

## Brent Road Survey Results

### Summary

- On February 14, 2011, the Regional District of Central Okanagan mailed out surveys to 135 properties in the Brent Road and Trepanier Road areas. The surveys asked questions about future directions for the community to guide the Official Community Planning process.
- 14 total surveys completed from the Brent Road area and 46 surveys were completed from the Trepanier area. These were analysed separately, to better reflect the unique issues in these areas.
- This is a summary of the Brent Road area results only. 14 surveys in total.
  - 11 online surveys completed,
    - 1 not completed
    - 2 completed from Alberta, and one completed from Mexico.
  - 3 paper surveys submitted

### 1. “Residential Growth: What rate of rural residential growth should the OCP support within the Brent Road Trepanier Valley?”

For all responses, 62% marked “A) Slow Down.” The remainder marked “B) Maintain” (15%) and “C) Speed Up” (23%). This question received a 93% response rate.

### 2. “Growth: Where should most growth occur in Brent Road and Trepanier Valley?”

Responses show a split between “A) Little growth – All growth should be concentrated in adjacent municipal areas, like the adjacent Peachland neighbourhoods” (38%) and “C) Growth should be allowed in various areas through subdivision of rural lots” (31%). Only one person marked “B) Growth should be concentrated in and around existing rural developed neighbourhoods, like Brent Road and Trepanier Road.” 23% of responses marked “D) Other.”

The written in comments for “D) Other” included:

- “No Growth”
- “No Growth”
- “Fill in Existing Lots”

### 3. “Economic Development: Which economic activities should be encouraged to expand and diversify the economy in Brent Road and Trepanier Valley?”

This question allowed respondents to pick multiple options. The most popular response for Brent Road respondents was “A) Attracting tourism and resort based businesses” (36%). “B) Encouraging home based business,” “D) Encourage agriculture (crops and livestock) and related activities,” and “E) Other” each received 29% of votes. “C) Encouraging rural resource extraction (timber, and gravel)” received no votes.

Written in comments for “E) Other” included:

- “None, Brent Rd is residential”
- “No economic activities”
- “No economic activities”
- “No economic development on Brent Road”

#### **4. “Community Services: Which of the following community services should the Regional district investigate?”**

This question allowed participants to select multiple answers. The most support was for “E)Community fire protection servicing” (50%) and “A)None keep the rural area self-servicing” (50%). “C) Community sewage collection and disposal” and “F) Other” each received 29% of votes. “D)Community potable water supply and distribution systems” (14%) received 2 votes. No one voted for B) Community facilities/hall.

Written in comments for “F) Other” included:

- “Fire protection is in place”
- “Water/Sewer feasibility study only at this time”
- “Comprehensive water and sewer feasibility study only at this time”
- “Transit”
- “Full fire protection through community water supply or remove cost from property taxes as not any use as is!”

#### **5. “Land Use Contract: Should Land Use Contract #277 in Trepanier be discharged?”**

Not applicable to Brent Road. No responses.

#### **6. “Transportation: How important is it to see improvements in the following areas?”**

This question averaged 81% participation.

The highest ranking responses were “B) Intersection improvements” (55 points), “C)Road Safety” (50 points), and “D) Maintenance and Operations” (47 points). Intersection improvements and road safety both received a ranking of “very important” from all respondents. “E) Infrastructure to encourage walking and cycling” was prioritized the least (30 total points); however, it received very strong positive or negative responses (“Not important” or “Very important”).

Written in comments include:

- “Road and intersection safety, it is very dangerous to turn from Hwy 97 left on Brent Rd. and there have been numerous accidents”
- “Brent Rd North is gravel and old, should be resurfaced.”
- “Maintain servicing above road”

## **7. “Parks: What are the priorities for parks and open space in the Brent Road and Trepanier Valley?”**

This question averaged 92% participation.

By far, the most popular response was “F)Protection and Conservation of sensitive habitat and species at risk,” which received 61 total points. “D) Improving Amenities” (27 points) and “E) Active Recreation” (26 points) received the least support. “A) Acquiring new park spaces” (42 points) “B) Acquiring new linear trails and greenways” (43 points), and “C) Connect existing parks” received lukewarm responses.

