the FVRD delay inclusion of this section until the question of Bill 15 has been answered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 6.3.2 Expanded Agricultural Uses: The ALC suggests that this section be amended as follows to ensure consistency with the recent amendments to the ALCA: <i>Expanded land use options to supplement and support agriculture in Popkum will be considered by the Regional Board, including agri-tourism uses such as farm gate retail, bed and breakfast and other tourism accommodation uses, and carriage home/secondary suite uses.</i> 	Suggest 6.3.2 – Remove policy. There is sufficient text about expanded land uses	6.3.2. Address recommendation by removing policy.	
	<p>Section 7.2 Policy 7.2.1: The ALC notes that Yale Road E. and Popkum Road North run through and/or adjacent to the ALR and that the proposed upgrades may require ALC applications. It is recommended that the FVRD consult with the ALC early on in the road upgrade planning process in order to determine whether or not ALC applications are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 7.2.12: The ALC notes that should any of the referenced unused or undeveloped right of ways be in the ALR, an ALC application would be required in order to facilitate their use as public trail. 	<p>No edit recommended – See 7.2.5</p> <p>No edit recommended – evaluation includes many factors, including referrals / consultation not explicitly listed.</p>	No update required	
	<p>Section 8.0 The ALC notes that the use and/or development of any parks and trails within the ALR are subject to the ALCA and its regulations. The construction of trails in the ALR requires an ALC application, as do some park and recreation uses. The ALC recommends that the FVRD consult with the ALC on any proposed trail, park, and recreation development within the ALR to ensure compliance with the ALCA and its regulations.</p>	<p>Suggest 8.4.15 Community Consultation</p> <p>No edit recommended, OR</p> <p>d. Referral to ALC for any parks or trails within or adjacent to the Agricultural Land Reserve</p>	No update	
	<p>Section 12.0 The ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that any proposed temporary use permits proposed for ALR lands should first be circulated to the ALC for review and comment in order to ensure compliance with the ALCA and its regulations.</p>	No edit recommended – Referrals are common practice for ALR lands	No update required	
	<p>Section 13.0 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessory Farm Employee Dwelling: The ALC wishes to advise the FVRD that any proposed accessory farm employee dwellings cannot be approved by the FVRD and must be submitted to the ALC as a non-adhering residential use application. The ALC also requests that this section be updated to reflect the new regulations, specifically: the Agricultural Land Reserve General Regulation and the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation. Associated Rural Residential Uses: Please update this section to reference the change to the Agricultural Land Reserve General Regulation and the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation. Farm Use: Please update this section to reference the change to the Agricultural Land Reserve General Regulation and the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation. Please also note the following typo: Agricultural Land Reserve Commission Act. </p>	<p>Suggest: Update definition ACCESSORY FARM EMPLOYEE DWELLING means a building on a farm under the BC Assessment Act, used as a home or residence by a full time employee of the farm and his or her family members provided the use is <u>in accordance with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dwellings could be located outside ALR. Not included: ‘The dwelling must be approved by the Agricultural Land Commission as a non-adhering residential use.’ <p>Suggest: Update name of regulation in all definitions</p>	<p>Update per recommendation</p> <p>Update per recommendation</p>	Edited - Dec 4/19
	<p>Section 11.2 The ALC notes that much of this DPA is located within the ALR. As a general comment, the ALC recommends consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture to ensure that the DPA does not infringe on the provisions outlined in the <i>Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act</i>.</p>	<p>ALR / DPA overlap is Cheam Lake</p> <p>Suggest: Add exemption 11.2.2 (f) Soil based agricultural activities</p>	Update per recommendation	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 11.5		No update required	

	The ALC notes that the entire Bylaw area is located within this DPA, including ALR lands. As a general comment, the ALC recommends consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture to ensure that the DPA does not infringe on the provisions outlined in the <i>Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act</i> .	No edit recommend		
External Referral: Ministry of Ag	Generally not compliant with recent changes to ALC Act and Regulations			
	The plan outlines in some detail a development strategy for urban development on lands that are currently ALR, and are not slated for development in the Regional Growth Strategy and which has not been approved for development by the ALC.			
	Section 1.7 We note a lack of specific consultation with farmers or the agriculture industry. This is a significant omission in the development of the plan, as it is unlikely that a full picture of the amount and type of agricultural land required over the next 5 years, as required under s.473 of the <i>Local Government Act</i> could be obtained without this consultation	No edit recommended – S473 (b), An OCP must include... ‘the approximate location, amount and type of present and proposed commercial, industrial, institutional, agricultural, recreational and public utility land uses;’ Add new policy: Refer all applications for lands in the ALR to the ALC	No update - See new policy 1.7.6	Edited - Dec 4/19
	Section 2.0 would benefit from a section on the agricultural lands and the nature of agriculture in the FVRD and where Area D fits into that data. (Census data from 2016 shows that the FVRD has 509.6 B in Farm Capital and Gross Farm Receipts of 1.5 B, with census data showing returns around \$30,000 per hectare. Due to discrepancies between Agriculture Land Use Inventory data and Census data, it appears as though the headquarters rule is reporting on more land holdings than are contained strictly within Area D. Total farm area was reported to be 4318 ha in the 2016 Census, however this is likely affected by the headquarters rule. Agricultural Land Use Inventory data shows that there is 821 ha including land outside legal parcels and IR land. There are 493 ha when IR lands and lands outside legal parcels are excluded from the calculation. Ministry staff can provide more statistics as required. Keeping this in mind, 2016, Census Subdivision D reported \$547 million in farm capital and 71.6 million in farm gross receipts showing an average return of \$16,600/ha. Growth from the period of 2010 to 2015 was 12% in farm capital and 20% in farm gross receipts. The agriculture currently in place in Area D is valuable for grazing and some lower intensity agriculture and has provided grazing land for dry cows (cows that are coming into calf for the first time or are between lactations) and some smaller scale or start-up farming operations. This type of agriculture is important to support the intensive agriculture that is prevalent in the FVRD. Also, the statistics show that there is room to grow for agriculture in Area D. Currently, there are 92 ha of land that could be developed for farm businesses, 19% of the ALR, with most of the parcels below 8 ha in size. It should be noted that 11% of the parcels and 15% of the land in the ALR are in protected area/park/reserve and not used for farming and mainly associated with Cheam Lake Wetlands Regional Park. This is a high percentage of non-farm use in the area.	Discussion: Move section 6.3 ALR Lands to section 4? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Talk about the nature and value of agriculture in the community, Section 6 is about developing neighbourhoods. Does ALR discussion belong here? 	No update	
	Section 3.2 the objective to protect agriculture is good but would be better if it were “protect and enhance agriculture”, as there may be opportunities to expand or intensify agricultural production in the area which could provide benefits to the local economy, and this is more in line with the statement in the RGS.	Edit captured in ALC revisions/comments	See update in ALC section	
	Section 3.3 Regional context – it is worth mentioning that agriculture in the region is growing and	See comments in ALC comments / review 3.2 and 3.3	See update in ALC	

