

**Sproat Lake Official Community Plan
Open House, 14 March 2013
Compiled Comments (as of 26 March 2013)**

Summary:

Fifty-four signed in for this open house. Fifteen left completed comment sheets at the open house. Another two were delivered subsequently to the ACRD offices.

Attendees were divided on the question of maintaining the proposed 30-m development permit area (DPA) around lakeshores or reducing the area to 15 m. For Sproat Lake in general, 8 were in favour of a 15-m DPA, 6 in favour of 30 m; for Two Rivers Arm, 6 for 15 m, 5 for 30 m; for Stirling Arm, 7 for 15 m, 4 for 30 m; for Great Central Lake, 5 for 15 m, 4 for 30 m; and for Boot Lagoon, 5 for 15 m, 3 for 30 m.

Concerns were expressed with regards to hardening of the lake shoreline, grey-water disposal and the quality of water in Sproat Lake, the future of the Bomber Base, noise pollution, and unaccompanied dogs roaming around freely.

Detailed Responses:

1. It has been suggested that the development permit area on Sproat Lake be reduced from 30 metres to 15 metres from the high water mark. Do you support this reduction?

- Yes (8 responses)
- No (3 responses)
- I do not support 15 m setback. I support 30 m setback.
- No – development permit areas are largely in undeveloped areas and should remain as undeveloped as possible, given rights to development of the proper # (? see #14) Development permit areas must have highest quality sewage systems and ensure landscape quality is maintained.
- No, refer to p. 37 of the [draft] Sproat Lake Community Plan under *Justification* heading. Continually reducing the natural environment that protects and interacts with the aquatic environment may harm their vitality.
- Not really bother either way.

2. Do you feel that the development permit are reduction from 30 metres to 15 metres should apply to the following:

- Yes to all (4 responses)
- No to all (2 responses)
- I don't support any move to 15 m setback (applies to all)
- As a Sproat Lake resident can only speak for: all arms "including Taylor Arm and Faber Arm" should not be compromised by lowering standards, on all arms not just two arms [Two Rivers Arm and Stirling Arm both checked]
- Not really bothered (applies to all)

Two Rivers Arm

- Yes (2 responses)
- No (2 responses)

Stirling Arm

- Yes (3 responses)

- No

Great Central Lake

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Boot Lagoon

- Yes
- Don't know

3. Do you have concerns or additional comments regarding the draft OCP?

- No – only that a public access is not realistic in residential areas.
- I'd like to see the development land along the Sproat River protected from development.
- No – agree with the proposed zoning for DL567 and other areas of the OCP. Good opportunity for a site specific plan that fits. Good presentation.
- No (2 responses)
- No – agree with proposed zoning.
- (1) I am happy with the OCP, one step at a time.
(2) Keep an eye on what Island Timberlands will do with the bomber base if Coulson should leave.
(3) Make sure the people who live out on the Pacific Rim Highway are informed before Western Forest Products start to log behind them.
- I am concerned that I see some land owners building breakwaters and permanent structures such as retaining walls right at lake edge! This must be in contravention of current regs as well as any proposed here! OCP should have more teeth.
- I agree with the proposed zoning for DL567 in Two Rivers Arm to Comprehensive Development Area. (2 responses)
- (1) I feel that the goal of "continued ... economic growth" is not appropriate in this day and age. We should have a goal making our lifestyles more sustainable and healthy. Everyone seems to think that bigger is better. We need to think about how we can progress towards "healthy shrinkage".
(2) I feel we need to work harder to outlaw the discharge of grey and black water into the lake.
(3) We also need to outlaw styrofoam floats.
- I would like more onus for dog controls to be placed on the owners of the dogs, rather than forcing land owners to spend thousands on fencing, while the owner of the dog is off the hook until someone is hurt.
- I like the vision of the new plan. Well considered. Good work.
- Access to Sproat Lake at public areas for boat launch needs to be controlled. Issues with water quality, damage to foreshore, etc., are largely (but not exclusively) from local residents or visitors who don't respect the environment and safety issues. I have a major concern regarding the land owned by Island Timberlands surrounding the park. This company has a reputation for irresponsible logging and development.
- Yes. Access to Upper Stamp Lagoon for public tubers, drift boats to float down Stamp River and then exit at Stamp Falls Prov. Park (above the falls). This could be a park or boat launch access. This area would have to be below the various falls and rapids, above the area going upstream to the Stamp dam. Presently fishing guides use the area, tuber walk trails.
- (1) Under Infrastructure objectives (14.1, p. 22) Advocacy Policies – consider

encouragement of grey water holding tanks on commercial houseboats on the lake, in order to protect existing and future water quality (see 18.2 Marine Use policies and 12.2.9 page 28).

(2) Increasing concern of very loud satellite radios and open no-muffler speedboats with no enforcement (see Advocacy Policy 18.2.12). Update noise bylaws and penalties.

(3) Complete paving on Faber Road and Stirling Arm Drive as these roads have not been addressed for a number of years.