Written in responses include:

- “Don’t allow public access to or through private property for trails.”

## **8. “Environment: How important is it that the Regional District do the following?”**

This question averaged 93% participation.

“E)Protect from hazardous conditions” (54 points), “F)Protect from wildfires” (53 points), “A) Increase the amount of land for parks and trails” (53 points), “G) Reduce the amount of current garbage generated” (53 points) all received significant support. “D)Protect lake, shoreline habitat and streamside environment” (51 points), “C)Improve air quality” (46 points), and “B) Introduce green building requirements to reduce the impact of development” all received quite high support, also.

Written in comments include:

- “Don’t restrict private open burning”

## **9. “Housing: Brent Road/Trepanier OCP should allow more of the following types of housing:”**

This question averaged 93% participation.

The question elicited strong reactions for and against the statement:

- “A)Single family residential homes through subdivision” received 43 points, with most respondents voting either “1 strongly against” or “5 strongly support.”
- “C)Seasonal cabins/recreational buildings” received 42 points
- “B)Separate accessory dwelling units on lots” received 35 points, with most respondents voting either “1 strongly against” or “5 strongly support.”

Written in comments include:

- Subdivision to minimum 1 acre

## Characteristics about Brent Road that people value

- “The lake and remote location”
- “The rural atmosphere”
- “Rural acreage lake access to wild crown land above Brent Road”
- “Rural atmosphere, Orphaned Area, Self serving services, Larger lots”
- “Proximity to Crown land”
- “Rural life style”
- “Isolation and fairly natural wildlife habitat.”
- “For Brent Rd. I value seclusion, privacy, and the beautiful rural setting. At present most building lots are large -- nearly an acre, more or less. I prefer to keep it that way.”
- “Seclusion, privacy, unspoiled nature”
- “Rural feel, park-like setting, Low density, Self-sufficiency, Quiet”
- “Lake access and view”
- “Privacy”
- “Natural beauty and privacy”

## Improvements people would like to see

- “Road and intersection safety, it is very dangerous to turn from Hwy 97 left on Brent Rd. and there have been numerous accidents”
- “Brent Road resurfaced”
- “Safe access from Highway 97 to Brent road or highway relocation before not after someone is killed. “
- “Watershed land above us to the top of the Saddle protected as Park with uses restricted to no buildings or logging (except for fire control) or mineral extraction and to be open to hiking, biking, riding and restricted ATV use and most importantly protected for wildlife.”
- “Protection of watershed lands above Brent Road “
- “Incorporation of parks, changing Crown lands to limited use parks”
- “Hwy 97 turning lane to Brent Road”
- “Turning lane Hwy 97 to Brent Road”
- “sewer/fire protection/potable water”
- “I would like to see improved safety at the intersection of Brent Rd and Highway 97 by having a turning lane.”
- “Improved safety at highway intersection with added turning lane”
- “Access to Hwy 97”

## Additional comments

- “Leave as it is”
- “While some of the land above Brent Road is Crown Land it is important that it be included in the Community Plan.”

- “Maintain residential zoning with no provision for commercial or multifamily development Complete a comprehensive water and sewer feasibility study including individual property hook ups and operating costs”
- “Opt out of Arena and Pool facilities”
- “Crown land west of Brent Road . Keep as wildlife habitat. No commercial activities. Restrict dirt bikes and off road vehicle to a minimum. “
- “I would prefer not to have subdivision of existing lots to all additional single family dwellings.”
- “Prefer not to allow subdivision of existing lots to enable building of additional single family dwellings”
- “With limited land area on Brent road development in any way seems unlikely. Important! Turn off from hwy97 to Brent road is extremely dangerous. There will be a fatality. Need proper turn off/intersection and continued twinning.”
- “We hope to keep Brent Rd a quiet small rural community”
- “The ability to develop small acreages for tourism purposes: holiday rentals and separate accessory dwelling units need proper (healthy) sewage systems and fire protection for this”
- “Access to Brent Rd for safer access to Hwy 97”
- “Overall, Get going!”
- “Overall, can we please get on with this! We have been meeting for many years and nothing has changed!”