	intensifying as this may increase nuisance and farm practice complaints in the future. Goal 2: - this statement of providing flexible uses is rather concerning as if the result is to allow more non-farm uses or subdivision in the ALR, it will have the effect of undermining agriculture. As stated, ministry staff view this to be contrary to the RGS goal to protect and enhance the agriculture sector, rather than being consistent with it. This language is mirrored in Goal 4, however, it does not promote a sustainable agricultural community. Strongly recommend changes here. A more appropriate statement would be to ensure consistency between zoning regulation and provincial legislation. The statement could also mention good practice in land use planning for agriculture. Ministry staff can provide more details if required. Goal 7: - While supporting agri-tourism can be part of supporting the agricultural community, caution needs to be exercised that this is an accessory use to an active farm, and not that tourism uses are replacing farming altogether.		section	
	Section 4.2: In addition to directing development away from ALR lands, there should also be a statement in Policy 4.2.4 regarding buffering of ALR lands from residential lands as this interface is the most prone to urban/ALR conflict. Contrary to popular belief, it is often single-family residences on large lots along the ALR edge that generate the most complaints. We would support a move to higher density on the urban side of the edge provided buffering and setbacks are implemented that are in accordance with the Ministry's Guide to Edge Planning.	4.2.4 Suggest Option 1 Add – New developments adjacent to agricultural lands must Be designed to include a vegetative buffer that adheres to guidelines in the Ministry of Agriculture's Guide to Edge Planning. Option 2 – No update. Edge planning is discussed in 6.1.4 (West Popkum)	No update. Ag buffer is discussed on 6.1.4	
	Section 4.3 we note an apparent numbering error in the policies under this section. Policy 4.5.1 in this section should include a statement that would evaluate impacts to agricultural lands as well. Although there is generally less conflict between agricultural land and industrial land, there are still some impacts that require assessment and mitigation such as stormwater runoff. Adequate buffering in accordance with the Ministry's Guide to Edge planning should be established between industrial and agricultural uses.	4.3.1 Suggest – Add – 'stormwater runoff' to list of considerations	Update per recommendation	
	Section 5.0 The designation of ALR lands as Agricultural (AG) is a good step for supporting agriculture. However, the statement under the Rural (R) designation that these lands serve as a buffer for agricultural uses is incorrect. The majority of farm practice complaints and conflict actually come from large rural residential lots that abut farmland.	No edit recommended	No Update	
	Section 5.1 The acknowledgement that the agricultural lands are productive and important to the local economy is excellent, but the way the section begins with the limitations of these lands seems to suggest a development agenda. We suggest re-working this section to highlight the importance of these lands to the community first and then to acknowledge any limitations. It is important to distinguish between limitations for which there is no solution (i.e. lack of sunlight) and those which can be improved (i.e. drainage). Consideration should also be given to non-soil based agriculture as this can often occur where there are limitations of soil or sunlight. The vagueness of what the "flexible options" are is highly problematic as noted above, as is stating that the ALR contributes	Suggest – Add sentence add the value of agriculture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less intensive ag found in Area D supports the more intensive ag found in the other area of the regional district Add <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALR lands in Popkum-Bridal Falls are mainly used for lower intensity agriculture including grazing, hay, and dry cow operations. ALR lands in Popkum provide opportunities for small scale and start-up farming operations. This type of agriculture is important to support the intensive agriculture that is prevalent in the FVRD. 	Update per recommendation. See update in ALC section	

	to “rural character”. Unfortunately this wording may set up expectations for rural residents that they will have a bucolic lifestyle if they locate next to ALR lands, when in fact modern agriculture, especially where industry is intensifying can have significant impacts to neighbouring residents, and vice versa, and can result in conflict. Acknowledgement of the precedence of the <i>Agricultural Land Commission Act</i> is a positive in this section. The statement that active farming occurs on 60% of the ALR land is misleading, as this only denotes land cover. Much more land than what is actually cropped is usually needed to support farming and the remaining land can be necessary riparian setbacks, drainage infrastructure, etc. Ministry staff are working to change reporting of data in the Agriculture Land Use Inventory reports to correct the common misconception that land cover data refers to the active farming area, as it consistently underrepresents the active farming area. A more correct reporting of the data would say that 65% of the ALR is in active farming, with 15% unavailable for agriculture development (in park or reserve) and approximately 20% could be developed for farming.	No edit required – about amount of land farmed		
	Policy 5.1.1 this is an excellent statement and should be retained.	No edit recommended – AGRI in support	No update	
	Policy 5.1.2 the Ministry encourages farmers to use best practices regarding protection of the environment, but it should be noted that the Environmental Farm Plan program is completely voluntary. A better statement would be “ <u>consistent with the Environmental Management Act and associated regulations</u> ”, as this is what farmers are legally obliged to do.	Suggest: 5.1.2 Agricultural activities in the Plan area should be conducted in an environmentally sensitive and sustainable manner that is <u>consistent with the Environmental Management Act and associated regulations</u> adhere to guidelines as provided by the Ministry of Agriculture’s Environmental Farm Plan Program and other best practices.	Update per recommendation	
	Policy 5.1.3 This is quite a vague statement that does not seem as if it will be helpful in guiding any decisions of the Board.	See comments in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Policy 5.1.4 Support for exclusions is not consistent with the RGS goal of protecting and enhancing agriculture and is not consistent with other objectives of this plan.	See comments in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Policy 5.1.5 This is a good policy.	No edit recommended – AGRI in support	No update	
	Policy 5.1.6 If these are the “flexible options” it is good to see them clarified here. The statements are appropriate, but it would be good to see a further statement specifically that non-farm uses which do not support farming will not be supported. Also, it should be clarified that many non-farm uses require approval of the Agricultural Land Commission.	See comments in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	The policy section could benefit from an additional statement that zoning bylaws should be consistent with the <i>Agricultural Land Commission Act</i> and associated Regulations. <u>While this may be considered a matter of course</u> , most local governments around the province are failing to have zoning bylaws consistent although they are legally obliged to	FVRD is working to update our zoning bylaws to bring them into alignment with recent changes to the ACL Act its regulations.	No update	

	be. Outlining this as a matter of policy in the OCP may help local governments become more consistent with provincial legislation over time.			
	Designation policies – These are good policies, but it should be noted that the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation has been repealed and replaced by the Agricultural Land Reserve General Regulation and the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation. Given recent changes to the <i>Agricultural Land Commission Act</i> , it would be prudent to check that the section numbers are still correct as well.	Edit captured in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Use Policies – As stated above, the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation has been repealed and replaced, and it would be wise to note here that all additional dwellings in the ALR now require approval of the ALC.	Edit captured in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Policy 5.1.12 given that non-farm use approvals may have time limitations as a condition, we would suggest changing this to “ <u>zoning amendment or temporary use permit applications</u> ”. This ensures that zoning changes are not supported for temporary uses.	No edit recommended. TUPs discussed in 5.1.17	No update	
	Policy 5.1.15 this should be checked to ensure that it is consistent with the new Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation.	Edit captured in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Policy 5.1.16 additional dwellings other than secondary suites are no longer permitted in the ALR without application to and approval of the ALC. Additional dwellings can have a detrimental impact on agricultural land and increases speculation. A policy more supportive of agriculture would be to not support applications for additional dwellings unless a clear need for farm use has been demonstrated. This would provide greater guidance for the Board when considering applications for the additional dwellings.	Edit captured in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Policy 5.1.24 Four hectares is quite a small minimum lot size and it would be very difficult to support a thriving agricultural operation with such a small parcel size outside of the floodplain area. We recommend a minimum of 8 hectares throughout the area, and larger if at all possible in order to align with the objectives to protect agriculture. Our data show unequivocally that larger parcels are more likely to be farmed than small parcels and that the price per acre of farmland increases significantly in smaller parcels.	See comments in ALC comments / review	See update in ALC section	
	Policy 5.6.5. As mentioned earlier, low density use adjacent to agriculture use does not reduce conflict. Rural residential use is a major cause of complaints on the ALR. This incorrect assumption should be removed.	No edit recommended	No update	
	Policy 5.6.9 It is unclear if the Rural land designation may include land in the ALR. If there are lands within the ALR in this designation, please note that s.555 of the Local Government Act allows these uses in the ALR despite local government zoning bylaws and this should be	No edit recommended – No ALR in the Rural designation	No update	

	mentioned. If there are no ALR lands within the Rural designation, then this is fine to remain as is.			
	Policy 5.6.13 Ministry staff support clustered subdivisions and density averaging, especially where this is used to create setbacks and vegetative buffers between rural residences and the ALR.	No edit recommended – AGRI in support	No update	
	Policy 6.1.4 Vegetative buffers and separation of land uses along the ALR edge should be in accordance with the Ministry’s Guide to Edge Planning as this is a more current document than the Landscape Buffer Specifications and is more strongly based on supportive science. Graduated density has been shown to not work as a suitable separation between land uses and actually increases complaints.	6.1.4 Suggest Add clause E a. House design – <u>Orient patios</u> away from ALR lands b. No change c. Landscape buffer <u>and separation of uses</u> in accordance with <u>the BC Ministry of Agriculture’s Guide to Edge Planning</u> d. Remove clause e. <u>All rezoning applications adjacent to ALR lands shall be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for review and comment</u>	Update per recommendation	
	Policy 6.3. Enhancing agriculture can involve detailed study as can be achieved by completing an agriculture area plan. Such a plan is beneficial in not only identifying agriculture opportunities and helping farmers overcome issues, it also provides a valuable opportunity with Local Government planners to consult and work with farmers who make up about only 1-2% of the population on enhancing agriculture.	See comments in ALC comments / review There is little political appetite for an Ag Area Plan at this time.	No update	
	Agritourism is but one means of increasing farm revenue. Ministry staff would like to add that there is a great deal of support available to people who wish to start farming or for established farmers who want to make their farm businesses more profitable through appropriate insurance programs, business development training and funding for innovation all of which are made available to the agriculture sector through provincial and federal programs. Details of this type of programing can be found through Ministry of Agriculture websites, or Ministry staff can provide more details.	Good resource information on provincial programs and funding. No edit recommended to OCP	No update	
	Policy 6.3.1 Boundary Review a) Phase 1. Assessment.: Assessment of the suitability of land for agriculture use needs to examine improvements that can be made to land, such as drainage improvements and, in addition, account for the large number of agriculture operations (over 1/3 of farm receipts) that are not soil based and can have varying requirements for optimal conditions, including the moderate climate, availability of water resources, access to transportation to name a few. b) Phase 2 – Conceptual Plan and Consultation: Ministry staff are concerned that development of such a plan precluding support for a block exclusion by the ALC could lead to speculative pricing of farmland and dampen serious investment in the agriculture sector and development of agriculture businesses.	6.3.1 a (iv). Suggest – Add – The study must also comment on opportunities for non-soil based agriculture. 6.3.1 b Consider – Remove section.	Update per recommendation. See update in ALC section See update in ALC section	
	Policy 6.3.2 As mentioned above, ministry staff do not support non-farm uses that are detrimental to	Edit captured in ALC revisions/comments. Remove policy.	See update in ALC section	

