REPRESENTATIONS: (DISTRIBUTED AT Planning and Development Committee July 21, 2016)

- MINISTRY COMMENTS
- APC MINUTES
- FEEDBACK FORMS FROM OPEN HOSUES

Lauri Feindell

From: Christopher Garrish
Sent: July 8, 2016 2:17 PM
To: Lauri Feindell
Subject: FW: Preliminary Comments on Bylaw No.2728

From: Collins, Martin J ALC:EX [mailto:Martin.Collins@gov.bc.ca]
Sent: May-03-16 1:01 PM
To: Christopher Garrish
Subject: Preliminary Comments on Bylaw No.2728

Chris

As per our telephone conversation:

1) I have no objection to the current bylaw standards for setbacks for livestock structures, but would not object to their being reduced;
2) The qualifying statement about additional dwellings on ALR parcels being required for "farm" purposes needs to be clarified to capture those ALR parcels which do not have "Farm " status;
3) The housing table remains problematic, but somewhat improved from past bylaws;
4) I have checked Tinhorn Creek's ALC application record and can find none for "assembly" uses for up to 400 persons;
5) More to come on the site specific front – I will continue to undertake checks.

Regards

Martin Collins
Regional Planner
Agricultural Land Commission
#133 4940 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC, V5G 4K6
martin.collins@gov.bc.ca
604-660-7021

Lauri Feindell

From: Christopher Garrish
Sent: April 14, 2016 1:20 PM
To: Lauri Feindell
Subject: FW: Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations

]

From: Rick Hatch
Sent: April-11-16 10:45 PM
To: Planning; Christopher Garrish
Subject: Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations

Hello Chris,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the amendment of Electoral Area F Zoning Bylaws, as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations.

My perspective is coming from someone who owns a parcel of approximately .5 Acre, or 2023 m2. At the moment, my wife and I are currently raising 6 Muscovy Ducks, a breed who are virtually silent (they hiss and trill rather than quack.) We are raising them for eggs, pest control, and to be breeding stock for future meat birds. We do plan to have up to 25 birds, as our land can easily accommodate this size of flock without causing a nuisance.
We place a strong value on local and healthy food, as well as lowering our personal carbon footprint by raising our own animals, and to this goal we plan for our flock to be a cornerstone of our food system. Our neighbors and friends who walk and drive by our house love to see our happy ducks splashing in their kiddie pool.

I would propose amending the sizing regulations as follows:
Adjust #2 from 500m to 2500m to 500m to 2000m.
Adjust #3 from 2500m to 4000m to 2000m to 4000m.

I would also proposing allowing 1 rooster per parcel as well, as the important functions of a rooster in maintaining a healthy and safe flock are many.

I would be happy to speak to anyone regarding these matters.

Please feel free to contact me anytime,
Thank you for your time
Rick Hatch

Lauri Feindell

From: Monica Sullivan a>
Sent: May 26, 2016 7:13 PM
To: Planning
Subject: bylaws regarding livestock in the RDOS

Hello,

I was under the understanding that when we purchased our property in West Bench that we were allowed 1 horse for the first acre and an additional horse for every ½ acre thereafter. I strongly feel that should be the minimum number of horses allowed. The reason many people buy in the RDOS is that they are strong proponents for an agriculture environment that allows for horses, chickens or other types of livestock. Without this, our area would lose a lot of the appeal it currently holds for us.

Many thanks,

Jim and Monica Sullivan

.

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations Feedback Form April 13, 2016

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations? (additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

In response to the March 10, 2016 update which summarizes the most recent proposal. I have three topics I wish to comment:

1. **Owning Horses <0.4 Ha to 2 Ha** I support the proposed number of livestock limiting <0.4 Ha (0 horses) and up to 2 Ha (4 horses). Identifying the optimum property size per horse helps to address issues arising from too many horses on small acreages. The proposed bylaw is fair and allows many properties on the Westbench to have horses or board horses for others while respecting property rights of non-livestock owners and helps to minimizing the impacts of neighboring properties. Limiting horse number and the ability to enforce those limitations are important to the health of the community and neighboring properties.

As it relates to horse health, there are numerous studies (on the internet) that confirm the one horse per acre model which addresses requirements but not limited to: adequate pasture, running space, dust/dirt controls, concern over water contamination from improper manure disposal, spread of parasites and weed seeds and socialization (not necessarily with another horse).

2. **>2 Ha – Unlimited Livestock** - The proposal for >2 ha proposing unlimited livestock is concerning. For example, when reviewing the RDOS map, there are 3 properties in one cluster (Sparton Drive) that could each have unlimited horses. As this is not a rural ranch setting, this would have negative impacts on neighboring properties for reasons stated above (dust, dirt, parasites and environmental concerns). Determining a set number of horses per acre and setting a maximum number per property (for >2 Ha) would be most responsible (ie: no more than 6 horses per property over 2 Ha). The variance permit application is available to anyone seeking more than the bylaw allows and is a great tool for collaboration between neighbors to address concerns.

3. **Setback** – The proposed setback for building (and not inclusive of pasture) is extremely concerning as well. Many properties are narrow and neighboring properties are situated close to property lines. The proposal of 4 metres from a property line for a structure that houses livestock could be as close as 8 metres from a neighboring house. A barn (housing horses, pigs, chickens,.etc) situated just metres away from a neighbouring house would greatly impact and interfere with the rights of others to enjoy their own property as well as diminish property values. The concerns being odors, dust, dirt, parasites, flies, and ground water runoff onto the neighbour's property. The previous set back of 30 metres has worked for years with property owners having the ability to apply for a variance permit. This is still the preferred model for collaboration and concerns to be voiced & heard. I would suggest maintaining the 30 metre setback clause as this model does work for most properties that will be permitted to have livestock. Additionally, the bylaw should consider an additional clause to ensure that a structure housing livestock not be built within 30 metres of a neighbouring house. A variance application is always a tool available.

