

Kingfisher Local Area Plan

Interim Report: Issues Identification and Summary of Public Participation to Date

Project No. 302-0450

Prepared by: Andrew Bruce, Site360 Consulting

July 20, 2010

COMMUNITIES
TRANSPORTATION
BUILDINGS
INFRASTRUCTURE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.0 PUBLIC MEETINGS..... 1**
- 2.0 SUMMARY OF INPUT 2**
 - 2.1 Specific Input 2
 - 2.2 Early Analysis 3
 - 2.3 Specific Areas of Interest 3
 - 2.3.1 Seasonal Use of Community Amenities 4
 - 2.3.2 Existing Development Potential..... 4
 - 2.3.3 Community Infrastructure 4
 - 2.3.4 Environment 5
 - 2.3.5 Valley Specific Issues 5
- 3.0 NEXT STEPS 6**

1.0 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Site360 and RDNO have hosted two public meetings at the Kingfisher Hall. The first meeting was held on May 12th between 4:00 and 8:00 PM. This meeting was intended to introduce the stakeholders to the process and the consultant. Encouragement was provided for the public to use email as the preferred method of contact but fax numbers and mailing addresses were also provided. The evening was well attended with 98 individuals signed in and an estimated 25-30 people who did not sign in for an estimated total attendance of 125.

Comment sheets were provided for participants to fill out and leave behind or send in to either Site360 or RDNO at a later date. The consultants made a presentation followed by a participatory discussion of the issues that were brought up by audience members. These issues were recorded on flip charts.

The second meeting was held on June 16th at the same venue between 6:00 and 8:00 PM. For this meeting, the consultant compiled a summary of the issues that had been identified by the public through various correspondence and presented them on ten display boards. The consultants reviewed the summary issues with the audience and engaged in some discussion on each issue. Some clarification and sub-headings were added to the display boards and then each participant was provided five coloured dot stickers. It was explained that this was not a vote but it was a method for the participants in attendance to signal to the consultant what the priority issues were.

Unfortunately, there was an issue with the mail out process such that the notices were delivered late and some were not received until after the meeting. Only 42 individuals signed in to the meeting but 53 people participated in placing the stickers. Total estimated attendance was approximately 60 people.

A third public meeting is scheduled for August 4th with an afternoon session from 1:00 to 3:00 PM and an evening session from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. This will be the last of the general information public meetings but there will be another meeting held in September (tentatively) to review the draft plan.

2.0 SUMMARY OF INPUT

2.1 Specific Input

To date, Site360 is in receipt of the following;

| Letters and Emails | Completed Comment Forms |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 64 | 22 |

Prior to the June 16th meeting, Site360 compiled a list of general topics that summarised the input received to date. Many of the stakeholders who responded provided extensive detail to their input and it has all been retained and copied to RDNO for reference into the plan. The general topics were elaborated on during the presentation and discussion sessions. The consultant did not reveal the distribution of areas of concern prior to or during the June 16th session in order to try and get a comparison between the input received from individuals and the input received during the June 16th meeting. The following table indicates the general topics, the distribution of concerns received directly by the consultant and the distribution received during the public meeting.

| | General Topic | Distribution Prior to June 16 th Meeting | Distribution at June 16 th Meeting |
|---------------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Policing: traffic/speeding, unlicensed vehicles, summer parties | 5.7% | 6.0% |
| 2 | Noise/Pollution: seasonal peak use | 4.4% | 0.3% |
| 3 | Fire Safety: emergency planning, summer congestion | 6.9% | 3.4% |
| 4 | Over Population, Crowding and Growth: public amenities, building/bylaw enforcement, generally carrying capacity of the area | 4.4% | 40.8% |
| 5 | Parking: lack of parking for summer visitors, lack of parking for Westside residents and guests | 13.9% | 7.2% |
| 6 | Traffic: general congestion in vicinity to lake/campground, Enderby-Mabel Lake Road | 13.8% | 13.6% |
| 7 | Parks: trails, public parks, public beach, sidewalks/multi-use trails | 11.9% | 10.2% |
| 8 | Water Quality: lakefront and riverfront, groundwater, fish habitat | 5.7% | 6.4% |
| 9 | Boating: congestion at ramps, proliferation of buoys, storage (trailer) parking | 23.3% | 7.5% |
| 10 | Sewage Disposal: extension of sanitary sewer service, capacity of community system, capacity of private fields, monitoring of groundwater | 10.0% | 4.6% |
| TOTALS | | 100.0% | 100.0% |

2.2 Early Analysis

When reading the detailed emails and letters, it is clear that all of the specific issues that have been raised are in some way related to growth. However, what is interesting is that a very low percentage (4.4%) of the individual submissions suggested that the area had reached or exceeded capacity while the group response at the public meeting clearly indicated this was the prime concern at 40.8% responding to this category.

It is apparent that the issues of concern can also be divided into two broad categories; (i) physical and evident issues, and (ii) perceived or suspected issues. Examples of the physical and evident issues are issues such as the proliferation of buoys and parking congestion. Examples of the perceived or suspected issues are issues such as ground water quality and capacity and function of the community sewer system.

Physical and evident issues are easier to quantify and qualify as they are visible and the cause and effects are usually relatively easy to interpret. Perceived or suspected issues typically need to be quantified and qualified through additional study to either validate them as physical and evident issues or to dismiss them as being non-issues.