	<p>agriculture. A clarifying statement such as that found in the agriculture designation about types of non-farm uses that could be considered or not considered would help here as well to allay expectations.</p>			
	<p>Policy 6.3.3 As mentioned above, putting the expectation of maintaining rural character on ALR lands can lead to disappointment when residents discover that modern agriculture is not associated with a bucolic lifestyle.</p>	Discuss. Remove policy	See update in ALC section	
<p>External Referral: City of Chilliwack</p>	<p>Schedule 8 Parks and Trails should illustrate the connection with the Experience the Fraser Trail, as shown in the City of Chilliwack OCP 2040</p>	<p>Suggest: update Parks and Trails map(schedule 8) to reflect existing ETF trail in CoC and future potential ETF trail in Area D</p> <p>Policy(new): 8.4.18 Experience the Fraser Trail and Blueway. The Regional Board supports continuation of the ETF Trail and Blueway from its current terminus within City of Chilliwack jurisdiction to existing recreation opportunities within Electoral Area D, including connection to Ferry Island Provincial Park, in accordance with the ETF Concept Plan.</p> <p>Update policy 8.4.11 to be inclusive of Regional Parks and Trails as well, not exclusive to Community Parks and Trails</p>	<p>Update Schedule</p> <p>Include 8.4.18</p> <p>No change to 8.4.11</p>	Edited
<p>External Referral: BC Parks</p>	<p>Section 2.1 The park facilities mentioned include a range of community, regional and provincial parks. The list does not include Ferry Island Provincial Park.</p>	<p>Suggest: update list to include Ferry Island Park</p>	Update per recommendation	Edited
	<p>Policy 5.2.2 According to this policy, recreation uses, or recreation potential is identified as the only criterion for park use. This should be broadened to include conservation uses by amending policies 5.2.2.a, c., and d. To explain further, recreational use could be interpreted quite broadly to include all forms of recreational use and development, including motorized use and intensive recreation uses such as trails, campgrounds and day use facilities, which may be inconsistent with the conservation management direction for a provincial park. In recognizing that both conservation and recreation values are components of the park use the policy acknowledges a broader balance of park objectives.</p>	<p>Suggest: amend 5.2.2c to “areas of important wildlife or environmental value, including habitat <u>and lands requiring conservation management</u>”</p> <p>Duplication of this terminology in a/d is unnecessary</p>	Update per recommendation	Edited
	<p>Section 5.6.4 Development surrounding park areas can benefit from policies that address interface use issues such as encroachment, trespass, environmental impacts and conflicting land use. The OCP provides interface policies for Cheam Lake Wetlands Regional Park and BC Parks would suggest the FVRD consider extending similar interface policies to lands adjacent to Bridal Veil Falls Provincial Park.</p>	<p>Suggest: Cheam Lake Park and Bridal Veil Falls Provincial Park “...dimension of development, <u>and design which incorporates hard edges distinguishing property boundaries and reduces opportunities for trespass.</u>”</p>	Update per recommendation	Edited
	<p>Section 6.2.5 Future initiatives to expand the Bridal Falls tourism brand such as the business association may increase visitor use to the park. BC Parks should be consulted to coordinate visitor management strategies and operations to ensure use is appropriate to the park carrying capacity.</p>	<p>Suggest: 6.2.9 The Regional Board encourages communication between any future business improvement association and BC Parks in order to effectively coordinate visitor management strategies and operations, ensuring use is appropriate to the park carrying capacity.</p>	Update per recommendation but include FVRD in list	Edited
	<p>Section 6.2.8 & 8.4.18 BC Parks recognizes that Bridal Veil Falls Provincial Park is a key tourism destination for</p>	<p>Suggest: 6.2.8 “...supports <u>consideration of an extended...</u>”</p>	Merge 6.2.8 and 8.4.18 into single	Edited

	the corridor and an extended operating season is desirable. The current park operating season of April 1 to October 31 reflects a range of considerations including; a marked period of lower visitor use, increased seasonal precipitation usually accompanied with freeze/thaw of Bridal Veil Falls and resulting impacts to visitor safety, park infrastructure and budget availability. BC Parks supports working together with the FVRD and other partners to consider options for enhanced park opportunities in a safe and sustainable manner.	Suggest: 8.4.18 “The Regional Board supports advocating that BC Parks consider options for enhanced park operations, where appropriate and feasible, including extending the operating season for Bridal Veil Falls Provincial Park.”	policy under 6.2.8 (delete 8.4.18)	
	Section 8.2, Table 2 Ferry Island Provincial Park is collaboratively managed by both Cheam First Nation and BC Parks.	Suggest: update Table 2, Ferry Island: (collaboratively managed with Cheam First Nation)	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Section 8.2, Table 5 Eastern Hillside – Opportunities to connect regional and community trails to Bridal Veil Falls Provincial Park are best suited to designated development or (intensive recreation) use areas of the park as identified in the park management plan. BC Parks should work together with the FVRD to connect community trails with park trails where their uses are compatible.	No edit recommended	New Policy (section 8.4) 8.4.6 Continuous Connections. Trail networks connecting existing community, Regional, and Provincial parks should be prioritized. Additionally, opportunities for continuity between Area D and other communities (e.g. City of Chilliwack and First Nations neighbours) through shared spaces and trail connections should be explored.	Edited
	Schedule 2 I would suggest that the colour for the Conservation or Forest be changed to prevent confusion with the similarly green coloured land use designation.	Suggest: lighten “conservation” further to better distinguish from “forest”	Update per recommendation	Edited

<p>External Referral: Fraser Health Authority</p>	<p>Housing The future Bridal Falls Neighbourhood Plan can provide opportunities for a diversity in housing densities and has the potential to include residential, gateway commercial and tourism related uses.¹ It is beneficial for communities to offer a variety of diverse and affordable housing options. Affordability, tenure, size and flexible housing is recommended for consideration, this includes housing that allows for multi-generational living and aging in place. In addition, establishing greater residential densities provides market support for economically viable grocery stores and other retail uses to be brought into the neighbourhood.² Easy access to a variety of fresh produce and whole foods is associated with increased purchase and consumption of healthy foods, which helps to lower obesity rates.²</p>	<p>No edit recommended – comments can be considered when NCP development for Bridal Uplands is explored</p>	<p>New Policy (section 6.2.4(g)) (f) conceptual lot layout to ensure the design of lot layouts, roads and infrastructure preserve the hillside character, retain natural values, minimize land alteration, and results in creating a compact, walkable suburban form which prioritizes pedestrian orientations; and,</p>	<p>Edited</p>
	<p>Neighbourhood Design Providing opportunities for increased density and mixed-use development that have the potential to create more compact, complete and connected neighbourhoods. Increased density also has environmental benefits such as reducing pressures on agricultural land and natural environments. Neighbourhood Centre’s with increased density are generally more walkable and residents are more likely to take part in active transportation. More walkable neighbourhoods support an increase in physical activity rates and reduce unhealthy weights, as well as reduce the use of vehicles and decrease air pollution.² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkable communities also help older people to be socially connected and mentally healthy, which are states associated with longevity. The proportion of older adults will increase significantly in coming years.⁸ • Community design influences community connectedness, mental and physical health and chronic disease outcomes by promoting healthy behaviors such as walking or cycling. Increasing people’s ability to be more physically active reduces the risk of obesity. Obesity is associated with high blood pressure, stroke and heart disease which are among leading causes of disability and death in Canada.⁷ </p>	<p>No edit recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.2.2 encourages secondary dwellings • 8.4 table 5 / 8.4.4 / 8.4.5 / 5.7.12 / 6.1.1b policies supporting increased trail connections • See also, new accessibility language for commercial and parks 	<p>No update</p>	
	<p>Transportation Networks The provision of easy access to the regional trails and paths to further encourage walking and cycling for active transportation.² In all contexts, physical activity, and the provision of easy access to active transportation are linked to a spectrum of health benefits including increased social well-being.² Opportunities for active transportation, pleasant scenery and aesthetically designed neighbourhoods are associated with increased physical activity in small communities. For example, 82% of Canadians are willing to walk more if there is better infrastructure. ⁸ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address safety concerns and improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists regarding active transportation. This may include constructing buffers from traffic; providing wide shoulders in areas where there are no sidewalks and bike lanes; providing safe crossings; installing visible and clear signage that indicate connections to trail system.² This helps </p>	<p>No edit recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.4 / 7.2.1 / 7.2.10,11 / 7.2.12-21 support ped/cyclist trail connections and safety and transit stops 	<p>No update</p>	