The Alberta Government website is one of those sites that lists health and environmental concerns regarding horse ownership and management and describes the issues of concern very well. For your reference: http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/agdex7954 *On average, an 1100 pound (500 kg) horse will produce 31 pounds (14 kg) of feces and 2 to 3 gallons (8-11 litres) of urine per day, plus bedding. The amount of manure that can build up over one year from just one horse is substantial. A poorly managed manure pile can harbour intestinal parasites, provide a breeding ground for flies and insects and produce objectionable odours. Runoff from improperly stored manure can quickly become a potential environmental contaminate, because it can carry nutrients, pathogens and organic particles into the water cycle via surface runoff or leach into groundwater.*

For all the reasons listed, limiting the number of horses on the Westbench is important to the health of the neighbourhood and property values.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the important issue of owning livestock and how this impacts both livestock and non-livestock owners and respecting individual property rights for the diverse community in which we live.

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations? (additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)
I do not support the proposed changes to the agriculture zones.

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).	
Name:	Shaloa Street
Address:	Husula Highlands
Phone:	
Email Address:	

RECEIVED
Regional District
101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?

(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

I, oppose the change in the bylaw.
I feel these are rural areas and should remain as such with relation to reasonable numbers of livestock.
We have lost our school up West Bench we should not loose more residents to new rules and additional changes.

Thankyou

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	Shawna Eshlerman
Address:	Forsyth Drive Husula Highlands
Phone:	
Email Address:	

RECEIVED
Regional District

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

I would like to voice my input for the change to the bylaw for keeping of livestock provisions.

We have only moved to Westbench a year and a half ago and we moved specifically for the reason that we could have our horses on our land while living close to Penticton. We have two young girls and two horses. What better environment for children to grow up in?? We have a wonderful community of horse people who not only care for their animals but have pride of ownership in their property. While riding down KVR you can view many, many horse properties all of which are beautifully kept and have had or having extensive work done to them. I have never heard of a complaint nor problem with any horse owners and residential neighbors regarding dirt, dust nor smell. In speaking with neighbors who have lived in Westbench for decades they have never heard of a problem with domestic horses at all. We have a beautiful riding arena which is part of the RDOS Selby Park and have spent a lot of volunteer time and a lot of money to have this venue for all to use. This was also another reason we moved to Westbench, as accessibility is easy and safe for my children and all children in the area. This arena is very well used because owners have their animals on their property and are not boarding elsewhere.

If you were to change the bylaw it would be a huge negative for so many people who have less than 1-2 acres. Horses need to be with others. They are a herd animal and do not do well mentally nor physically when on their own. If we are to be responsible horse owners we need to have the capability to keep them together, and all horse owners purchased their land with that in mind. When buying a piece of property the cost of boarding your horse is not what is in the planning.

I hope that you will consider this very carefully. Westbench has been through enough in the last months losing our school. Please don't ruin our wonderful little community by putting restraints on something that has not been a problem.

Linda Brooks

Lauri Feindell

From: Stuart
Sent: April 15, 2016 3:54 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Agriculture Bylaw letter- Livestock allowance

April 14th-2016

RDOS PLANNING DEPARTMENT

From: Alisa & Stuart Kulak

113 Sunglo Drive Penticton,

We are writing to propose that the bylaw should be changed to allow 1 horse per half acre with regards to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaw as it relates to the Agriculture zones and Agriculture Regulations of keeping livestock.

Some of the reasons we support the update for an amendment to the current bylaw with regards to the Agriculture zones and regulations of keeping livestock is that we live in a Rural Community that is just minutes to town and for this very reason we enjoy a country lifestyle which benefits our family and children. This rural community has embraced a love for horses for many years while still being close to town. Many families move to this area just so they can enjoy horses on their property without being far from the city.

We have had horses in this community for several years previously. As have many residents in this community owning several horses. The benefit of having horses within our family has been seen firsthand with our family, our children and their friends. It has taught them responsibility, how to work hard, caring for an animal, love, freedom and confidence. It has also been shared with many friends that don't have that opportunity to have horses, in that they have learned many gifts that I think are quite valuable in a day and age where technology rules a lot of the children. We have children over all the time and the benefit of being outside with nature and animals is fantastic.

I believe the community of horse owners that care and love these animals (horses) also possess great animal husbandry. We ourselves have always practiced excellent horse husbandry and care at our own property. We

also have great farm practise in which we haul the manure away every two to three weeks. The area is cleaned daily. We have worked with all our neighbors in providing some of this manure for their gardens and plants. We have hauled it to the city dump in which they use it for compost and recycle it back into the community as fertilizer. We have brought it to many community gardens and organic orchards to help their growth of fruits and vegetables.

We keep our property clean, safe and odor free. The neighbors enjoy seeing our family and children with our horses. We have also never received any complaints of any kind in the past.

Thank you kindly for reading this information,

Alisa and Stuart Kulak

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations? (additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)
OPPOSED - SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR MY
REASONS

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).	
Name:	THOMAS NOLET
Address:	319 NEWTON DRIVE WEST BENCH
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

My number one concern is that this has not really been put before the residents of the RDOS for proper input and consideration. Only area F and area D had any public awareness and those one hour meetings were not advertised well and the notification was very short time wise.