The majority of the issues identified to date are physical and evident issues. They could be mitigated by effective management and/or capital expenditure. There will be a few perceived or suspected issues which will require additional study and data gathering and will therefore not be fully addressed by this planning process. However, efforts will be made through the last general public meetings to try to refine the perceived or suspected issues as far as possible. The August 4th public meetings are expected to attract a higher amount of non-resident owners than the previous two meetings and it will be interesting to try and establish where the distribution of concern is from this group of stakeholders compared to what has been collected to date.

2.3 Specific Areas of Interest

At this point in the process, it is not appropriate to indicate what issues will be the most prominent to be addressed by the Kingfisher Local Area Plan. However, it is appropriate to document some generalised topics that, based on the input to date, will require significant study during the completion of the first draft of the plan. Input received during the August 4th public meetings will be considered and evaluated in the same manner as all previous input.

2.3.1 Seasonal Use of Community Amenities

Seasonal use is prevalent in the area closest to the lake and is expanding westward through the recent development of two new RV resorts. Public use of the river is also extending from the east to impact areas along the river. Community amenities such as public parking, boat launches, boat moorage facilities, retail (i.e. convenience store), public beach access, trails and park space are all impacted by the seasonal influx of both non-resident owners and visitors. Some of the impacts are the result of the lack of any management of the public resources, some public resources are inappropriately located in the conflicting locations and some are simply undersized for the peak use. Further review of existing underutilised resources in the community is a key component to fully understand the capacity for the seasonal peak use.

2.3.2 Existing Development Potential

There have been a lot of comments regarding new or further development of the area. There is an existing inventory of lots that are vacant or under developed based on the current land use regulations. Discussion about future growth needs to recognise how much future growth is already de facto approved by way of existing lot and zoned land inventory. There also needs to be a better community understanding of what can be done with these lands in terms of services, maximum buildable areas and current environmental regulations. The plan area has a relatively small land base with respect to non-rural (i.e. less than 1 hectare lots) development potential. A detailed inventory and clear set of criteria for development on all lots less than 1 hectare and all lots that allow for multi-family, commercial or tourist commercial should be prepared. This would help evaluate the current capacity that the community should expect without any changes in the OCP or other planning policy documents. There needs to be a clear understanding of what the approved but undeveloped land potential holds in terms of additional buildings and population growth before any future growth and development models can be examined.

2.3.3 Community Infrastructure

There are reports that were prepared when the community sanitary sewer system was implemented by Mabel Lake Resort and RDNO that describe how the system can be expanded to serve a broader segment of the lakeside and near lake community. However, it does not seem as if there has been a clear mandate by the community nor the local government since that time to see the expansion of the system, despite efforts by both parties. There are also perceived issues with the capacity, both current and future, of the system as well as the quality of the effluent and the effectiveness of the ground disposal system. Reporting and monitoring of the system is required and has likely been done over the years. If the broader community is to have faith and confidence in the sewer system, this reporting should be made more readily available to the community. Until there is a more complete buy in to the system, it will be difficult to get a majority of support for expansion. Similarly, the local government will have options for expansion of the system and they will have tools to mandate connection. These need to be discussed with the community within the design limits of the system to see if a strategy can be developed and championed by the community.

The community water system has not been a significant topic of discussion to date but it also deserves the same kind of disclosure on monitoring and capacity. Both of these infrastructure systems are demand driven. The community can have a significant impact on how effective and efficient these systems are, how capacity can be preserved through demand management and how both individual and community sustainable practises can influence the need for infrastructure in the future. However, if the community is not aware of anything beyond the tap or the toilet, they will not establish any sense of ownership in the systems.

2.3.4 Environment

Concerns about the environment are evident as a thread in almost every piece of correspondence. The issues range from protection of surrounding mountains and forest by way of provincial park dedication to concerns over groundwater quality. The plan, as per the terms of reference, will address best practises for development, Riparian Areas Regulations and Development Permit Guidelines. However, the main issue of identifying carrying capacity needs some baseline work that will also require future monitoring and analysis. There is no doubt that human activity leaves a footprint on the environment. The question for Kingfisher is how big should the footprint be? There needs to be a fixed set of data collection that can be used as a “yardstick” for the environmental health of the community. It need not be complex but it should be a consistent set of tests that are done on an annual or semi-annual basis and made available to the community. The primary issue, based on feedback so far, should be water quality in the lake and in the ground. There are provincial standards that the data can be compared to and over time, they can see what is happening to their local environment. Similar to the issue with the infrastructure, awareness in the community needs to be established based on physical evidence rather than perception or suspicion. Kingfisher is a relatively isolated area and is near the top of an elaborate water basin. If the community desires to take extensive measures on their collective environmental impact, they can likely do so without a lot of impact from neighbouring communities.

The environmental issue in general will cross over to all other issues. It is impossible to develop a local area plan without addressing the environment in all other divisions of policy.

2.3.5 Valley Specific Issues

The most specific issue that has come up with respect to the river valley portion of this community has been a few opinions about the ALR. It does not seem that further exclusion from the ALR is desired by the valley residents nor have they expressed any need for changes in land use. They are concerned about river use by the public and general traffic issues. There has also been a few comments made about affordable housing options within the more rural parts of the plan area and the recent RV parks created west of the Kingfisher Road. Although many of the issues seem to be focused around the lakeside of the plan area, these issues seem to be consistent across the participants to date. It seems to indicate that the Valley residents are also concerned about issues at the lake as they see it as a community resource.

3.0 NEXT STEPS

This paper will be updated after the August 4th public meeting and augmented with any new or expanded issues raised by the public or RDNO. Once all of the main issues have been identified and published, Site360 will commence the drafting of the plan and developing recommendations for updating the OCP for Electoral Area “F”. The next public meeting will be held after RDNO has reviewed and commented on the draft plan.