

# Brent Rd / Trepanier Survey Two – Results

## Summary

- 135 surveys sent out in mail, posted online from July 21 to September 9
- 25 online surveys completed and 7 paper surveys submitted, though some submissions came from a pair of people.
- Brent and Trepanier areas are different and need to be referenced differently especially w/r to servicing needs, future lot sizes and subdivision...the OCP must reflect this better.

Further differences include:

- Trepanier Maxwell supports water service and fire protection only (not sewer)
- Brent Road not supportive of servicing
- Trepanier area supportive of future development potential/ subdivision of lots, Brent not
- Trepanier has concerns with transportation connections and heavy truck use
- Brent Rd needs a safe access turning lane from the Hwy.
- Concern with gravel pits. Keeping pits away from residential development in Trepanier area
- Concerns with identifying parks that may indicate private lands; stronger view from Trepanier residents that there are enough parks already
- Strong areas of support included:
  - Preserving rural character and directing future development to municipalities
  - Protect land from hazardous conditions, like fire prevention and steep slopes
  - Support protection sensitive aquatic ecosystems and sensitive terrestrial areas
  - Yes, remove Land Use Contract. Land use to be reviewed under Zoning Bylaw No. 871 only
- Not supportive of:
  - Changes in land use or existing zoning (note – the draft OCP aimed not to do that)
  - Adding more regulation ‘red tape’, restrictions to future development
- Areas of contention include:
  - Provision of water and sewage
  - Creating connections between park areas – equal support and not for future parks
  - Permitted uses on Crown land, and uses that can be considered in any designation in the Brent Road area

## 1. Draft Vision and Objectives

	Brent Road		Trepanier	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
<p><b>DRAFT VISION</b></p> <p>Brent Road and Trepanier is a rural area that preserves agricultural land and the rural character by directing urban development into the appropriate serviced town centres of neighbouring municipalities. Recreational, park and trail opportunities are provided and expanded, while protecting the unique ecological areas and environmental qualities. Residents recognize the unique and rare natural setting of the area as being of high value to citizens of the Brent Road/Trepanier area.</p>	11	0	10	7
a. Preserve the rural character of Brent Road and Trepanier by directing future urban development into the neighbouring municipalities of Peachland and West Kelowna.	15	0	13	9
b. Seek opportunities for shared funding to assess the costs associated with delivering a community water and sewage collection system to Trepanier Valley and discuss options for shared cost arrangements and service delivery options with landowners.	4	8	11	11
c. Create connections between park areas in Trepanier Valley to increase recreational enjoyment of parks. There is a desire to increase the trails, greenways, and bike paths between natural areas.	8	5	9	12
d. Recognize the unique and rare ecosystems of Brent Road and Trepanier by identifying sensitive areas and requiring compliance with guidelines for their protection.	13	2	18	3
e. Brent Road and Trepanier has relatively rolling terrain, with some steep slopes exceeding 30%. When development is proposed there are a variety of hazards that are assessed including flooding, landslip or rockfall, and wildfire. These areas will be required to follow pre-development guidelines to reduce the risk to property.	15	0	20	1
f. Encourage any changes to land use to be reviewed as a rezoning bylaw under Zoning Bylaw No. 871 rather than a Land Use Contract (Note: this applies only to the Trepanier Valley).	6	2	18	3
g. Encourage the provincial government to consider permits for aggregate and timber extraction only in accordance with provincial best management practices, a detailed environmental review and neighbourhood impact review.	8	5	15	6