Second on my list of the issues I have with the bylaws is that they still are only allowing one horse at the low end of the parcel size for lots that are 0.4 to 0.8 ha or basically 1 to 1.98 acres in size. It was discussed in detail at the meeting how horses are herd animals and it is a humane standard in the National Farm Animal Care Council Code of Practice for the care and handling of Equines that horses" have company of the animals own kind" under the Freedom to Express Normal Behaviour, as well as in other parts of the code. Here is a link to the code itself http://www.nfacc.ca/codes-of-practice/equine

which can also be found on the SPCA's website in reference to equine care. It was also brought up at the meeting that when several of the people in attendance had purchased their properties the bylaw was one horse for the first acre and one more horse for every additional ½ acre and they were not even aware that the bylaws had changed since they originally purchased their properties.

I have gotten information from the city of Penticton, Summerland and Kelowna and interestingly their livestock bylaws are more relaxed than what the RDOS currently has or is proposing. The municipalities are more in line with what the Provincial Agricultural regulations are. In the City of Penticton I spoke with Lindsey Fraser and Darryl Haddrell who told me that in zoning under RC- Country Residential Housing which has a minimum lot size of 0.4 ha, or one acre agricultural use is allowed and the number of horses is NOT restricted.

In Summerland I spoke with Gary Ellis who told me they do not limit numbers of livestock, using other bylaws to address problems if they arise and or refer complaints to the Farm Practices Board. Mr. Ellis told me they have lots as small as ½ acre in A1 AG zoning.

In Kelowna areas zoned as A1,RR1, and RR2 with a "C" notation have lots of 0.4 ha and animals and poultry are unlimited.

I find it very interesting that within municipalities it seems that they are following the Ministry of Agriculture regulations and yet in the RDOS which is mainly rural properties the bylaws are so much stricter. I do not necessarily agree with the unlimited approach but I think perhaps there should be some type of actual agricultural reasoning and science application on the numbers as opposed to what seems to be just numbers applied for no real reason. I personally feel that even the rigid lot size ruler, so to speak is not guaranteed to work, as on the West Bench where I live the lot lines often zigzag or can be mostly ravine even on large lot sizes. This leaves many large size lots with actual very little useable space for animals of any kind, but because they would meet the lot size requirement they could have more animals than the land is actually suited for.

Also why do the numbers jump from 4 horses at 2.0 ha yet as soon as you go over that number say at 2.01 ha you can have unlimited numbers of livestock? Does this really make sense? Why would .01 of a hectare meant that suddenly a lot can sustain unlimited numbers of livestock?

I would really like to have an explanation as to how and why these numbers are chosen, as even within the different Regional Districts there is no consensus on numbers? And the municipalities seem to be more in line with the Provincial Agricultural regulations, all very confusing and not making much sense in my mind.

In essence as I understand the proposed bylaws they are not really changing anything in regards to the number of livestock ie: horses but they are changing it in regards to the number of small livestock such as chickens on small lots and eliminating roosters altogether until one meets the golden size of 5 acres/2ha. at which point numbers or types of animals apparently are not limited. Again I find it interesting that cities are moving towards allowing people to keep a small number of chickens on city lots and our rural areas the numbers are being reduced from what the historical numbers were, from 25 down to 5 with no roosters.

As for the elimination of roosters I have an issue with that as if a person has heritage birds there will not be a way to continue the breed without a rooster. I know that recently a B.C. breeder of heritage birds has gone out of business and therefore I wonder if a person would be able to easily replace a specific breed and the minimum number one would have to order and how that would work in regards to the numbers one is allowed on their property. Ie if they only need or want to replace a few birds but have to order more to meet the minimum which I believe can be 12, which means for those only allowed 25 birds they have to wait until their flock is 50 % reduced before they can build it up again. For those who are only allowed 5 birds they will be more than 50% over their limit in the purchase?

Also some of the more expensive heritage breeds are sold "straight run" which means they are not sexed, so you may pay big dollars for a bird you will have to get rid of if it turns out to be a rooster.

Here is a link to a heritage chicken breeder in B.C. which shows pricing and minimums.
http://www.gradeehfarms.ca/ordering-guidelines.html

Another large concern is the properties where the bylaws suggest to totally remove the wording "agriculture" and base the numbers totally on lot size. At first I thought that was a good idea, but after discussing with a few more educated people familiar with bylaws I have been told that is not really a good idea going forward into the future.

These are all questions that should have an answer in my opinion before the bylaw changes take place.

Theresa Nolet 319 Newton Drive West Bench

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations

April 11, 2016

Feedback Form

As a Backyard Chicken Farmer with 16 chickens – 1 rooster and 15 hens – who has completed extensive research in small flock farming and has years of experience in raising backyard chickens, I offer the following thoughts and adjustments to the *Proposed Zoning Bylaw Regulations*:

Parcel Size

Adjust #2 from 500m to 2500m to 500m to 2000m.
Adjust #3 from 2500m to 4000m to 2000m to 4000m.
This reduction from 2500m to 2000m would fall more in line with actual property sizes and be less limiting.

Roosters

Adjust the complete ban of roosters to allowing 1 rooster, or 1 rooster per 12 hens.
A small poultry flock is of great benefit to a rural setting, and a flock of 10-25 hens is incomplete without a rooster which serves 3 main purposes: defense, curtail negative hen behavior, and fertilization.

With my free range birds the rooster is the bodyguard for the flock – he will fend off hawks, owls and other predators. The rooster is the 'head of the family'. He watches over and maintains order in the flock – otherwise hens can cluck at and peck each other incessantly, even causing death. He fertilizes the eggs which enables a 'broody' hen to hatch baby chicks – a natural and economical way to maintain the flock. Chicks raised and taught by their mother hen (rather than from an incubator) are calmer and more 'free range savvy'.

One rooster is adequate for 10 to 12 hens. Flocks of 25 or more would be better serviced and maintained by 2 or more roosters. Multiple roosters are only a problem when there are not enough hens to go around.