	<p>benefit community health through increased physical activity including the reduction in the risk of chronic diseases such as heart disease, obesity and diabetes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A convenient and frequent transit system that connects neighbouring communities and other cities with Popkum and Bridal Falls. This can include a well maintained, convenient and safe access to transit stops to encourage equality by enhancing mobility among a wide range of vulnerable groups (including children, older adults and people with disability).² Prioritizing “active transportation” (primarily walking, cycling and the use of public transit) and encouraging mobility of all people, can help achieve an increase in physical activity and social interaction, which is associated with improved mental and physical health. Access to public transportation regardless of income or status is considered a key determinant of public health. 			
	<p>Food Networks</p> <p>Incentive programs for existing small food retailers to carry healthy foods and partner with local growers, farmer’s markets or local food programs.² Encouraging healthy eating habits significantly reduces the risk of chronic diseases such as high blood pressure and cancer. People with a healthy lifestyle tend to make healthier choices, this results in an increase in their quality of life and reduces overall health care costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of community intergenerational gardens which supports social interaction. ² Healthy food systems can contribute to healthy behavior including (but not limited to) consumption of 5 or more serving of fruits and vegetables per day. Data shows that only 41% of British Columbians eat at least five servings of fruits and vegetables per day.⁸ • Maximizing healthy, accessible, and affordable food options near affordable housing and public transit connections.² Residents living in a neighbourhood with at least one grocery store are 1.5 times as likely to be physically active than residents living in an area with no grocery store. Each additional grocery store within a one-kilometer distance from an individual's residence is associated with an 11% reduction in the likelihood of being overweight.⁸ • Provide active transportation options to healthy food retail services, such as making trails and pathways readily accessible within residential areas and connecting them to healthy food retail services.² 	<p>No edits recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot sizes in excess of 800m² provide opportunities for all residents to engage in personal food production/gardens, likely low demand for community gardens <p>Suggest: incorporate policy under new section “Community Well-Being” in 3.0 Vision and Values</p> <p>“The Regional Board supports establishing a local grocery store in order to maximize health, accessible, and affordable food options in the community and complement the existing commercial services available to Popkum-Bridal Falls residents.”</p>	Update per recommendation	Edited
	<p>Natural Environments</p> <p>Increasing biodiversity across the landscape and integrating strategies to address air quality contamination and noise that tend to co-exist with close access from the highway.² Plant and place trees strategically to reduce energy use, air pollution and storm water runoff. Increasing the vegetation in developments can add aesthetic appeal for recreation and tourism.² There is strong evidence to support that being in nature and viewing nature has significant physical and mental benefits, including increased social well-being and reduced stress.² For example, people who live close to parks use them for physical activity. Studies show that people who live within 800 meters of a park get 50% of their vigorous physical activity while at the park compared to those who live just 800 meters further away get 16% of their physical activity while at the park.⁸</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green spaces are designed for the needs of all ages, physical abilities and cultural groups, with features such as adaptive playground equipment, wheelchair-accessible paths and places for individuals or groups to comfortably sit and talk.² Natural spaces 	<p>Suggest: update Section 10.5 “tree preservation policies in suburban residential areas under development <u>and public education in tree retention for areas subject to development.</u>”</p> <p>Suggest: 10.5.2 “retain as much of the natural vegetation cover as possible <u>and prioritize tree retention when preparing land.</u>”</p>	Update per recommendation	Edited

	<p>help children build gross motor skills, interact socially, alleviate adverse effects of exposure to chronic stress,⁸ and reduce rates of obesity and cardiovascular disease.⁸ People living adjacent to green spaces know more of their neighbours and report strong feelings of belonging, they are typically more supportive of each other.⁸</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving biodiversity and connecting environmentally sensitive areas, which also has economic co-benefits. Tree canopies are correlated with decreased costs related to air pollution removal and storm water management, and increased energy savings and property values for home owners.² Green infrastructure filters pollutants and sediments out of surface water, buffers developed areas from flooding, and prevents soil erosion. 			
	<p>Aging in Place In 2016, an estimated 40% of the population in FVRD were older adults (40 years plus). We recommend that the OCP for Popkum and Bridal Falls communities include strategies from “Aging in the Fraser Valley Regional District” that allow seniors to age at home.³ For example increasing walkability features in the neighbourhood and increasing healthy food options addresses key components of the strategy by promoting senior’s physical activity and healthy eating. Age-friendly communities reduce travel barriers, allowing seniors to visit friends, exercise, and volunteer, all of which are good for mental and physical health as they reduce depression and heart disease, and increase life expectancy. Age-friendly communities have design features that are less likely to cause falls, this is a major cause of disability among seniors.⁸</p>	<p>Suggest: incorporate policy under new section “Community Well-Being” in 3.0 Vision and Values “Intergenerational housing options which promote age-friendly principles may be considered by the Regional Board in areas designated AGRICULTURAL, LIMITED USE, RURAL, and SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL subject to zoning amendment and other relevant provincial legislation as applicable. “</p>	<p>Update per recommendation but remove designation list and incorporate language pertaining to “new development” and “considered” to “encouraged”</p>	<p>Edited</p>
	<p>Health Equity Lens Increased mobility and reliable access to transportation can contribute to better mental and physical health for seniors. For example, opportunities to participate in fitness programs and social activities can lead to a more meaningful life. Adequate transportation can also enable a senior to stay and age in place, this will reduce costs of facility care and increasing quality of life. Maintaining a high level of mobility can be challenging given the increase in physical limitations often associated with age. In the FVRD, 45% of seniors between the ages of 65-74 reported limitations in activities.³ After age 75, the percentage of seniors experiencing difficulty or reduction in daily activities climbs to 70%. The numbers are even higher for low-income seniors. These limitations can make it unsafe for many seniors to get around without help. We recommend considering the development of a health equity impact assessment as part of the future neighbourhood planning processes.⁶ Health inequities within populations can exist in the community due to the lack of research and data on health impacts among vulnerable or priority populations (e.g. low socioeconomic status, elderly, homeless, those with chronic health conditions or those with disabilities). It is useful to engage in a health equity assessment process to uncover potential health inequities in the future neighbourhood renewal strategies. Access to services and amenities can vary for different segments of the population and can be present on different levels such as access to healthy foods, affordable and healthy housing, public transportation and family and age friendly housing. Improving health outcomes can be accomplished by providing a safe and connected neighbourhood, food security, access to protected natural environments and accessible options for active transportation and housing.</p>	<p>Option 1: No edit recommended – defer contemplation of health equity assessment to Bridal Uplands NCP</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Option 2: Suggest: update 6.2.4 to include that any land use concept or neighbourhood plan should be developed in consideration of a health equity lens</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Option 3: Suggest: incorporate policy under new section “Community Well-Being” in 3.0 Vision and Values “Development of new neighbourhood plans within Popkum-Bridal Falls should be considered through a health equity lens to uncover potential health inequities.”</p> <p>FHA Recommended Tool: FHA Community Planning Tool – Applying a Health Equity Lens to Program Planning</p>	<p>Option 2 - as 6.2.4 (g) but “through community health and well being lens”</p>	<p>Edited</p>