## Comments

### Brent Road

- No sewer on Brent Road

### Trepanier

- DRAFT VISION Please define the difference between rural and urban in reference to lot sizes. If urban development means under 1 hectre and condos then yes direct it to neighbouring municipalities of Peachland and West Kelowna. If rural means 1 hectre and larger lots lets plan for this by delivering a community water system and road upgrades to Trepanier. OBJECTIVES a) if urban development means under 1 hectre and condos then yes direct it to neighbouring municipalities of Peachland and West Kelowna. If rural means 1 hectre and larger lots with a community water system and road improvements then lets plan for a community that has water,fire protection,road upgrades. b) no to sewer----yes to water. c) no to connecting parks in Trepanier Valley. e) Trepanier is mainly flat but yes to the assessments
- We are greatly in favour of a water system but don't think a sewer system is feasible at this time as the properties are so large and far apart
- No gravel permits should be issued within 1 km of existing homes. There is 50-100 year supply past the residential area west of Trepanier, and a road access to 97C would fix this issue for industry and the residents.
- Absolutely agree with the aggregate extraction proposal -- this should be a no brainer as we already have enough gravel pits in the Trepanier valley--- the process should be made so tough for the gravel pit owner operator , there is already to much dump truck pressure on our roads and noise levels --- be prepared for a major fight with anyone who applies for the next gravel pit application...
- You ask, ""Did we get it right?"" NO Trepanier and Brent Road is not a rural area. They are two separate areas. The Trepanier residents have had many meetings to discuss Trepanier issues. Never at any meeting has anyone suggested they want sewer. The residents have always indicated they want to stay rural with many wanting 2.5 acre lots. Sewer would change the entire area. Water and fire protection have been the most requested services. To put sewer and water as the same ""objective"" makes absolutely no sense. ""Brent Road and Trepanier has relatively rolling terrain"" Brent road has rolling terrain, it rolls right down to the lake. Trepanier has hundreds of acres of flat land ideal for septic fields and smaller acreages.
- The two areas are so different that the questions answers to the question can changed based on what area you are concerned about. Trepanier is my area of concern, and I am not interested in sewer.
- b) No sewer for Trepanier. c) We have enough unused parks now. Lived here five years have yet to see a single person in Coldham Park !! d) Leave us alone, we will use our properties and preserve our sensitive areas and ecosystems. e) Not applicable to Trepanier where we are for the most part flat. g) Live and let live. Once we have our gravel pit, RV park, greenhouse, or whatever, we are quick to jump on the bandwagon and make sure no one else gets an opportunity to earn a living or enjoy

their property. Many hypocrites here in the valley ! Put your effort into eliminating grow ops once and for all.

- Draft Vision Please define ""urban development"". If this means condos and multi-family development then the vision is on course. Objectives a. All urban development should be directed to areas with full services. Rural development only in Trepanier b. Community water has been the topic discussed at many if not all of the residents and community meetings. Sewer has never been a desire expressed at any of these meetings. Why do you link the two together? This is very confusing and detrimental to the process. c. As long as sensitive areas such as creek banks and riparian zones do not allow greenways or trails and encourage public access through private property. Keep walkways along existing road right of ways.
- Keep Trepanier rural with 2.5 acre minimum lot size with community water and 5 acres without community water.
- The valley can accommodate higher density and still retain the rural setting and feel. As residents age they may find a need to split their properties for their family or for retirement planning and can still remain in their own homes!
- two seperate issue. I have no need for sewer. As far as shared funding for water i thnk it is the responsibility of the province, regional district and municipality to provide tax payers with a source of safe water. b)I am not interested in expanding the connections between the parks or adding more parks in the area as it only encourages people from other areas into our neighbourhood with little to no regard for the citizens in the neighborhood or our area
- Two separate issues. My main concern is water only because is being forced on use by Interior Health and we need a water source to attain fire protection. I am not at all interested in shared funding as I feel it is the responsibility of the governing bodies, provincial and local municipality, to provide tax payers with this a source of safe drinking water. c) Not interested in any additional parks or connectivity between them. This encourages people who have little to no respect for the people or the area in the neighbourhood into this neighbourhood.
- We want rural character of 1 hectare size. Rural means wells and septic, but if fire protection means community water then perhaps!

## 2. Draft Land Use Designations

	Brent Road		Trepanier	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
<b>Rural Resource:</b> Land with Rural Resource designation includes provincial forests and community watersheds and rural areas consisting of Crown Land and privately owned large rural lots with minimal services.	12	3	14	2
<b>Crown Lands</b> within this designation are intended to support resource industries such as cattle range, timber harvest, gravel extraction, and outdoor recreation on large parcels / unsurveyed Crown land.	8	7	9	8
<b>Private lands</b> within this designation have environmental constraints, and the provision of services, such as community water, and the provision of adequate road access. In order to minimize road access and to protect resource and environmental values, large parcel sizes are encouraged (30 ha or larger).	10	3	10	8

<b>Agricultural:</b> Lands within this designation are intended for agricultural use and will support crop growing, food processing, agritourism and other industries in support of the agricultural sector.	14	1	10	8
<b>Rural Residential:</b> Lands within this designation are large rural properties with minimal services and some limitations consisting of a 4-hectare minimum lot size.	12	3	5	13
<b>Parks and Natural Areas:</b> This designation is intended for outdoor oriented parks, recreation services, conservation parks and natural open spaces.	14	1	18	0
<b>Private Recreation:</b> This designation is intended for large-scale, open space oriented, private recreation such as eco-tourism facilities or recreational cabins.	13	2	14	3
<b>Uses that may be considered in any designation:</b> Public utilities and public parks zoned P1 (Park and Open Space), and the use of Comprehensive Development Zones (zones written specifically for a particular site in consideration of OCP policies and designations) may be considered in any designation.	7	7	14	1