Education

I would be more than happy to share my experience and knowledge with any who care to learn more about backyard chicken farming, and especially 'neighbourly' chicken farming.

Stewart McLeod [Rooster Booster!]

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?

(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

Let's go back to Bylaw #68!! The West Bench is a one of a kind community in the RDOS. There is nothing like this five minutes from downtown. We look after our animals as best we can and keeping at least two horses together is terribly important. If we kept our horses the way the Channel Parkway stables keeps their horses, I could see concern. We supply green pastures for our four legged friends to enjoy all year, regardless if it's less than 1 acre per horse.

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	Andrea Kinnin
Address:	2001 West Bench Dr.
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations? (additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)
I am opposed to the proposed amendment in regards to "Keeping of Livestock". provisions.

My reasons for lobbying for the change to the bylaw for keeping of livestock provisions are as follows;

- Horses are herd animals and do not thrive when kept alone. To keep them stress free and healthy, we need to practice good horse husbandry and keep them in a herd environment.
- We have a beautiful riding arena which is part of the RDOS Selby Park and have spent significant money and volunteer hours on upgrading it. This is a huge draw for families moving in to the area with horses and the arena is well used.
- Even though West Bench is zoned residential, it is a rural community and the majority of horse owners (I believe) practice good farm practices and good neighbour practices of keeping dust, odor and general cleanliness in mind.

I encourage the Board to consider changing the bylaw to allow for two horses per acre (0.4 hectares), as it was in Bylaw #68, 1969. Thank you!

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	Sue Gibbons
Address:	2020 West Bench Drive Penticton B.C. V2A8Z3
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?

(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

- As a coach it is important I promote the best possible horse husbandry
- horses are herd animals, + do not thrive alone.
- when I purchased my property in 1984, the bylaw was "one horse per acre, + one horse for every additional ½ acre, OR PORTION THEREOF!"
- I would encourage the bylaw to read 2 horses for the 1st acre, so smaller acreages can still have a horse facility, + a horse not to be kept alone.
- the investment by the RDOS for our lovely equestrian ring, clearly supports the West Bench's historical value placed on horse ownership.
- we live in an obese/health issue society. Encouraging children to ride promotes healthy living, + encourages the West Bench to stay a rural environment/as much/
- I am in favour of the 4-7 metre setback for stabling, to facilitate green-space - i.e. pastures - on the West Bench acreages.

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	JANE WINDELER
Address:	2201 WEST BENCH DR.
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

RDOS
OKANAGAN SIMILKAMEEN

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?
(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

PROPOSED RDOS LIVESTOCK BYLAWS

THE NATIONAL FARM ANIMAL CARE COUNCIL CODE OF PRACTICE for the care and handling of Equines states that horses " have company of the animals own kind" under the Freedom to Express Normal behavior.

IN ORDER TO PROMOTE humane treatment of horses and all livestock, owners should be able to have at least two of the same species, regardless the ~~set~~ size of ~~own~~ property

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	HEATHER LEAKE
Address:	3014 WESTBENCH DR PENTICTON, BC
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?

(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

I AM IN SUPPORT OF 2 HOUSES PER HECTARE IN AREA F.

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	Kelvin Leake
Address:	301A W BENCH DR.
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations? (additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)
I AM IN SUPPORT OF MORE THAN 1 HOUSE IN AREA F.

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	COLIN LEARKE
Address:	3014 WEST BENCH DR.
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

RDOS
OKANAGAN SIMILKAMEEN

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?

(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

I support having no horses (livestock) on properties less than .4 ha (1 acre)

* I strongly request that for .4 – .8 ha, two (2) horses (livestock) be allowed in particular where this is a simple # because of the historic situation

I support having livestock shelters conform to the standard setbacks in the RDOS – 4.5 m from property line & believe for 3 or more on larger properties

I support the farm-worker housing proposals for the Okanagan

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	Eva Drummee
Address:	1120 Jonathan Dr. Penticton (West Bank)
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

RECEIVED
Regional District
101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

TO - CHRIS GARRISH

Eva Durance
1120 Jonathn Drive
Penticton, BC
V2A 8Z6

RECEIVED
Regional District
JUL 30 2014
101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

Okanagan Similkameen Regional District
101 Martin St.
Penticton, BC
Attn: Planning Department
Review of Approved Keeping of Livestock

I have lived on the West Bench since 2003 as well as for three years in the early 1990s and have had a horse owner for the past two years (boarded nearby). I realize that the proposed changes to the policy above would affect other RDOS areas as well, but I can only speak for the one where I live.

One of the great attractions of the Bench for me and many others is the rural nature of the place and the sense I've always had here that most residents at least are extremely protective of that. This rural character includes horses and other livestock virtually all of which are kept because the owners like having the animals and the rural lifestyle that goes along with them. It's not a commercial venture.

I constantly hear concerns expressed about the Reserve horses, but have never heard anyone I've spoken to complain about their neighbours' livestock. Getting wakened in the morning by a rooster crowing or hen cackling at laying an egg, or hearing a horse whinnying is part of the joy of living here and one of the main reasons many people buy property on the Bench or wish to. That said, apparently there have been one or two complaints, one of which is from someone who doesn't live on the Bench himself, but is running a boarding stable here. Basing a draconian change such as is proposed on the basis of one or two people's complaints, one at least of which is commercially motivated, is unjustified.

Nor is using another Regional District's regulations as justification for changes here reasonable, and especially as a way to emphasize how fair the changes are compared to other places' rules. Why not use the City of Penticton's and Summerland's complete lack of such regulations on acreages as the basis for a policy? At least these municipalities are in the same area as the RDOS.

