



## ELECTORAL AREA E/WEST BOUNDARY (BIG WHITE)

### ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

#### MINUTES

Tuesday, February 2 and 9, 2021 via tele-conference and zoom, commencing at 1605 and 15 06 respectively.

Minutes taken by: \_\_\_\_\_ John LeBrun \_\_\_\_\_

- PRESENT:** Feb 2 meeting. Peter Hutchinson John LeBrun, Gerry Molyneaux, Anastasia Byrne and Paul Sulyma  
Feb 9 meeting. Peter Hutchinson, John LeBrun, Rachelle Hawk and Paul Sulyma.
- ABSENT:** Feb 2 meeting. Rachelle Hawk  
Feb 9 meeting. Anastasia Byrne and Gerry Molyneaux.
- RDKB DIRECTOR:** Feb. 2 and Feb. 9 meetings Vicki Gee
- RDKB STAFF:** None
- GUEST:** Feb. 2 meeting Andy Hill Feathertop Strata

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meetings were called to order at 1605 and 1506.

#### 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA (Additions/Deletions)

**Recommendation:** That the February 2, 2021 Electoral Area E/West Boundary (Big White) Advisory Planning Commission Agenda be adopted.

**Motion to adopt by John seconded by Paul**

**ADOPTED**

#### 3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

**Recommendation:** That the January 5, 2021 Electoral Area E/West Boundary (Big White) Advisory Planning Commission Minutes be adopted.

**Motion to adopt by Paul seconded by John**

**ADOPTED**

#### 4. DELEGATIONS. Andy Hill as an observer, from Feathertop Strata; February 2.

Electoral Area E/West Boundary (Big White) APC Minutes  
January 5, 2021  
Page 1 of 6

**5. UPDATED APPLICATIONS AND REFERRALS**

1. The application last month (1247676BC Ltd.) will go to public hearing towards the end of February and requires architect approval for snow storage and drainage.
2. There is a town hall meeting scheduled for 9 March 2021.
  - a. It was asked about how the meetings and application review will be shared publicly. RDKB representative noted that there may be a direct mail out for the town hall and relying on the social media networks on the mountain and will be sent to strata's as well.
  - b. Asked how the town hall will be held and RDKB representative noted that it would be held on line.

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Kevin and Sharia Blackett**  
**RE: Development Permit**  
RDBK File: BW-4222-07500.865

**Discussion/Observations:**

1. The permit indicates an exposed aggregate driveway. Based on the slope this could create a run-off problem. Exposed aggregate not conducive to ride in/ride out, exposed aggregate damages skis and snowboards as it finds its way on to ski easements in snow moved by the loader.
2. The permit indicates tarping may be required "if necessary" during construction to prevent erosion on the ground. Watershed advisory suggests stopping erosion before it begins so could this language change to "require tarping on slopes during construction".
3. The diagrams appear to show that snow run-off/sliding from the roof would be above an entrance way.

**Recommendation:**

It was moved, seconded and resolved that the APC recommends to the Regional District that the Development Amendment BW-4222-07500.865 be;

**Supported with the above comments as provided.**

**B. Permpaul and Pamela Deol**  
**RE: Development Permit**  
RDKB File: BW-4222-07500.730

**Discussion/Observations:**

The landscaping plan indicates the use of Pine Shrub. This bush is not fire friendly.

**Recommendation:**

It was moved, seconded and resolved that the APC recommends to the Regional District that the referral BW-4222-07500.730 be:

**Supported with the above comment as provided.**

**C. Big White Ski Resort- Provincial Referral**  
**RE: Ski Resort Master Plan**  
**RDKB File: B-22**

**Discussion/Observations**

It was suggested that we provide our feedback in concise and organized manner that is inclusive of different streams, like time lines, environmental, winter season, summer season, social and economic.

The APC collectively agreed to try and provide balanced feedback.

As the report is very long and very involved it was suggested to adopt a process where the APC members would review individually and summarize their comments for further review and discussion at a meeting the following week.

**Comments about process:**

The buildout does not require the expansion of the CRA until completion of Phase 2. The resort can operate and expand within its current CRA without need to expand. Considering all the variables that might influence rollout including market demand and Big White priorities. We would suggest **not supporting this application**. We think the proposed expansion to the CRA can occur in the future after Big White demonstrates marketability for the expansion within the current CRA. The community and the corporation need to address the outstanding current issues of the CRA use.

Phased development should be rolled out incrementally, with each phase having its own application for expansion.

There are questions about the process of the application including if the APC would be able to provide comments at other times. The question was raised because there seems to be several reports that would inform the APC that are not yet included in the application.

There are 3 different documents that have been circulated describing the expansion. One on social media, another by email and the 3<sup>rd</sup> the Provincial referral plan. There are different items on each of the first 2 documents that don't appear on the Provincial plan.

