



# Minutes

## Electoral Area 'A' Advisory Planning Commission

Meeting of Monday, June 22, 2020

By ZOOM – virtual meeting

---

### Present:

Members: Peter Beckett (Chair), Mark McKenney (Vice-chair), Grant Montgomery, Manfred Freese, Bill Plaskett

Absent: Director Pendergraft, Gerry Hesketh

Staff: Christopher Garrish, Planning Manager

Recording Secretary: Mark McKenney

Delegates: EcoPlan consultants: John Ingram (Project Manager), Graham Farstad, Evelyn Riechert

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:20 p.m. due to Zoom connection issues

### ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The agenda circulated by RDOS was amended to add:

- Review of engagement consultations that have occurred
- Request from Anarchist Mountain residents for a public meeting

### MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the amended Agenda be adopted.

**CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)**

## 2. DELEGATIONS

### 2.1 Delegation:

Consultants from EcoPlan introduced themselves.

Discussion.

No motion was made regarding items 2 or 2.1 (introductions only)

### 3. OTHER

3 There being no other business, beyond Item 4. Below, no motion was made

### 4. REVIEW OCP PROJECT

#### 4.1 Review Draft Electoral “A” OCP Bylaw

Mr. Ingram led discussions for EcoPlan consultants. He started off by informing APC that a Draft of the OCP was not ready to share with the APC. It will be “a few more weeks”. Mr. Garrish indicated that when it is available it will be shared with the APC.

Mr. McKenney pointed out that several residents of Anarchist Mountain, within Area A, had joined the call as public observers and that there is a keen interest in the development of the OCP. More discussion on that later.

EcoPlan provided a general outline of their OCP development to date. This included demographic data collection, a summary of some issues they have flagged (drought, climate change, aging population, ecological issues, growth strategies, ). This presentation was essentially the same as that presented to APC in Jan or Feb 2020. No new information was presented.

EcoPlan presented the schedule of the project as represented below.



This prompted a statement from Chairman Beckett, that in the opinion of the ACP the Phase 2 (Visioning, Issues & Ideas) has not been accomplished, and the public has not been adequately consulted on the development of this OCP revision. APC members unanimously agreed that the project has not accomplished the Visioning, Issues & Ideas stage. APC agreed with the consultants, and Mr. Garrish, that the Covid pandemic emergency is the cause to disrupting public engagement, however this engagement phase cannot be ignored or removed from the project plan.

Ecoplan indicated that approximately 100 “response cards” and 46 email comments from the public have been received. They also confirmed that no public meetings have been organized or convened. Ecoplan agreed to provide the APC, through Mr. Beckett, an analysis of where within Area A the comments have been received, and what a summary of what those comments were\*.

APC members continued to insist that the “process” of public consultation and engagement is as important as the OCP product document and eventual bylaw. APC advised to find a way to make this happen.

Members of the APC also advised RDOS and the consultants that there are serious local issues within Area A that have residents concerned. These include that Environmentally Sensitive Permit bylaw and its restrictions of property owners to work on their private properties without an QEP study in order to get a building permit. APC asked what evidence RDOS has of eco sensitive assets on Anarchist Mtn and other parts of Area A; and to explain how the “pink zone” was established. Mr. Garrish indicated this is a separate issue from the development of the OCP, leading to Mr. McKenney indicating that the “pink zone” issue must be dealt with, in a cooperative manner with rate payers. No commitment from RDOS was forthcoming.

It was pointed out that the wildfire risk is a primary hazard in the south RDOS area (Area A). APC members indicated that the OCP must present findings and recommendations of how that risk is mapped and risk is being planned for. A comment was made that the “pink zone” requirements currently prohibit Fire Smart activities beyond 10M of the principle structure on an Area A property. This is counterproductive to property owners taking responsibility for mitigating fire risk on their properties and within community interface fire zones.

Mr. Beckett asked if and how the Osoyoos Indian Band has been engaged. Mr. Ingram indicated that OIB had been consulted, and Ecoplan / RDOS agreed to provide the APC with details of those engagements. As previously suggested by APC in our Jan/ Feb meeting with Ecoplan, it was confirmed that no engagement with the Sikh community, or with the Rural Rate Payers Association has occurred.

OCP members suggested that the OCP project should reschedule its deliverables. The lack of open public engagement is the main concern of the APC. APC acknowledges that until now the Covid emergency has made public engagement difficult, however, as we move into phase 3 of recovery, we must conduct strategies for wider public input. APC pointed out that their comments do not represent the general public. For that RDOS is advised to restructure the schedule, offering engagement opportunities for the general public to gain acceptance of the process and the revised OCP in Area A.

\*An analysis of the geographic distribution of the 92 residents who replied to the survey indicates that 79 live on Anarchist, 1 near Kilpoola, 1 south of Osoyoos on the western side of the lake, one on the northwest side of the lake and 6 close to the border. Five indicated they “don’t live in area A”. This is not representative of Area A as a whole.

**MOTION**

**On a Motion** made and, **Seconded** :

That the RDOS reschedule the development of the OCP Review project to add three months to the schedule for the OCP Review, for the final report to be delivered by the end of Q1-2021 (March 2021), to allow for public engagement including public meetings, presentations, residents being informed of engagement opportunities and requesting input from citizens. Preferably this should involve in-person meetings subject to public health guidelines.

Additionally, a meeting with Anarchist Mountain residents is requested.

Discussion: No further discussion by APC members was offered.

**CARRIED: UNANIMOUSLY**

**4.2 Election of Chair, Vice Chair & Secretary - deferred**

**5. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES**

**MOTION**

It was Moved and Seconded by the APC that the Minutes of January 20, 2020 be approved.

**CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)**

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

**4.1 MOTION**

It was Moved and Seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 8:40 pm.

**CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)**

\_\_\_\_\_  
P. Beckett

Advisory Planning Commission Chair



\_\_\_\_\_  
Advisory Planning Commission Recording Secretary / minute taker