

## **COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT**

Notes of the second Public Hearing held on Wednesday November 28, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at the Lower Level of the Cedar Heights Community Centre, 2316 Lakeview Drive, Blind Bay, BC, regarding proposed Bylaw No. 725-12.

---

PRESENT: Chair Paul Demenok – Electoral Area C Director  
Dan Passmore – Senior Planner, Development Services  
9 members of the public

Chair Demenok called the Public Hearing to order at 6:00 pm. Following introductions, the Chair advised that all persons who believe that their interest in property may be affected shall be given the opportunity to be heard or to present written submissions pertaining to the proposed Electoral Area 'C' Official Community Plan Amendment (Shuswap Country Estates) Bylaw No. 725-12.

The Planner explained the requirements of Section 470 of the Local Government Act and noted that the Public Hearing Report will be submitted to the Board for consideration at its August 16, 2018 meeting. The Planner explained the notification requirements set out in the Local Government Act and noted the Public Hearing was placed in the Salmon Arm Observer, November 21, 2018 and the Shuswap Market News on November 23, 2018.

The Planner provided background information regarding these proposed bylaw amendments and reviewed the purpose of the bylaws. At the Chair's request, the Planner also summarized the additional information from the Applicant's consultants received by the CSRD to the public in attendance.

The Chair opened the floor for comments.

██████████ read aloud the contents of a letter submitted to Development Services staff. He again advised he was speaking on behalf of a number of local residents who had signed a petition for the first public hearing, which he stated still represented the views of the 19 names of people who lived in the immediate area. These documents will be provided to the Board as correspondence received.

██████████ advised that since the last public hearing the owner of the property had started a cattle feed-lot operation with 50 head of cattle on the agricultural portion of the property. He advised that the cattle are situated in proximity to a well downslope which is within a catchment basin formed by the railway berm. The concern is that this well may utilize the same aquifer which the neighbouring properties obtain their drinking water from, and that agricultural waste may then contaminate their drinking water, if the well is not abandoned properly. He noted that there are also 6 other wells noted in diagrams provided by the applicant in the area. He advised that the project engineer during the first public hearing advised these wells needed to be sealed off.

The Chair interceded in ██████████ presentation when he began quoting statistics regarding the Walkerton disaster.

██████████ next addressed the hydrogeologist report submitted by the applicant. He noted that the report did not adhere to the resolution by the Board in that current flow testing was not done, and neighbouring wells were not therefore monitored for drawdown interference. He advised that the data used in the analysis was from well testing performed 10 years ago, which would not likely remain the same 10 years later. He noted that both the original well testing firm Summit Environmental Consultants Ltd. and the current hydrogeologist's analysis indicated additional testing was required to determine if the well can meet demand from the development.

██████████ continued by advising that 2 immediate neighbours he talked to would be amenable to drawdown testing of their wells if a current flow test was done. He advised that he had called the hydrogeologist for an explanation of some of the information in the report.

He concluded by asking for current certified information as suggested in the hydrogeologist's report and that the report was not accurate or strong enough to support the development.

██ responded that the hydrogeologist had given a professional opinion that the well was capable of sustainably supplying the expansion of the development. He indicated that the flow data provided for the homes was based on the current usage and flows experienced within the park, and therefore was not an estimated figure.

██, noted again that the report advised more testing is required, and that the neighbouring property owners are asking for that testing to be done before the development is approved. He advised that the neighbors are willing to cooperate with the developer, but they would appreciate more transparency. As a result they are still not willing to say yes or no to the development. He advised that there still aren't any design plans for the proposed park expansion. There are no details on setbacks or drainage.

██████████ continued by noting that the wells need to be properly abandoned. He noted that in all the years of operation the sewage lagoon had not been pumped out. He advised that since the sewage treatment plant was registered there must be new ways to deal with waste using other methods of disposal. He advised that spray irrigation atomizes effluent and that better results were obtainable through direct soil injection.

██ responded that these were all good comments and that he could offer a rebuttal but the professional reports provided stand for themselves. He noted that the well can sustain the development and is currently used to service the development. He finished by advising that in terms of the waste treatment, spray irrigation has not been necessary and even with future development would be a remote possibility that nevertheless is available to them in the registration of the system.

Chair Demenok asked whether the well testing and whether drawdown would impact on other aquifers.

██, advised that testing would show if the aquifers were connected.

██████████ responded that the hydrogeologist report indicates the aquifers are not connected.

The Planner noted the report to the Chair where it refers to the different aquifers present.

Chair Demenok asked if there was any contamination in any of the wells.

██████████ advised that the water in the drinking water well is tested weekly by Mountainview Electric Ltd. and that the result is forwarded to IHA. The drinking water is treated by sand filtration, UV and chlorination. He advised that the information they have given to date is sufficient to prove that the expansion of the park is serviceable. He advised that they will need to get more work done when the system is expanded to service the additional units.

██████████ explained that although the spray irrigation is permitted for effluent disposal, they have never needed to do it as the effluent level has never achieved enough volume to reach the inlet. He advised that there is an additional 15' of lagoon volume that has not been used. He stated that he was not willing to spend more money to design all the details of the expansion and the servicing until they are ready to begin the expansion. He indicated that the proposed subdivision and park expansion will see more regulation to be met. He advised he has no issues working with his neighbours and that he anticipates that next spring the cattle operation will expand to 3 new fields.

Chair Demenok asked if additional transparency would be afforded the neighbours, and if the owner would conduct a public meeting.

██████████ stated absolutely. He also advised that surface water issues would be dealt with.

Chair Demenok asked what the time frames were for the development.

██████████ advised that it would take 1 more year after the approval of the re-designation to pursue the subdivision, with another year to do the necessary construction. He stated that they see uptake of the units at 3 to 5 per year to expand and that maybe it might take 10 years to full buildout.

██████████ asked what lots would be for sale.

██████████ advised that the 3 10 acre lots at the back of the site would be subdivided and sold and that possibly 30 to 45 more units would go into the park. He noted that due to the topography of the site, the units wouldn't be on much of the land available.

██████████ advised that they see market takeup of the units at 5 per year.

██████████ advised that the neighbourhood was not concerned about the 3 new lots being created, but that their issue was with the density of the units in the park. He advised that the servicing of the new units has the potential through water and waste treatment to impact their properties. He reiterated that the hydrogeologist report is based on 10 year old data and that more testing needs to be done.

██████████ noted the submission he had hand delivered to staff contained a petition in support of the bylaw signed by 70 residents in the area.

██████████ noted that the petition was signed by people already in the park. He stated that people in the park are already facing watering restrictions and that they are told they cannot wash cars.

[REDACTED] advised that the park owners spend a fortune on treating the water.

[REDACTED] noted that washing a care requires about 30 gallons and that restrictions within the park are in place to ensure that water is conserved.

Hearing no representations or questions about proposed Bylaw No. 725-12 the Chair called three times for further submissions before declaring the public hearing closed at 7:07 pm.

CERTIFIED as being a fair and accurate report of the public hearing.

  
Director Paul Demenok  
Public Hearing Chair

  
Dan Passmore  
Senior Planner