It was suggested that the RDKB consider a process for future application to provide a plain language brief (or in the staff report) along with the application so that it is accessible to community members who are asked to comment on the application.

#### **Comments about the economic impact.**

The application proposes to have a destination resort that has an extraordinary number of single-family residences, not high-density hotels that are normally associated with destination travel.

Number of bed units and comfortable carrying capacity does not seem to be aligned, as a destination resort. Where will the overage of the comfortable carrying capacity stay? If the CCC is over the number of available bed units where will those riders stay? Are they expected to travel?

There is no description of where the riders will come from, what portion of the market will make up the increase in ridership at Big White.

#### **Comments about the environment.**

The utilization of winter sport runs for bike terrain has a high impact on the environment as the gradient for winter sport runs is not conducive to mountain bike gradient. This requires changing the terrain to the point where it promotes erosion, especially within the alpine environment.

They have not assessed the hazards in the terrain they have chosen to develop, as noted in 4.13. Seems like the assessment of possible riding terrain has not been completed.

The terrain capacity analysis should involve a closer on the ground analysis, not reliant on computer imaging.

Waste reduction initiatives do not mention waste control across the current or proposed CRA, rather waste reduction is only a concern in their buildings. Anyone who utilizes the area can attest to the garbage that is scattered across the current CRA.

Climate change considerations in the proposal are only for those effecting the winter sport activities, not how the Corporation will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Creating a resort, the size proposed has a huge carbon foot print as a result of snow removal, and transport of guests across the resort. There is not a plan to include environmentally friendly transport, or other considerations to reduce environmental impact.

Solid waste disposal in its current form is not sustainable. The current trend of vacation rentals increase waste substantially. Current planning uses a single-family model rather than a model that is inclusive of vacation rentals, where single family dwellings will hold multiple families. This increases the amount of waste produced in a area where it is assumed to only be single family residences. Solid waste disposal should be charged to businesses that utilize the services at the expense of the taxpayers. Buildings in the residential areas must be zoned and the zoning must be respected for its intended purpose. The last few years have turned residential neighborhoods into transient populations of vacationers. Once the neighbors were known, now they are different every day.

There are several portions of the application/proposal that include areas outside of the CRA, including using areas as a water reservoir and trails.

Wildlife corridors are not being respected, the Trapping Creek Valley and the proposed water reservoirs are in areas that are critical to several ungulate species, bears, amphibians and fish.

Extension of CRA impedes on established trail systems. There is no description of how Big White will work with other community groups who use these areas already and will try and limit access.

There is also no consideration for other people using the land for grazing cattle, harvesting, and spiritual purposes.

**Comments about the winter season impact.**

The proposed gladded terrain method of "feathering" along runs increases risk of injury to riders transitioning between runs,

Several walkways are not accessible in the winter and are dangerous (traffic, natural hazards) or closed in the summer. Need to be accountable to keep spaces accessible.

**Comments about social impact.**

The roll out is very dependent upon taxpayers, inclusive of more fire protection, more policing, more roadwork and more waste collection.

Transporting twice as many riders to the hill on the same road system is problematic and not sustainable and will increase congestion and accidents as a result.

The Civic Center land should come out of the CRA and not be in the control of Big White Corporation to determine roll out. One of Big White goals is to increase/provide space for community services. They provide no plan for this; only an indication that the land west of the school could be used for this purpose. The community of Big White needs a building that provides essential services; post office, medical facilities and just a place that community members can meet. The area west of the school (DL 4242) should be removed from this master plan and turn over to the RDKB as a park. This would allow the community to move forward with the development of a community center.

Big White should develop a social responsibility statement noting how they are accountable to the community and to the land.

The document indicated that there is plenty of parking. If nothing else this season has shown that there is not enough parking; especially on the weekends and holidays. Compounding the problem is that when a chair closes because of weather/maintenance the parking is also closed compounding the problem at other sites. Even with the ice rink made into parking there was still a huge shortage of parking. This was apparent to Big White as they offered up day only parking for \$1000.00 for the ski season.

The plan covers a huge area without connectivity by walkway for the different areas. In the winter ski ways work but all other seasons the plan needs usable walkways that connect each of the communities.

The majority of the housing appears to be single family residence. The foot print and land disturbance would be much less with more multifamily dwellings.

There appears to be no plan to house the many employees that a development of this size would require and no plan to provide housing for workers taking part in the buildout.

**Recommendations:**

It was moved, seconded and resolved that the APC recommend to the Regional District that the referral Ski Resort Master Plan RDKB File: B-22 is too premature to support and ask that the APC be given another opportunity to review as the plan is refined.

**Motion to adopt by John seconded Paul**

**ADOPTED**

**7. FOR DISCUSSION**

Nothing

**9. FOR INFORMATION**

Gerry Molyneaux submitted to Vicki a letter of resignation due to other commitments.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 1720 for the Feb 2, meeting and the Feb 9 meeting was adjourned at 1602.