ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
April 10, 2024 Regular Council Meeting Re: Item 5a) District of Lantzville Zoning Bylaw 180, 2020 Amendment Bylaw #362, 2024

District of Lantzville

Regular council meeting April 10th

Public Hearing

Re:- 5a District of Lantzville Zoning Bylaw 180, 2020 Amendment Bylaw #362, 2024

FOG zone

Referring to Page 49 map, I am concerned that those sites shown are not easily located in the field and might be very expensive to survey. If no one actually can find the actual locations, what is the point other than to suggest that there is something special there? Anyone who was to take the time to go to the area would soon realize there isn't an old forest. One can claim wildlife viewing almost anywhere in the foothills.

There are some old roads in the foothills that are still being used by bikers and hikers. Unfortunately, there are also trucks and motorcycles, etc. that are tearing up the roads and trails. How are those vehicles going to be kept out? I would hate to see hikers being banned from the little sites shown on the map. Fire protection is needed so the roads need to be maintained in some way. What is that cost going to be? I suggest this land could be of significant value as a Regional Park. Time is right to get funding through the Regional District, which has a planning department to take on such a significant area. I have been through the area several times and I know it was logged and that any trees of value were removed. The former owners of the foothills spent considerable funds to replant almost the entire foothills site and some areas have self seeded, a 15 year old forest at best.

The OCP was dealing with old mapping, which one can understand, when there was nothing else available at the time. If someone truly wants to consider an older forest why not choose a location where some larger trees actually exist. The steep slope area on the south side of Lone Tree or Bald Mountain (seems to be called two different names) was not completely cleared of trees because they couldn't get to the site to harvest the mature trees. That area is within walking distance and has some chance for wildlife viewing.

I dislike the thought that people have been mislead by the term "old growth". What is the point of calling park land by another name? The Times Colonist paper had an article, Lantzville Mulls Future Old Growth dated March 18, 2024 that quoted a

councillor and it could leave people thinking that the proposed site was actually an old growth forest, which it is not. Is the land being rezoned any more environmentally sensitive than any other location in the foothills parkland? That site may be a poor area to consider a special designation compared to many other areas within the huge park land in the foothills. Perhaps a forester or arborist should actually look at the site.

The trees shown on Chek TV news item Future Old Growth televised March 19, 2024 were nowhere near the proposed site of rezoning. The trees shown were obviously older than the 15 year old trees in the foothills. Again, it was misleading for residents and anyone who watched the report. Perhaps there are better locations, than what is being proposed, which are more accessible to residents. However, I doubt council is really interested in considering any other location that would likely be a better choice. In my opinion this is one person's pet project that really has nothing to do with old growth forest. It seems council members have already decided the outcome of the public hearing given the comments that have been made. That makes me wonder what is the point of spending time and money on a public hearing. Perhaps the money would have been better spent on filling a few potholes.

I have been on the existing foothills roads a few times. I have to wonder if any members of council have actually been to the site shown and will also question the real reason to propose that this site is a unique area.

Brian Dempsey
[redacted]
Lantzville B.C.
[redacted]