## Comments

### Brent Road

- Rural Residential 1 hectre parcels would be preferred. Please note the minimum lot size is not 4 hectares in Trepanier as stated in your rural residential land use designation.
- Rural resource designation above Brent Road does not consider the protection of environment and recreational use of this land, it should be parks and natural areas. Future expansion of Hwy 97 is not indicated and directly influences this plan.
- No sewer on Brent Road

### Trepanier

- Brent Road and Trepanier Road need different services, land use policies, and provisions in the OCP.
- a) Privately owned land should not be Rural Resource. c) Private land ""may"" have services. e) Rural Residential -- 2 ha OK. g) Private Recreation is a farce.
- Land with Rural Residential designation are large rural properties with minimal services and some limitations consisting of a 4-hectare minimum lot size. Rural residential lots should be a minimum 1 hectare with community water and 2 hectares without. Eliminate the RU2 zoning in rural residential areas as this zoning encourages gravel operations, intensive agriculture and other negative uses that impact neighborhoods.
- 2.5 acre minimum with community water and 5 acre minimum without water.
- Agriculture in the Trepanier valley is very limited and some areas in the Agriculture Land Reserve are very questionable and will be challenged in the future. The forest potential in this area is all so limited and perhaps a wild fire reduction strategy is all that will become of it.
- Rural Residential should be a minimum 1 Ha Lot size. Future development of more residences will provide the ability to fund and man our own volunteer fire department. This will address the safety issue of no fire protection and retain the Rural character of the area. There is no water for

agricultural land and the elevations are too high to grow anything. Realistically there should be no ALR.

- Rural Residential designation should be minimum 1 Hectare. When we did a boundary extension we were delayed three years because of a policy from 1995 prohibiting future development until a land use plan is done. Staff attempted to place a covenant on our property to prohibit future subdivision. If this minimum 4 Ha designation is not changed we want our property designated Industrial. This conforms with the current use. How do you expect anybody to farm in Trepanier?
- No gravel pits close to homes even if the property is crown land. Should have a buffer zone of at least 2 miles.

### 3. Draft Development Permit Areas

#### A) Wildfire Interface Areas

	Brent Road		Trepanier	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
The Regional District will require that Fire Smart practices be followed in high risk areas through building materials and landscaping to reduce the fire risk to homes and neighbourhoods.	14	0	18	0
Wildfire Interface Development Permit Areas Guidelines will be required for proposed developments close to high risk areas.	14	0	17	0

## Comments

### Trepanier

- Allowing RU3 in Trepanier will help protect against wild fire through landscaping and water and fire protection.
- Common Fire Protection Practices.
- Provide community water to help fight fire.
- Implementing this policy with future development will mitigate the current fir risk.
- Using these practices the development of 1 Ha lots will mitigate the existing fire danger and expand the tax base and the manpower for a fire department.

B) Steep Slope Hillsides (> 30% grade)

	Brent Road		Trepanier	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
The Regional District will require that development on hillsides be done in a manner that minimizes damage to property from erosion, soil instability, rock fall, or other identified hazard.	14	0	17	1
Development Guidelines will be put in place for lands with steep slopes greater than 30% to ensure that hillside development is sensitive to natural topography, landscape features, drainage patterns, and visual impacts.	12	2	17	1

**Comments**

**Brent Road**

- No sewer on Brent Road!

**Trepanier**

- Common sense.
- This will negate the need for 30% no build no disturb covenants.
- Implementing Hillside DP's will negate the need for 30% no build no disturb covenants.

C) Aquatic Ecosystems

	Brent Road		Trepanier	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
The Regional District will ensure that land development is compatible with sustaining proper ecological function of sensitive aquatic ecosystems.	12	2	18	0
Aquatic development permit areas guidelines are focused on protection of the foreshore, streamside ecosystems, wetlands, seasonally flooded sites and broadleaf woodland ecosystems.	11	3	18	0
Streams and shoreline areas will be buffered with no development in identified "leave-strip" areas.	11	3	17	1

## Comments

### Trepanier

- a) "Proper" ecological function of sensitive aquatic ecosystems is subject to interpretation and can be used to strong-arm property owners. Ensure that the 'buffer' zones aren't too stifling and realize that broad leaf woodland ecosystems are durable and virtually impossible to destroy by anyone except those who have access to large earth moving equipment.
- No development in identified ""leave-strip"" areas. This means no development of walkways or greenways.
- Leave-strip areas should be left untouched. This includes no greenways.
- leave strip areas could be part of the Linear Park which could eventually go all the way to lacoma Lake.
- Riparian should be 15Metre setback not 30Metres as per Provincial guidelines
- The Provincial legislation is for 15 Metre setbacks not the current RDCO 30 Metre. Asking for the additional 15 Metres should not be required.