External Referral: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	As you will know, the Province is committed to implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action. As part of this, the provincial government continues to encourage local governments to work with the First Nations whose traditional territory they are situated within.	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.7.4 / 2.3 incorporate UNDRIP principles and TRC calls to action 	No Update	
	You may be aware that the Province made changes to the Local Government Act to strengthen the ability of local governments to understand what kinds of housing are most needed in their communities, and to help ensure that local policies, plans and development decisions are responsive to housing needs. This new Housing Needs Reports legislation requires local governments to collect and report on information on current and projected housing needs, and to further consider that information when developing future OCPs and RGSs, or making housing-related amendments to those plans and strategies.	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2 / 4.2 address housing, building permits, housing needs 	New policy (section 1.6.4) 1.6.4 Housing Needs Report. An update to the OCP should occur once the FVRD receives a Housing Needs Report as prescribed by the <i>Local Government Act</i> . The amendment to the plan should consider the report and what implications exist for policies related to demand for and supply of housing.	Edited
	The Local Government Act requires that OCPs are specifically required to address the location, amount, type and density of residential development required over a minimum of a 5 year period, as well as policies regarding non-market housing.	4.2 Housing Needs – does not specifically include provisions for affordable, rental, or special needs housing (except 4.4 Community Care Facilities) Suggest: update 4.2.2 “...second residences may be considered by the RB subject to zoning amendment <u>on the basis that they may provide opportunities to expand the availability of affordable, rental, and/or accessible housing in the community.</u> ” **Further Discussion Required**	Update per recommendation but add for “new development” and remove SBR from designation list	Edited
External Referral: MOTI	Section 7 Through legislation (Sections 52 and 62 of the Transportation Act, Section 505 of the Local Government Act and through Subdivision), the Ministry has opportunity to request Traffic and Drainage reports as well. To avoid having the proponent potentially do multiple traffic reports, the Ministry would like to be involved in developing the scope early in the process. The Ministry’s requirement for drainage reports may be different and the requirements are listed in the BC Supplement to TAC Section 1010.03. Should a development require Ministry sign off, all reports must be to Ministry standards.	Suggest: update 7.2.7 “The Regional Board, <u>in coordination with MOTI</u> , may require...” Suggest: update 7.5.3 “...stormwater management plan prepared by a professional engineer <u>to MOTI standards that at a minimum meets the following objectives...</u> ”	Update per recommendation but add to MOTI <i>and</i> FVRD standards	Edited
	Section 12 The Ministry would request to receive referrals for TUPs as any access permits that have	Suggest: Procedure and Public Notification “...and is placed in a local newspaper <u>in addition to referrals for comment to key partners.</u> ”	Update per recommendation	Edited

	been issued (or were not required) would be invalid for the term of the TUP as the use would be changing and a new access permit would be required.			
External Referral: PRRO	Engagement Level: 3 – Extensive Communities: Aitchelitz, Chawathil, Cheam, Kwaw’kwaw’Apilt, Shxwha:y Village, Skowkale, Skwah, Soowahlie, Sq’ewa:lxw, Squiala, Ts’elxweyeqw, Tzeachten, Yakweakwioose	Achieved through PRRO referral and separate Cheam FN collaboration	No update	
	S’olh Temexw Use Plan (STUP) Overlap with <i>Cultural Landscape Features, Sanctuary, Protected Watershed, Culturally Sensitive Habitat, Sensitive Waterways</i>	Section 2.3 and 10.3 – STUP description and call out boxes Suggest: add STUP Zone Map as a Schedule to OCP	Update per recommendation (add Schedule)	Edited
	Cultural Heritage Overlap with <i>Material Culture, Navigation, Resource Harvesting, Resource Management, Spiritual Practice, Sxwoxwlyam, Xa:Xa</i>	Suggest: add STUP Zone Map as a Schedule to OCP	New Policy (section 2.3.9)	Edited
	Environmental Project area location raises concerns over the integrity of terrestrial, aquatic, floral/faunal, and fish environmental values	Suggest: add STUP Zone Map as a Schedule to OCP	2.3.9 First Nations Planning Tools. Land owners and developers should refer to First Nations land use codes or land use plan documents to inform development plans in the interest of balancing land use interests and needs with those of our First Nations neighbours.	Edited
	Socio-Economic Opportunities Further information is required to access potential socio-economic opportunities between this project and sto:lo communities	See Cheam FN comments.	No update	
	Conditions Cheam First Nation requested a meeting to engage directly with the Proponent	Email sent from GD 07-29-19 - See Cheam FN comments.	No update	
Plan Review Team (June 2019)	MOTI should be highlighted as a key partnership with FVRD	Suggest: update Section 1.7 to include MOTI and RCMP to list	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Inclusion of Halq’eméylem and historical references in place naming	Suggest: update 3.1 Vision Statement “...central commercial nodes, surrounded by scenic mountains and well managed agricultural lands, with a deep First Nations history.” Suggest: update 6.1 bullet list to include “Integrate Halq’eméylem language and First Nations history in placenaming and interpretive signage throughout community.” Suggest: update section 6.2 Bridal Falls Uplands add bulletin re: Future NCP “Culturally significant areas identified in the STUP are acknowledged and integrated in the early stages of neighbourhood planning.”	Update per recommendation but add “deep respect for FN people, culture, and history”	Edited
	Big picture goals should incorporate strong language pertaining to: accessibility, air and	Suggest: update Section 3.2 (3) “Provide <u>accessible</u> outdoor recreation...”	Update per	

	water preservation, climate change, ensuring infrastructure keeps pace with rate of growth, highway safety	Suggest: update Section 3.2 (6) “...and terrestrial habitat is preserved; <u>and the integrity of the community’s air and water resources are maintained</u> ”.	recommendation	
	Support for compensation offered to landowners within utility corridors whose lands are not returned to original/farmable state after works are carried out	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil issue 	No update	
	Consider additional land use designation for areas affected by geohazards in order to further restrict permitted uses	No edit recommend <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option was considered but DPAs 1D and 3D sufficiently address geohazards in conjunction with LU designation and are easier to administer than a separate designation 	No update	
	Limit bio-solid composting on ALR/AG lands	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defer to Agricultural Waste Control Regulation and Organic Matter Recycling Regulation (BC) – application not within jurisdiction to regulate 	No update	
	Preservation of farm land should be prioritized over the long term	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed through policies 5.1.1 and 5.1.25 	Update to section 3.2.7 add “future”	Edited
	Covenanted areas of Rose Garden should be redesignated to Conservation, not SR – same for neighbourhood parks	Suggest: update Schedule 2 Map to reflect covenanted areas as “Conservation”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Consider adding sanctuary areas to further restrict public access in parks for especially sensitive areas	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defer to park specific management (through Outdoor Rec Park Mgmt Plan), not OCP designation 	No update	
	Accessibility language should be included in HTRC designation and Commercial DPA	Suggest: amend policies 5.4.2 / 5.4.9(b) / DPA 4-D 11.4 bullet #3 / DPA 4-D 11.4(e) to include “accessible”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Commercial DPA should require minimum number of trash receptacles	Suggest: amend 11.4.4 “ Boarders, Landscaping, Screening and Trash Receptacles ” add (g) minimum one (1) exterior trash receptacle provided for the development.	Update per recommendation	Edited
	OCP should take position on transport truck parking – either to properly accommodate or create physical barriers to prevent/prohibit	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HTRC designation allows for truck stop use (rezoning maybe required) which provides opportunity for market to dictate whether the use is established based on demand MOTI responsible for barriers to prevent parking along roads 	Update (section 7) 7.2.9 The Regional Board should work with MOTI to address the existing and ongoing issue of commercial truck parking along highway and arterial corridors.	Edited
	Commercial corridor along yale, west or roundabout – is this balanced or too large for the community?	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not consider expansion of existing commercial lands, consistent with previous OCP to allow future growth 	New Policy (Commercial Lands) 5.4.9 Notwithstanding Policy 5.4.7, HIGHWAY TOURIST RECREATION COMMERCIAL areas along the south side of Yale Road, west of	Edited