I strongly object to the proposed changes for the following reasons, among others:

- There has been no prior opportunity for public input to these substantial proposed changes nor I suspect are most people in the RDOS even aware of the matter.
- The numbers of complaints are far too few and from, in one case, a tainted, source, to base any changes on; as well the basis of the complaints should be taken into account, whether they had substance as to numbers of livestock in violation of current policy or

were about other issues such as a property not kept clean of manure, animals getting out onto neighbours' property, and so forth. These are different issues

- Simply dictating so many animals per ha doesn't take into account how much land is used for the animals. A person could have 2+ ha (proposed unlimited numbers) yet confine the animals to a very small part of that land, whereas someone with one ha or less could devote most of the property to the animals and therefore have a much more appropriate arrangement than the first person. Individual cases should be considered
- There are a number of people on the Bench who purchased their properties as ones where they could have a certain number of horses and built expensive facilities (barn/shelter, fencing, and so forth) on that basis. Now they are to be told that when they sell they won't be able to do so under the terms they purchased and made those large capital improvements. That effectively reduces their property values greatly and is manifestly unfair as well as possibly actionable.
- The designation of one horse on properties of under 1 ha indicates a lack of understanding of horses and their needs. They are herd animals that need to live with another horse to be content and kept in a humane manner; short periods alone won't harm, but long-term is unacceptable. An inquiry to the SPCA would have made this clear as their policy is to strongly discourage anyone keeping a horse by itself. This policy change would either encourage inhumane treatment of horses or effectively make it impossible to have a horse on many Bench properties that now can.
- The RDOS paid for the initial building of and then improvement of the riding ring, round pen, and adjacent fencing. If horses are to be effectively barred from most properties on the Bench, what is the point of the ring which was meant as a facility for HORSE OWNERS here?!
- I fail to see any serious connection between the setback regulations and the number of horses currently allowed on various-sized properties. Many horse owners have a simple lean-to as shelter for their animals or even just one or more large coniferous trees. Again, some attention to what is actually going on might mitigate concerns in this area.
- There are fewer than three dozen horses on the Bench, omitting of course the up to 24 from the Reserve that appear to now live here. Given the cost of horse ownership, there is unlikely to be a huge increase in those numbers. Most people who live here would never consider owning a horse, or any livestock, but enjoy very much the ambience having them around creates. When I am out riding, drivers and passersby invariably smile and wave or comment as they go by; I'm very sure it's not me they are happy to see! And if one passes children, there's always great excitement in their eyes. We want children to learn about other creatures; one of the easiest, most natural ways is to see well-loved domestic animals in everyday life.
- To designate only 3 "livestock" on 1-2 ha, but an unlimited number on 2 ha or over is simply ridiculous. That means that someone with 1.99 ha could only have 3, say horses, but someone with 2 ha could have-- pick a number. Where is the logic in this?
- Instead of focusing on the non-issue of the owned and well-cared-for horses on these rural properties, I would suggest that the RDOS to put its efforts into finding solutions for the Reserve horses. Their safety and well-being are at serious risk and from a human perspective, they do substantial damage to residential properties. The domestic horses are neither at risk nor do they damage others' properties.

Update of Agriculture Zone & Regulations
Feedback Form

Do you oppose, or are you in support of the proposed amendment to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws as they relate to the Agriculture Zones and Agriculture Regulations?

(additional information is available on the Regional District's web site)

OPPOSED - SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR MY REASONS

Feel free to give us your contact information (but this is not required).

Name:	GERALD DESJARDINS
Address:	319 NEWTON DRIVE WEST BENCH
Phone:	
Email Address:	

Please send your comments by:

Mail: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street,
Penticton, BC V2A5J9

Fax: 250-492-0063
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Please return this Comment Sheet by April 15, 2016

My number one concern is that this has not really been put before the residents of the RDOS for proper input and consideration. Only area F and area D had any public awareness and those one hour meetings were not advertised well and the notification was very short time wise.

Second on my list of the issues I have with the bylaws is that they still are only allowing one horse at the low end of the parcel size for lots that are 0.4 to 0.8 ha or basically 1 to 1.98 acres in size. It was discussed in detail at the meeting how horses are herd animals and it is a humane standard in the National Farm Animal Care Council Code of Practice for the care and handling of Equines that horses" have company of the animals own kind" under the Freedom to Express Normal Behaviour, as well as in other parts of the code. Here is a link to the code itself http://www.nfacc.ca/codes-of-practice/equine

which can also be found on the SPCA's website in reference to equine care. It was also brought up at the meeting that when several of the people in attendance had purchased their properties the bylaw was one horse for the first acre and one more horse for every additional ½ acre and they were not even aware that the bylaws had changed since they originally purchased their properties.

I have gotten information from the city of Penticton, Summerland and Kelowna and interestingly their livestock bylaws are more relaxed than what the RDOS currently has or is proposing. The municipalities are more in line with what the Provincial Agricultural regulations are. In the City of Penticton I spoke with Lindsey Fraser and Darryl Haddrell who told me that in zoning under RC- Country Residential Housing which has a minimum lot size of 0.4 ha, or one acre agricultural use is allowed and the number of horses is NOT restricted.

In Summerland I spoke with Gary Ellis who told me they do not limit numbers of livestock, using other bylaws to address problems if they arise and or refer complaints to the Farm Practices Board. Mr. Ellis told me they have lots as small as ½ acre in A1 AG zoning.

In Kelowna areas zoned as A1,RR1, and RR2 with a "C" notation have lots of 0.4 ha and animals and poultry are unlimited.

I find it very interesting that within municipalities it seems that they are following the Ministry of Agriculture regulations and yet in the RDOS which is mainly rural properties the bylaws are so much stricter. I do not necessarily agree with the unlimited approach but I think perhaps there should be some type of actual agricultural reasoning and science application on the numbers as opposed to what seems to be just numbers applied for no real reason. I personally feel that even the rigid lot size ruler, so to speak is not guaranteed to work, as on the West Bench where I live the lot lines often zigzag or can be mostly ravine even on large lot sizes. This leaves many large size lots with actual very little useable space for animals of any kind, but because they would meet the lot size requirement they could have more animals than the land is actually suited for.