### D) Sensitive Terrestrial Ecosystems

	Brent Road		Trepanier	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
The Regional District will ensure that land development is compatible with protection of identified sensitive habitat, its ecosystem, and biodiversity.	11	3	15	3
Sensitive terrestrial ecosystem development permit area guidelines are focused on protecting grassland ecosystems, coniferous woodland / mature forest ecosystems, and sparsely vegetated cliffs / rock ecosystems.	11	3	15	3
Sensitive ecosystem areas will be buffered with no development in identified high priority areas.	11	3	13	5

## Comments

### Trepanier

- This section will be used to stifle every request for every type of development, renovation, or expansion on homeowner's property in Trepanier.
- Smart development can take place and still be sensitive to all the above items.
- Sensitive Ecosystem is ambiguous and open to interpretation. It is overzealous and unnecessary.

# Comments on OCP Process

## Brent Road

- I find it unfortunate that Brent Rd and Trepanier have been lumped together. We have different terrain, different interests, different possibilities. I feel that we on Brent Rd will be overwhelmed by the larger Trepanier population.
- Define rural and urban in reference to lot sizes. Would like to have seen Brent Road/ Trepanier surveys separate. Thank-you for giving the residents and property owners a say in how their community is developed.
- Trepanier and Brent Road should have separate plans. Some questions are left unanswered because they apply only to Trepanier.
- Brent Rd should not have been combined with Trepanier -- it makes the survey process very confusing as our needs, and our population are very different.
- The OCP Process is a good thing. We love living on Brent Road and would like things to remain as is.
- We love living on Brent Road. No changes needed! It is perfect! No sewer please!
- Please put pressure on government to provide us with an access road off hwy 97. Our family obtained this property in 1949. It is very dangerous to enter and exit our property and that of our neighbours. Note we are south of Antler's beach but before Brent Road
- We have been to several meetings both in Peachland and Summerland over these years where we were promised an access road to our properties on Brent Road. Nothing has happened except traffic has dramatically increased. Please take the time to look at this very dangerous situation. It is impossible to turn in coming from the south. From the north we can make a left hand turn, but there is no lane. Many, many times we have been passed on the right while waiting to turn. this is incredible dangerous. There is no notice of our road or even a hidden driveway sign. I don't know how you can compare the dangers on Maxwell, Trepanier, and Paradise Valley with the traffic on Hwy 97. Please come and take a look

## Trepanier

- Trepanier and Brent Rd are completely different in there nature and services needs. Many general clauses can be for both areas, however the water sewer and land use zoning needs are completely different and need to be addressed as such.
- Loving this process -- good work everyone --- this is what we need --- very excited about the future
- The two areas are so different that I feel a separate plan is required for each, or at least a separate plan within the plan. Brent Road issues and Trepanier Valley issues are separate and distinct in so many ways that it would be difficult to come up with a blanket plan for the two areas.
- The OCP process caters to a few residents with special interest and who have already beaten the process and are now doing everything possible to prevent their neighbors from earning a living from or enjoying their own property.

- The survey was poorly put together. The questions were confusing, for example: Do you; Reside in Brent Road and Trepanier? No one resides in Trepanier and Brent Road. Seek opportunities for shared funding to assess the costs associated with delivering a community water and sewage collection system to Trepanier Valley. These two issues must be separated. Two of Trepanier's main issues are water and fire protection. The community has little desire for sewer.
- More priority and discussion on the future of a water system. Water should be more of a regional concern as the health standards are more critical and enforced. This area should be connected with Peachlands new system. A gravity flow system through the new Golf course which could connect to Peachlands existing lower Trepanier system. Transportation is a concern in Trepanier valley. However properties with good access to the Connector highway are better able to support higher density development. Continued expansion of the linear park system along Trepanier Creek and Jack Creek should be a priority as these corridors have high ecological and recreational value.
- Brent road and Trepanier are unique areas and should be separated. When you have a split on opinions to develop less than four hectares and the OCP stops the development into 1 Hectare Rural Residential lots you are violating the rights of the property owners that want the ability to subdivide. Socialist Dictatorship!
- I believe that you need to look at Trepanier and Brent roads as two separate issues as even though we have several common concerns. Jim Edgson has enlightened us of the issue revolving around the OCP for North Westside and we would not care to go down this same path when it can be dealt with right from the beginning. Making one designation with two separate areas
- Jim Edgson has advise us of the issues surrounding the implementation of the North Westside OCP and it would be best if we treated the Trepanier and Brent Rd OCP in the same manner as even though we have several common concerns, most of the issues very vastly and should be dealt with in differently.
- Great to see it's moving along