			Highway 9, may be considered by the Regional Board for a broader range of uses compatible with local commercial such as mixed use or live-work spaces that encourage a diversified housing stock while still meeting the day to day commercial needs of the local community. Include that the RB may rezone to allow, this is consistent with the policies of the plan.	
	Good Neighbour Practices – expand to neighbours outside of new construction context	Suggest: amend 5.7.10 and 6.1.3 “...and that the Regional Board consider broadening the Good Neighbour Practices Policy to include existing /established neighbourhoods in addition to new developments.”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Should the Plan increase focus on evening out the demographic, i.e. attract families with children and seniors	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographics are similar to regional demos 4.2.2 housing policy to appeal to various demographics 6.2.4 Bridal Uplands NCP should prioritize diversity in housing forms 	No update	
	Additional consideration required for Secondary Dwellings policies (servicing, parking)	Suggest: amend 4.2.2 to reference new Secondary Dwellings in the Electoral Areas Policy	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Better policy for mitigating and/or managing ag/residential interface conflicts at time of subdivision or infill development	See ALC/MoA comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new suburban development adjacent to ag lands proposed 	No update	
	Incorporate Bridal Falls Uplands as a third neighbourhood “One community – three neighbourhoods”	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Premature but good suggestion for future OCP update where NCP is contemplated 	No update	
	At-ground Design requires further clarification – consider how prescriptive/restrictive this should be	Suggest: amend 6.1.1 Table 1 replace “At ground design” with “Grade Appropriate Design” amend description to “Provide lot grading plan at subdivision, approved prior to BP, to encourage development that respects the natural grade, incorporates ground oriented design and prioritizes privacy protection”	Update per recommendation but remove “lot grading plan at subdivision”	Edited
	Incorporate Building Schemes as preferred method of assuring design guidelines	Suggest: amend 6.1.1(b) remove “design control agreement with FVRD” with Building Scheme between developer and builder	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Preference for native species in linear parks	No edits recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 8.4.12 	No update	
	More flexible timeline considerations for development of BF Uplands (less tied to West Popkum build out)	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Popkum buildout is well underway, FVRD resources for community water/sewer expansion are allocated. Allowing BF Uplands 	No update	

		to develop in advance if WP is not logical and may prolong WP buildout		
	Strengthen considerations for ALR boundary reviews – substantial/compelling community benefit required	See ALC/MoA comments	No update	
	Confirm accuracy of current sanitary system capacities	Suggest: update 7.4 Table with numbers provided by Sterling	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Desire for increased police resources	Suggest: policy 7.8.5 (new) “The Regional Board supports advocating for increased police services and resources to be allocated for the Popkum-Bridal Falls community”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Include sidewalks as a community service requiring capital replacement reserves	confirmed by Engineering: Sidewalks/linear parks are considered under capital replacement reserves but through Park dept. not engineering. Suggest: add linear parks/sidewalks to list 7.1.3	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Inconsistent application of Bylaw 1319 – stronger language required to reduce op for discretion	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 7.1.4 meets intent 	No update	
	Servicing partnerships with Cheam FN should be explored	See Cheam FN comments	No update	
	Better policies to address on-site storm management – limits to impervious surfaces	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 7.5.1-7.5.5 cover this adequately, including storm water mgmt plan requirement for new developments of a certain size 	No update	
	Telecommunications Policy (proposed) should be permissive in order to attract telecom companies and improve service	Suggest: update 7.7.6 “...of new telecommunications projects. <u>The policy should be developed in an effort to not only attract new telecommunications projects, but to adequately mitigate impacts and address community concerns.</u> ”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Prioritize connectivity of linear trails	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies 8.4.1 / 8.4.4 / 8.4.5 adequately address 	No update	
	Identify gaps in community level parks and trails e.g. sports facilities, school site with community facilities, dog park or dog friendly, parks beyond tot lot age range	Suggest: new policy Community Park Diversity “Opportunities to expand and broaden the types of community parks and trails should be explored and prioritized in order to adequately appeal to a broader range of recreationists, including but not limited to opportunities for dog friendly parks and trails, sport oriented parks and facilities, and playgrounds appealing to a wider range of users.”	Update per recommendation but replace “playgrounds” with “park infrastructure and adult exercise equipment” – tie in need for partnerships and shared facilities between communities	Edited
	Opportunities for use of SROW for recreation and parks	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 8.4.5 addresses this 	No update	
	Prioritize the following pedestrian/bicycle connections to connect separated development nodes and expand access to park and rec opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> East/west connection across highway 9 – separated from traffic North/south connection across Yale Road in West Popkum Policy should acknowledge investment required, reaffirm that a solution is required beyond what currently exists	Policy 8.4.4 addresses this Suggest: amend 8.4.4 “...safety within Popkum are a priority <u>and are recognized as requiring significant investment for which partnerships between stakeholders should be explored.</u> Specific crossings to address include:”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	School site should be identified within Popkum-Bridal Falls	Suggest: new section Community Well Being , policy “The Regional Board will	See new section	

		continue to work with School District #33 and other key partners to explore options for an additional school site to accommodate the growing need for school spaces and community facilities, and to address the existing capacity issues of the Rosedale Traditional Community School.”	below and Update per recommendation	
	Community/recreation facility is a priority	Same as above	See new section below and Update per recommendation	
	Map 2 – Geologic and Stream Hazards is difficult to read/understand – can legends be put on reverse side for increased legibility	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audience for map interpretation is limited to staff and RPs – clarity for layman is not required/prioritized. FVRD customer service includes map interpretation – can be viewed as a digital file for better clarity 	No update	
	West Popkum being generally free of hazards (flood, slope) presents further rationale for place to establish a community centre that could double as an reception centre during emergencies	Suggest: new section Community Well Being , policy “The Regional Board will continue to work with School District #33 and other key partners to explore options for an additional school site to accommodate the growing need for school spaces and community facilities , and to address the existing capacity issues of the Rosedale Traditional Community School.”	See new section below and Update per recommendation	
	Brochure for wildfire interface risks and prevention should be annually mailed to residents – policy 9.5.5	No edits recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC Firesmart Homeowners Manual is readily available online and brochures are available at the FVRD Engineering Counter – this is an operational matter not typically addressed in OCP 	Update section 9.5.6 to include “RB will try to circulate information”	Edited
	Fire Hazard Rating Sign should be established at entrance to community/near campgrounds	Suggest: The Regional Board will advocate to the BC Wildfire Service for the installation of a Fire Danger Rating Sign in the community to increase the level of public awareness surrounding wildfire risk. *Confirmed with Reg as preferred action	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Fire Dept. should begin issuing campfire permits and fine for non compliance – stronger enforcement required	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volunteer fire department cannot take on issuing permits or fining for non-compliance 	No update	
	Public info campaign/Brochure for noxious weeds required	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information available on website 	No update	
	Increased education/outreach for landowners adjacent to environmentally sensitive areas and for tree retention	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 6.1.1 Table 1 addresses this 	Update section 10.4.2 – “prioritize tree retention”	Edited
	Policy for reduction of GGG from illegal garbage burning	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 7.6.4 addresses this 	No update	
	Some DP guideline language is vague and leaves too much room for discretion	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language is consistent with other DPAs DPA guidelines attempt to strike balance between prescriptive/flexible 	No update	
	DPA1-D – exemption c. – should there be a distinction between a restaurant vs. campground expansion? Where should the line be drawn?	Suggest: **further discussion required**	FURTHER DISCUSSION Suggest: No edit required. Rationale for distinction between restaurant	Concur. No edit.

			vs. campground expansion (i.e. inherent presumption of safety and increased risk for overnight accommodation) is sound and justified.	
	Public info campaign required for property owners affected by DPA2-D (Cheam Wetlands) and Restrictive covenants to ensure environmental preservation	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FVRD Webmap, planning counter, covenants registered on property title provide information 	No update	
	Stricter consequences for offences to DPA2-D required	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offence is within scope of RD powers 	No update	
	DPA4-D requires accessibility requirements (design)	Suggest: amend 11.4 Objectives add “accessibility standards” to bullet #3 / 11.4.3(e) (new) “incorporate accessibility principles consistent with BCBC regulations	Update per recommendation	Edited
Open House (April 2019)	More trails and parks required – under powerlines and in mountains, around Bridal Falls	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.4.18 / 8.4.8 / 8.4.5 / 8.4.3 / 8.4.2 / 8.4.1 / Table 5 address this 	No update	
	Development of and trail connection to Ferry Park required	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5 / 8.4.17 address this 	No update	
	Tree retention a priority for new developments	Suggest: update Section 10.5 “tree preservation policies in suburban residential areas under development <u>and public education in tree retention for areas subject to development.</u> ” Suggest: 10.4.2 “retain as much of the natural vegetation cover as possible and prioritize tree retention when preparing land.”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Better/increased equipment in parks	Suggest: new policy Community Park Diversity “Opportunities to expand and broaden the types of community parks and trails should be explored and prioritized in order to adequately appeal to a broader range of recreationists, including but not limited to opportunities for dog friendly parks and trails, sport oriented parks and facilities, and playgrounds appealing to a wider range of users.”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Safe pedestrian crossings required at: roundabout, Hwy 1/9 interchange,	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.4.4 addresses this 	No update	
	Maintain large lots with houses and detached structures to scale (less variances for increased sizes)	Suggest: new policy 6.1.4 “ Development Variance Permits “The Regional Board will consider DVPs that intend to increase the allowable size of principle and accessory structures, and increase the allowable lot coverage only where applicants demonstrate sound rationale for the request. Where DVP applications are abundant, a comprehensive review of the applications may be undertaken to determine if bylaw amendments are warranted.”	FURTHER DISCUSSION Suggest: No new policy required. The consolidated bylaw helps to address this issue by providing siting exemptions and revising how height is defined and measured for	Concur. No edit.