Also why do the numbers jump from 4 horses at 2.0 ha yet as soon as you go over that number say at 2.01 ha you can have unlimited numbers of livestock? Does this really make sense? Why would .01 of a hectare meant that suddenly a lot can sustain unlimited numbers of livestock?

I would really like to have an explanation as to how and why these numbers are chosen, as even within the different Regional Districts there is no consensus on numbers? And the municipalities seem to be more in line with the Provincial Agricultural regulations, all very confusing and not making much sense in my mind.

In essence as I understand the proposed bylaws they are not really changing anything in regards to the number of livestock ie: horses but they are changing it in regards to the number of small livestock such as chickens on small lots and eliminating roosters altogether until one meets the golden size of 5 acres/2ha. at which point numbers or types of animals apparently are not limited. Again I find it interesting that cities are moving towards allowing people to keep a small number of chickens on city lots and our rural areas the numbers are being reduced from what the historical numbers were, from 25 down to 5 with no roosters.

As for the elimination of roosters I have an issue with that as if a person has heritage birds there will not be a way to continue the breed without a rooster. I know that recently a B.C. breeder of heritage birds has gone out of business and therefore I wonder if a person would be able to easily replace a specific breed and the minimum number one would have to order and how that would work in regards to the numbers one is allowed on their property. Ie if they only need or want to replace a few birds but have to order more to meet the minimum which I believe can be 12, which means for those only allowed 25 birds they have to wait until their flock is 50 % reduced before they can build it up again. For those who are only allowed 5 birds they will be more than 50% over their limit in the purchase?

Also some of the more expensive heritage breeds are sold “straight run” which means they are not sexed, so you may pay big dollars for a bird you will have to get rid of if it turns out to be a rooster.

Here is a link to a heritage chicken breeder in B.C. which shows pricing and minimums.
http://www.gradeehfarms.ca/ordering-guidelines.html

Another large concern is the properties where the bylaws suggest to totally remove the wording "agriculture" and base the numbers totally on lot size. At first I thought that was a good idea, but after discussing with a few more educated people familiar with bylaws I have been told that is not really a good idea going forward into the future.

These are all questions that should have an answer in my opinion before the bylaw changes take place.

Gerald Desjardins 319 Newton Drive West Bench

Advisory Planning Commission Minutes
RDOS Electoral Area "A" Monday April 11, 2015
Sonora Centre, Osoyoos, BC

Present:
Acting Secretary: Mark Mckenney
Members: Chair Peter Beckett, Vice Chair Mark Mckenney, Gerald Hesketh, Bill Plaskett, Grant Montgomery; In attendance: Area A Director Mark Pendergraft.
Regrets: Bonnie Douglas, Dwayne Svendsen

Meeting was called to Order at 7:05 pm

Minutes of previous meeting were adopted by consensus
Agenda adopted by consensus

Delegations: Christopher Garrish, RDOS

Agenda item 2.1

Update of General Regulation for Agricultural Uses & Development

Mr. Garrish made a presentation regarding the scope of these proposed amendments. Their purpose is to provide amendments to "Keeping of Livestock; Setbacks for Buildings, Structures, & Farm Areas for Farm Uses"; to introduce General Regulations respecting "Kennels" and amend various Site Specific definitions in the Bylaws.

Mr. Garrish described how these amendments seek to standardize these bylaw provisions across as many Electoral Areas in the RDOS as possible.

Discussion

Mr. Garrish' s presentation was very specific and complex in terms of the various amendments that are proposed by planning staff.

Keeping of Livestock Regulations

Area "A" APC members asked many questions relating to the proposed amendments. When considering specific livestock limitations APC members expressed their concerns that they do not have specific knowledge pertaining to the best practices for the keeping of livestock to offer a fair opinion to the RDOS (number of horses, chickens, whether roosters should be allowed or not etc.).

Setbacks for Buildings, Structures, & Farm Areas for Farm Uses

Area "A" APC members had similar comments about the setbacks provisions, indication that these proposed changes may have implications on the agricultural community or non-agricultural property owners that APC is not aware of. For example, setbacks of 3.5 M are allowed now in Area and the proposal to move to 4.0 M may have implications on existing land owners, and should be analysed before APC comments.

Temporary Farm Worker Housing

Area "A" APC members commented that the subject amendments are very technical and complex and may have implications beyond the scope of knowledge of the APC members. This being the case more explanation and consultation with potentially affected RDOS citizens should be considered.

Grant Montgomery provided additional information to APC members (by email April 12, 2016) on the correct standards for temporary worker's accommodation.

Chairman Beckett commented that each of these subject areas is of sufficient complexity that perhaps they should be dealt with independently as individual subject areas to allow better understanding and consideration by APC members.

Motion

Made by Bill Plaskett, Seconded Gerald Hesketh

That the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed amendments related to the **Update of General Regulation for Agricultural Uses & Development** be approved with conditions:

- Prior to APC comments a focus group of agricultural stakeholders should be convened to discuss the proposed bylaw amendments and seek their input
- Consideration of changing the 3.5 Ha setback in Area A to 4.0 should be analysed by RDOS staff as to its implications on existing land owners, and reported to APC
- Setback amendments for livestock should be discussed with the agricultural community and other stakeholders to determine best practices

The Motion is CARRIED unanimously.