			accessory structures. Additionally, the fee bylaw update may disincentivize DVP applications due to increased fee. A preferred approach to address DVPs is an EA-wide Policy and not individual OCP level policy.	
	Need for community facility and activities for teenagers	Suggest: new section Community Well Being , policy “The Regional Board will continue to work with School District #33 and other key partners to explore options for an additional school site to accommodate the growing need for school spaces and community facilities, and to address the existing capacity issues of the Rosedale Traditional Community School.”	See new section below and Update per recommendation	
	Noise control measures required to mitigate large truck noise along highways	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1 addresses 	No update	
	School at capacity – new school facility required	Suggest: new section Community Well Being , policy “The Regional Board will continue to work with School District #33 and other key partners to explore options for an additional school site to accommodate the growing need for school spaces and community facilities, and to address the existing capacity issues of the Rosedale Traditional Community School.”	See new section below and Update per recommendation	
	Support for secondary dwellings on larger lots	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.2 	No update	
Online Survey (Spring 2019)	More information on secondary dwellings required	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.2 	No update	
	More parks – linear parks should not count as a park	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.4 Table 5 addresses 	No update	
	Improved safety along yale road and hwy 9 interchange	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.4.4 addresses 	No update	
	Sewer system plan should encompass all of popkum	Suggest: ***further discussion required**	No update	
	Commercial development should be emphasized along Hwy 9 corridor	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current HRTC designated areas identify lands feasible for commercial development, additional lands along hwy 9 are not feasible 	No update	
	Stronger efforts towards tree retention	Suggest: update Section 10.5 “tree preservation policies in suburban residential areas under development <u>and public education in tree retention for areas subject to development.</u> ” Suggest: 10.4.2 “retain as much of the natural vegetation cover as possible and prioritize tree retention when preparing land.”	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Increased signage for Bridal Fall Park	Suggest: amend 8.4.6 “ <u>Access to community, regional, and provincial parks should be clearly identified through signage.</u> Linear trail routes...”	Update per recommendation	Edited

	Illegal dumping on FSR should be addressed	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.65 addresses this 	No update	
	Need for truck stop at Bridal Falls	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current HRTC designation allows for truck stop use (zoning amendment may be required) 	No update	
	Plan should address options for curbside collection of recycling and compost	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not within the FVRD's solid waste management strategy for the anticipated life of the plan 	No update	
	Dog park needed	Suggest: new policy Community Park Diversity "Opportunities to expand and broaden the types of community parks and trails should be explored and prioritized in order to adequately appeal to a broader range of recreationists, including but not limited to opportunities for dog friendly parks and trails, sport oriented parks and facilities, and playgrounds appealing to a wider range of users."	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Commercial and backyard burning bans should be considered to reduce air pollution and improve air quality	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volunteer fire department cannot take on issuing permits or fining for non-compliance 	No update	
	Options for grocery store and restaurants	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HRTC designation allows for grocery store use 	No update	
	Internet services and fibre in rural areas	No edit recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.8.1 addresses this 	No update	
	Plan should include expectations and responsibilities of residents	Suggest: amend 5.7.10 and 6.1.3 "...and that the Regional Board consider broadening the Good Neighbour Practices Policy to include existing /established neighbourhoods in addition to new developments."	Update per recommendation	Edited
Other (emails, phone calls, etc.)	OCPs should do more to support bylaw enforcement efforts that maintain and benefit existing neighbourhoods	Suggest: amend 5.7.10 and 6.1.3 "...and that the Regional Board consider broadening the Good Neighbour Practices Policy to include existing /established neighbourhoods in addition to new developments."	Update per recommendation	Edited
Staff Comments	Update servicing nodes diagram to reflect infill connections to Minters System	Suggest: update map	Update per recommendation	Edited
	Include Community Well Being heading under section 3.0 – policies regarding community facility demand, accessibility, intergenerational housing, civic involvement	Suggest: Section 3.0 New Heading: Community/Social Well Being Preamble <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is social well-being What is a healthy community Needs and Challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited housing types Policy(new): "Intergenerational housing options which promote age-friendly principles may be considered by the Regional Board in areas designated AGRICULTURAL, LIMITED USE, RURAL, and SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL subject to zoning amendment and other relevant provincial legislation as applicable." Policy(new): "Development of new neighbourhood plans within 	Update per recommendation but Preamble: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close prox to schools Residential focus to dev More people = more demand for social connection, sense of place, service 	Edited

		<p>Popkum-Bridal Falls should be considered through a health equity lens to uncover potential health inequities and ensure that social and cultural aspects of development decisions are considered by the Regional Board.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited access to service/commercial <p>Civic Engagement and Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on well-being Funding limitations for small EA to develop community services (libraries, schools, childcare/eldercare, health services) No community facilities/programming <p>Policy(new): “The Regional Board will continue to work with School District #33 and other key partners to explore options for an additional school site to accommodate the growing need for school spaces and community facilities, and to address the existing capacity issues of the Rosedale Traditional Community School.”</p> <p>Policy(new): “The Regional Board will support the Popkum Residents Association in their advocacy to School District #33 and other key partners to explore options for integrating community facility space into existing or new infrastructure such as schools, libraries or fire halls. Note to GD: I don’t like how this is framed but wonder if there is a way to support this type of endeavour without committing the Board specifically to the action and also understanding that a school site in Popkum is highly unlikely in the life of the Plan.</p> <p>Policy(new): “The Regional Board will work with neighbourhood associations, businesses and other stakeholders to support and strengthen the community”</p>	<p>provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As comm grows and evolves so should social dynamic <p>Remove designations from intergen policy</p> <p>Move NCP policy to BFU section</p> <p>School/facility policy “encourage the development of publicly access com space” “integrate firehall comments from reg”</p> <p>Neigh. Assoc. policy “through principles of inclusion, participation, diversity, equity” “recognize the importance of assoc. and pop. Fire vols contribution to comm through grant-in-aid and in-kind etc.”</p>	
	Secondary dwellings Policy should be reflected as guide to consider these types of developments and more support should be offered to secondary dwellings in new developments serviced by water and sewer (west Popkum)	Suggest: amend policy 4.2.2 to reflect Secondary Dwellings in the EA Policy, New policy in Use Policies “The Regional Board will support and encourage consideration of secondary dwellings for new neighbourhood developments where appropriate levels of service can be properly calculated and accommodated during the development of new water and sewer systems in addition to consideration for adequate parking, road width, and privacy measures. ”	Update per recommendation but add storm and sewer considerations to list	Edited
	Update community parks and trails policies to reflect need/requirement for additional park land dedicated for west popkum buildout	**discuss with Parks (Christina/David) and David B – specific consideration to Armstrong development	NEW POLICY for cash-in-lieu to cash-in-lieu 8.4.13(e) <u>Alternative Contribution.</u> Notwithstanding	Edited

			Section 8.4.13(a) and 8.4.13(d), the Regional Board, at its discretion, may elect to accept an equivalent value of funding as a community amenity contribution dedicated to park and trail development, infrastructure, and enhancements in the place of cash-in-lieu contributions solely for the purpose of the acquisition of park land.	
	RR + SR to R	Suggest: Pull out affected properties – review impacts and possible paths forward	NEW POLICY 5.6.13 Notwithstanding Section 5.6.11 and 5.6.12, lands designated RURAL and zoned Country Residential per Zoning Bylaw No. 75 at the time of adoption of this bylaw, maybe subdivided in accordance with the standards of the responsible authorities, except that the minimum parcel size shall not be less than zero point four (0.4) hectares in size where a connection to a community water system can be achieved, consistent with the regulations of the Country	Edited