Agenda Item 2.2

APC Bylaw No. 2339 5.1 Appointment of APC Positions

By consensus the APC appointed these positions for 2016:

- Chair – Peter Beckett
- Vice Chair – Mark McKenney
- Secretary – Bonnie Douglas

Motion Made by Mark McKenney, Seconded Bill Plaskett

The Motion is CARRIED unanimously

Motion to Adjourn

Made by Gerald Hesketh, Seconded Bill Plaskett
For the motion: Unanimous
Opposed: None
The Motion is CARRIED
Meeting Concluded at 8:50 PM

M McKenney

Mark McKenney Peter Beckett

REGIONAL DISTRICT OKANAGAN-SIMILKAMEEN
ELECTORAL AREA "D" ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Tuesday, March 8, 2016
OPEN HOUSE at 6:00 to 7:00 p.m.
APC Meeting at 7:00 p.m.
Okanagan Falls Community Centre
1141 Cedar Street, Okanagan Falls, BC

DISTRIBUTION:
Mr. T. Siddon, Director, Electoral Area "D"
Mr. T. Styffe, Alt. Director, Electoral Area "D"
Members: Jerry Stewart - Chair
Doug Lychak – Vice Chair
Don Allbright, Ed Melenka, Robert Handfield, Robert Pearce, Bob Haddow, Jill Adamson, Navid Chaudry
Staff: Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor
Denise Melenka, Area "D" Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. APPROVAL of the February 9, 2016 minutes
MOTION
It was Moved and Seconded by the APC that the Minutes of February 9, 2016 be Approved.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
MOTION
It was moved and Seconded that the Agenda be adopted. **CARRIED**

4. DELEGATIONS/DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

4.1 Monteith, William & Eileen for OCP / Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application
Agent: Elenko, Brad
D02881.000 / D2015.128-ZONE

D02881.000 – OCP / Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application
Administrative Report submitted by Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor
MOTION
THAT the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed rezoning be denied.

CARRIED

5. OTHER

4.1 Update of General Regulations for Agriculture Uses & Development
Administrative Report submitted by Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor

MOTION
THAT the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed amendments to update the Agriculture Zones and Regulations be approved in principle.
Options:

CARRIED

5. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION
It was moved and Seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

CARRIED

_____
Jerry Stewart, Chair

_____
Denise Melenka, Recording Secretary

Minutes

Electoral Area 'E' Advisory Planning Commission

Meeting of Monday, March 14th, 2016

OAP Hall, 330 - 3rd Street, Naramata, BC

Present:

Members: Bruce Clough (Chair, Electoral Area "E" APC), David Kopp (Vice Chair), Heather Fleck, Phil Janzen, Don Mancell, Judi Harvey, Tim Forty, Tom Hoenisch

Absent: None

Staff: Christopher Garrish (Planning Supervisor), Evelyn Riechert (Planner)

Guests: Karla Kozakevich (Area 'E' Director), Ed Marbach left meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Recording Secretary: Heather Lemieux (Recording Secretary) via transcription

Delegates: Graham Birds (Ecora Engineering) left meeting at 8:01 p.m., Laurie Wheeler left meeting at 8:01 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:38 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the Agenda be adopted.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

2. DELEGATIONS

2.1 Riccio, Lucio & Patricia for Temporary Use Permit Application E02120.001 / E2016.006-TUP

Delegates, Riccio, Lucio & Patricia, not present.

Discussion: No concerns with the application. Permit to expire December 31st, 2016.

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded in favour of Option 1. THAT the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed temporary use permit be approved.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

2.2 Palomino Estates Ranch & Vineyard and Ryland, D. & W. for OCP / Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application

Delegates, Graham Birds (Ecora Engineering) and Laurie Wheeler, present.

Discussion: Lot lines, designs on new lot line configuration to allow access to an upper lot.

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded in favour of Option 1. THAT the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed rezoning be approved.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

3. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

3.1 E02120.000 - Temporary Use Permit Application, Administrative Report submitted by Susan Lightfoot, Planning Technician.

3.2 E07146.000 - OCP / Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application Administrative Report submitted by Evelyn Riechert, Planner. Agent: Ecora Engineering

4. OTHER

4.1 Update of General Regulations for Agriculture Uses & Development Administrative Report submitted by Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor

AMENDMENT Bylaw: Electoral Area Zoning Bylaw and Update of Agriculture Zones and Regulations Electoral Area 'E'.

Delegate: Christopher Garrish (Planning Supervisor) present.

4.1.1 Keeping of Livestock

Administration recommends that the ability to keep livestock (i.e. chicken, horses, ducks, rabbits, etc.) be based upon "single detached dwellings" being a permitted use in a zone, as opposed to the current requirement that "agriculture" be a permitted use; and the ratio of animals to land area is modified.

4.1.2 Setbacks for Buildings, Structures & Farm Areas for Farm uses

Updating the "Setbacks for Buildings, Structures & Farm Areas for Farm uses" regulations and applying these to the Resource Area (RA), Agriculture (AG1, AG2 & AG3); Large Holdings (LH) and Small Holdings One (SH1 & SH2) Zones:

Administration is proposing to delete the current setback table for commercial agricultural uses currently found at Section 7.22 of the Electoral Area "E" Zoning Bylaws, and to replace this with a limited number of setback provisions within each of the Rural Zones, including a reduction to the setback for livestock structures from 30.0 meters to 15.0 meters.

4.1.3 Kennels

Administration proposes to introduce the following as a new set of general regulations to Kennel Facilities

A kennel is permitted where listed as a permitted use, provided that No kennel shall be permitted on a parcel less than 2.0 hectares in size; and All buildings, structures and areas utilized in association with a kennel shall be sited a minimum of 30.0 metres from all parcel lines.