			Residential zone. This shall be considered consistent with the policies of this plan.	
	Highlight Connection between community well-being and parks	Suggest: options: 1. Update introductory paragraph 8.2 Com Parks; or 2. Tie into Section 3.0 <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Diversity of parks policy?- Senior/older adults oriented infrastructure?	Update per recommendation (section 8.2)	Edited
	Infrastructure should keep pace with development	Suggest: NEW policy in 7.1 to identify that provision of services should keep pace with development (e.g. road capacity, pedestrian accessibility)	NEW POLICY 7.1.5 Services and infrastructure, such as road network capacity, will be planned and constructed at pace with development as it occurs and be responsive to future development servicing needs.	Edited
	Cannabis Section	Suggest: New Section and Policy under 4.0 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No EA director support for production or retail sales• Intro: province legalized, laws continue to evolve, at this time the RB does not support• Nevertheless RB recognize the ag ops permitted	Update per recommendation: 4.9 Cannabis The Cannabis Act (Bill C-45) creates a legal and regulatory framework for controlling the production, distribution, sale and possession of cannabis in Canada. In addition to the land use policies provided in the Plan and zoning bylaw, the FVRD has adopted an additional policy that is relevant to Cannabis land uses:	Edited

			<div><div>1. <i>Land Use Policy for Cannabis Production, Processing and Retail Sales in the Electoral Areas.</i></div><div>It is recognized that Federal and Provincial legislation may supercede the FVRD’s ability to restrict Cannabis production, processing, and retail sales through policies and bylaws. Such is the case for lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), where under certain provisions the production of Cannabis is a recognized agricultural use. These limitations are reflected in the above referenced policy. Any new revisions to Federal and Provincial legislation may provide new and supplemental authorizations for Cannabis land uses.</div><div>Generally, Cannabis land uses are not supported in Popkum-Bridal Falls.</div></div>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<div>Policy</div> <div>4.9.1 For all development application and land use enquiries, the FVRD's <i>Land Use Policy for Cannabis Production, Processing and Retail Sales in the Electoral Areas</i> will be referred to for direction.</div> <div>4.9.2 Cannabis growing is not supported except where Federal and Provincial legislation supersedes FVRD authority and legislation.</div> <div>4.9.3 Cannabis processing and/or retail sales as a standalone land use or accessory to Cannabis growing or other complimentary uses is not supported except where Federal and Provincial legislation supersedes FVRD authority and legislation.</div>	
	Cross-jurisdictional subdivision should be discouraged	Suggest: New Policy	<div>NEW POLICY</div> <div>6.1.4 Cross-jurisdictional subdivision. Subdivision applications to facilitate the creation of new parcels that</div>	Edited

			<div>straddle jurisdictional boundaries that are deemed contrary to the public interest will not be supported by the FVRD Board.</div> <div>REPEAT NEW POLICY</div> <div>6.2.3 Cross-jurisdictional subdivision. Subdivision applications to facilitate the creation of new parcels that straddle jurisdictional boundaries will not be supported by the FVRD Board.</div>	
--	--	--	---	--

Summary of items raised at the May 10/19 meeting between representatives from Cheam First Nation, People of the River Referral Office and FVRD regarding the Draft official Community Plan for FVRD Electoral Area “D” (Popkum-Bridal Falls)

FVRD Comments in the table below indicate: i) areas of the draft plan that may partly address items raised at the May 10 meeting; and, ii) suggested amendments to the draft plan that may help to better address the item.

Item (May 10/19)	FVRD Comments (July 26/19)	CFN/PRRO Comments	Action
1. How can we bring the S’ólh Téméxw Use Plan Policy and the Stó:lō Heritage Policy into the plan rather than simply referencing them?	<p>Section 2.3 – S’ólh Téméxw Use Plan Policy description and land use zone map</p> <p>Section 10.3 – Sanctuary Lands call-out box.</p> <p>Policy 2.3.5 – zoning and community plan amendment applications should complete an archeological impact assessment in areas of known or potential arch. value</p> <p>Consider: Adding Map(schedule) identifying zones instead of including map imagery in section 2.3? Using shapefile data available through StoloConnect.</p> <p>Consider: adding to Section 2.3 to provide more information about the Cheam community and cultural heritage within the plan area</p>		<p>Pending – w/ GIS to add “Map 7 – S’ólh Téméxw Use Plan”</p> <p>Pending Cheam FN comment</p>
2. Can the plan have a policy about archaeological assessment	Policy 2.3.5 – zoning and community plan amendment applications should		

<p>prior to significant developments? Reference the Stó:lō Heritage Policy; heritage inspection permit process administered by Stó:lō.</p>	<p>complete an archeological impact assessment in areas of known or potential arch value</p> <p>Consider: amending 2.3.5 to reference the Heritage Policy and provide more details of Stó:lō permit process</p>	<p>Added</p>
<p>3. What can be done about encroachments into IR lands in the area of the Rose Garden subdivision?</p>	<p>Consider: policy statements to the effect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where new developments are proposed along IR land boundaries, applications should consider potential interface conflicts/trespass and minimize these conflicts through appropriate mitigative measures • Public education/outreach measures could be undertaken by the FVRD where existing residential developments adjacent to IR lands are contributing to interface conflicts/trespass • Policy 5.7.10/6.1.3 Good Neighbour Practices could be expanded to further include interface conflicts/trespass as a consideration 	<p>Added Policy 2.3.10</p> <p>Additional public outreach can be addressed through regular operations, outside of OCP policy</p> <p>Added</p>
<p>4. Support working together on Halkomelem place names for new streets, parks, etc. Place names and the names of plants common in the area; cultural use</p>	<p>Consider: Include as a priority for the community under Section 2 – Community Profile and Section 4 – Local Area Policies for new developments</p>	<p>Added to Section 6 – Local Area Policies for Popkum (6.1)</p>

names, heritage, etc.		
5. Policies to guide management of the Fraser River foreshore for all species	Consider: Section 8.4 Table 5 – include foreshore management for environmental protection as opportunity	Added
	Consider: Policy 8.4.17 – expand beyond access only to include foreshore management objectives	Added to 8.4.19
6. Policies to guide environmentally-friendly design of gravel removal from streams and rivers in a way that improves and protects stream habitat	Consider: Policy 10.4.11 – could strengthen language to include that sand, gravel, or rock removal in streams and rivers should be undertaken in a way that improves and protects stream habitat	Pending Cheam FN Comment
7. Reflect CFN co-management of Ferry Island and the goals that CFN council has set to enhance tourism and environmental values in the park	Section 8.2 Table 2 – Update tenure to include CFN/BC “collaborative management” – the jurisdiction of the Park falls under a park board, which is Cheam First Nation Chief and Council	Added
8. Support interpretation of living First Nations culture and heritage within Cheam Lake Wetlands Regional Park	Consider: Policy 8.4.11 – specify interpretation of FN culture and heritage	Added to 8.4.8
	Consider: Policy 8.4.16 – include guidance for Park Management Plan to include FN partnerships, culturally appropriate interpretation	Added to 8.4.17(c) and 8.4.18

<p>9. The proposed gondola project is supported by CFN to increase access to the mountain for cultural use and as an opportunity for education and jobs.</p>	<p>This specific project is not referenced in the Plan as it is at a conceptual + investigative/feasibility stage only; however:</p> <p>Section 3.2 – Plan objective #2 Build up tourism recreation uses. This policy supports business opportunities which build upon and enhance tourist recreation infrastructure</p> <p>Section 5.4 – HTRC designation supports major tourist recreation commercial</p>	<p>No edits.</p>
<p>10. Recognize and protect the wetland near Bridal Falls that provides rare habitat</p>	<p>DPA 5-D – supports protection of riparian areas in Area D generally</p> <p>Section 2.3 - S'ólh Téméxw Use Plan zones map identifies Sanctuary and Protected Watershed areas</p> <p>Consider policy statement under Section 10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFN has historic and ongoing cultural interests in the stewardship and use of the areas designated as sanctuary and protected watershed under the <i>STUP</i>. Plans and proposals in these areas should be referred to CFN for comment regarding the impact to practising cultural activities. 	<p>New policy 6.2.6</p>

11. Explore servicing partnerships for sewage disposal, transit, mosquito control animal control

Section 7.1 – include policy statement regarding servicing partnerships with FN where opportunities exist, areas of mutual interest

Consider: More detailed, specific policies encouraging partnerships could be included under sections 7.2 (transportation), 7.3 (water supply), 7.4 (sewage disposal)

New Policy 7.1.6

Contact:

Graham Daneluz
Deputy Director of Planning & Development
Fraser Valley Regional District
Tel: 604 702 5043
Email: gdaneluz@fvrld.ca

Katelyn Hipwell
Planner 2
Fraser Valley Regional District
Tel: 604 702 5084
Email: kipwell@fvrld.ca

Additional information on the update to the Official Community Plan for Electoral Area D can be found at:

<https://www.fvrld.ca/EN/main/services/planning-development/projects-plans/electoral-area-d-ocp-update.html>