4.1.4 Floor Area Limitations for Agricultural Uses

Administration proposes to reduce the maximum parcel coverage from 15% to 5% in the AG1 Zone; and introduce a 70% coverage allowance for greenhouses (in accordance with ALC Regulations). The 5% coverage represents an amalgamation of the 3% parcel coverage and the 600 m2 residential footprint allowance.

4.1.5 Temporary Farm Worker Housing

The "temporary farm worker housing" concept allows for this floor area to be built in the form of a single dwelling unit. Administration is proposing changes to Density Provisions.

4.1.6 Accessory Dwelling and 1.0 ha Policy

In order to bring introduce consistent provisions across the Electoral Areas, Administration is proposing to increase the land area required for an accessory dwelling in the AG1 Zone to 4.0 ha

4.1.7 Review of Site Specific Amendments

Proposed amendments to parcel coverage and floor area restrictions for wineries and packinghouses. Administration reviewed all of the AG1s Zones and is proposing a majority of these be deleted from the bylaw.

4.1.8 Definitions

Administration recommendation on significant amendment to the definitions of agriculture related uses in the Zoning Bylaw.

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded in favour of Option 2 THAT the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed amendments to update the Agriculture Zones and Regulations be approved with conditions:

i) With regard to livestock regulations the Area 'E' APC **neither supports or opposes the amendment** to base Keeping of Livestock upon "Single detached Dwellings" rather than an Agriculture requirement.

ii) Re: "Setbacks for Buildings, Structures & Farm Areas for Farm uses" - The Area 'E' APC supports reduction of setbacks for livestock structures and in cases of anything less, that builders should apply for variances.

iii) Re: Kennels - new Kennel regulations are supported by the APC as well as an amendment listing kennels as an accessory use.

iv) Re: Floor Area and parcel coverage restrictions for Agricultural uses - Amendments to protect Agricultural land use are supported as are the site specific amendments later discussed.

v) Re: Temporary Farm Worker Housing - The concept of Temporary Farm Worker Housing is supported; but

vi) Re: Accessory Dwellings and the 1.0 ha Policy - The Area 'E' APC still supports an eligible minimum size of 1.0 ha, can live with a 2.0 ha size, but **opposes a 4.0 ha minimum size requirement.**

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

5. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded by the APC that the Minutes of February 9th, 2016 be approved.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

6. ADJOURNMENT

4.1 MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

Next Electoral Area 'E' Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

Monday, April 11th, 2016

Advisory Planning Commission Chair

Advisory Planning Commission Recording Secretary / minute taker

Minutes

Electoral Area 'F' Advisory Planning Commission

Meeting of Thursday March 10 2016

RDOS 101 Martin Street, Penticton

Present:

Members:

Natalie Minunzie, Chair

Sandy Berry, Vice-Chair

Hillary Ward

Bob Nicholson

Stewart Patterson, Secretary

Absent:

Don Barron

Staff:

Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor

Also Present:

Michael Brydon, Director, Area "F"

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the Agenda be adopted.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

2. OTHER

2.1 Update of General Regulations for Agriculture Uses & Development Administrative Report submitted by Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor.
Discussion.

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the subject Development Application be approved with the following conditions:

Horses – Maximum of two horses on a 0.4 ha parcel.

Chickens – A revised maximum of 25 chickens per 0.4 ha parcel, and a request to review the amended schedule.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

3. APC Bylaw No. 2339 5.1 – Chair of the Commission Election of the Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary (to be performed at the first meeting of each new year – *Section 5.1; Bylaw No. 2339)*

3.1 Motion: That the following slate of officers be approved.

Natalie Minunzie, Chair
Hillary Ward, Vice-Chair
Stewart Patterson, Secretary

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded by the APC that the Minutes of Thursday, December 2, 2015 be approved.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

5. ADJOURNMENT

5.1 MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 9.00 pm.

CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)

(signed)

"Natalie Minunzie"

Advisory Planning Commission Chair

(signed)

"Stewart Patterson"

Advisory Planning Commission Recording Secretary

Minutes

Electoral Area 'H' Advisory Planning Commission

Meeting of Tuesday, April 19, 2016

148 Old Hedley Road, Princeton, BC (Riverside Centre)

Present: Bob Coyne, Director, Electoral Area 'H'

Members: Marg Reichert, Ole Juul, Dennis Dawson, Lynne Smyth, Gail Smart, Tom Rushworth, Dave Rainer

Absent: Rob Miller

Staff: Christopher Garrish, Planning Supervisor

Recording Secretary: Gail Smart

Delegates: _____

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

1.2 **MOTION**

It was Moved and Seconded that the Agenda be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. OTHER

2.1

Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Kennedy Lake
H00789.000
H2014.099-ZONE

MOTION

THAT the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed rezoning be approved with the following conditions:

> That following formalization of all seasonal cabins, the Regional District append the zoning to reestablish maximum density of 150 seasonal cabins on the subject parcel.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2.2 Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Housekeeping Amendment
Project # H2015.030-ZONE

MOTION

That the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed bylaw amendment be approved.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2.3 Update of Agriculture Zones and Regulations
Project # X2014.085-ZONE

MOTION

That the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed amendments to update the Agriculture Zones and Regulations be approved.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2.4 APC Bylaw No. 2339 5.1 – Chair of the Commission
Election of the Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary (to be performed at the first meeting of each new year – *Section 5.1; Bylaw No. 2339)*

ELECTIONS

Chair: Ole Juul nominated – Acclaimed

Vice Chair: Rob Miller nominated – Acclaimed

Recording Secretary: Gail Smart - Acclaimed

5. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

5.1 **MOTION**

It was Moved and Seconded by the APC that the Minutes of August 19, 2014 and September 15, 2015 be approved.

CARRIED

6. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the meeting be adjourned 8:30 pm.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

_____

Ole Juul, Chair

_____

Gail Smart, Recording Secretary