

# SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

## AREA E – ELPHINSTONE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 24, 2019

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA E ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT FRANK WEST HALL, 1224 CHASTER ROAD, ELPHINSTONE, BC

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair	Mary Degan
	Members	Rod Moorcroft Dougald Macdonald Nara Brenchley Ann Cochran Rick Horsley Ken Carson Mike Doyle
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Electoral Area E Director Recording Secretary Public	Donna McMahon (part) Diane Corbett 3
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Members	Bob Morris Lynda Chamberlin Sandra Cunningham

---

**CALL TO ORDER** 7:00 p.m.

**AGENDA** The agenda was adopted as amended, with a change in the order of items.

### DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

### MINUTES

#### Elphinstone (Area E) Minutes

The Elphinstone (Area E) APC minutes of March 27, 2019 were approved as circulated.

It was noted that Mike Doyle should be listed under "Regrets", not "Absent".

#### Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 18, 2019

- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 26, 2019
- Planning and Community Development Committee Minutes of March 14, 2019

## REPORTS

### Subdivision Application SD000058 (Caerus Construction Limited for Birch)

The APC discussed the staff report regarding Subdivision Application SD000058 (Caerus Construction Limited for Birch) to subdivide a parcel within subdivision district C into two lots. The owner responded to APC comments and questions.

The following points were noted:

- An error was noted on page 19 on the Subdivision Review Checklist, regarding availability of Regional District water supply (“no” was indicated): the owner reported that Regional District water is available.
- Would like a statement from staff about what the SCR D is asking of the applicant, with further clarification regarding water issues and stormwater management.
- Looks pretty straightforward and complies with the OCP; it all seems to be conforming.

### Recommendation No. 1      *Subdivision Application SD000058 (Caerus Construction Limited for Birch)*

The APC recommended that Subdivision Application SD000058 (Caerus Construction Limited for Birch) be supported for the following reasons:

- it appears to fit within the OCP;
- it fits the neighbourhood;
- it seems to be conforming; and
- the APC has no issues with it.

### Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.11 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.182 for Subdivision Remainder District Lot 1312 – Electoral Area D

The APC received the report entitled “Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.11 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.182 for Subdivision Remainder District Lot 1312 – Electoral Area D” for information.

The applicant reviewed the application in an interactive discussion with APC members regarding an air photo of the property, showing adjacent properties, related infrastructure, current zoning and OCP designations. The property is in the fire district. The applicant noted he would probably run some walking tours, and that the public information meeting would be re-scheduled from the previously announced date.

Points and comments in ensuing discussion included:

- Presentation of maps in the staff report could be more clearly laid out to enhance understanding.
- Difficulty with the ALR land classification; would be better off making it a gravel pit.
- Like the idea of having the walking trails to connect with the bus, but how many people are actually going to do that? For affordable housing, you would probably want the bus closer.
- This is in keeping with what is already here and what has already happened. Was a previous property owner in the area; there is no more development that will go up from

there – you would have to cross a lot of creeks, and need bridges; it gets more difficult the further up you get. The proposed development seems to be aligned with existing development in the area and will probably be the last in the area.

- Concern: it is not within the garbage collection area. Would people burn their garbage?
- It is hard to have an opinion without hearing other peoples' view on it. Would like to see what happens after the public information meeting (PIM), to see what the community thinks about it. Can we revisit this after the PIM? Do not have enough information, based on this one meeting. Will attend public meeting and report back.
- Regarding the 70-acres community amenity contribution and using it for affordable housing, not sure that would be a rule the SCRD would follow, putting high density modular housing in a treed area.
- There are tons of options; they are lucky there is someone to do this.
- Concern if there is already resistance to lots above the highway.
- It is beside District Lot 1313; the possibility of use for recreation is huge, the opportunity is huge to maintain this huge swath.
- Can't see how this is going to be detrimental.
- It isn't precedent setting; it is filling in. It is closer to town.
- Wouldn't mind if the density were tripled, and suggested putting smaller lots up there.
- They are in the fire district; this is better than the developments that have already happened.
- Creating that recreation corridor between Area E and D is a way to protect the trail systems, which have multiple users. Accepting the 70 acres would increase usability.
- There is an area where there is a variety of tree species planted 40 or 50 years ago by a previous owner; it would be interesting to learn what is up there.
- Based on responses, it looks like a pretty good project.
- Think it is a win-win for the Regional District and the developer.
- Agree, it is a good opportunity.
- If they are going to have a 15 m high buffer on the north side of the road, who is going to keep it to that? I would scrap that; it would detract from the value of the property.
- Can't think of a better use for the land than subdividing it.

Introduction of Proposed Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.3 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.174 for Remainder District Lot 2392 – Electoral Area B

The APC discussed the staff report regarding Proposed Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.3 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.174 for Remainder District Lot 2392 – Electoral Area B.

The project manager for Secret Cove Heights Development, Inc. was present in order to answer questions about the application to amend the Halfmoon Bay OCP and Bylaw 310 and to collect suggestions about the Dynamic Rural Zone, which is being developed. She outlined main points from a handout that was distributed. Points included the increased access to property, with smaller lots of 2.5 acres; opportunity to have parents on the property aging in place, or an employee living on the property; increased density would be an opportunity to create a neighbourhood feel, with home-based business people having a chance to hang out their shingle.

Points from discussion included:

- Lack of familiarity with the neighbourhood and Halfmoon Bay makes it difficult to make a recommendation on the proposal.
- Discussion about development above the highway.
- Like the idea of Dynamic Rural zone, looking into it, and exploring the idea, seeing

- how it works.
- Concern about it being so far away from the “neighbourhood”.
  - Up to four workplace staff would mean more traffic going up the roads; could affect rural character.
  - The OCP tends to limit development to hub areas; there needs to be a more dynamic and fluid approach to considering development, in light of limits of the land here and the need to be respectful about how we choose to use it.
  - The price of land will force businesses to work on smaller parcels.
  - Like idea of restricting the dwelling footprint size.
  - It would be providing more options on the coast.
  - This is a creative land use because of the different modes proposed to use the land for.
  - People are doing it anyway; why not legitimize it?
  - We need to be more welcoming and open here.
  - Has support from all the adjacent neighbours.
  - Need to experiment. If we don’t try it, we don’t give an opportunity to see if a different system is going to work.

It was noted the term “rural” is not clearly defined in the Halfmoon Bay OCP. Comments ensued.

The project manager invited APC members to email feedback or suggestions about the proposed Dynamic Rural zone, and left the meeting at 8:49 pm.

While some APC members were not clear on a preferred option in going forward, most members favoured option 2, to proceed with the application as proposed, whereby staff would “continue to work with the applicant to refine the proposed application with no decrease in density”.

The project manager clarified that the proposal would yield between 11 and 12 new parcels, not 12 and 16 as noted in the staff report. Some members had no problem with increased densification; another was dubious about the proposed number of lots, suggesting 9 might be more reasonable.

Several APC members stated they like the idea and supported looking into it.

**Recommendation No. 2**     *Proposed Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.3 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.174 for Remainder District Lot 2392 – Electoral Area B*

The APC recommended, regarding Proposed Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.3 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.174, support for option 2, to proceed with the Application as proposed, for the following reasons:

- The APC supports looking into and exploring the idea and how it would work; there is a need to experiment and be open to new ways of development that support the community.
- Support of adjacent neighbours.

**NEXT MEETING**     May 22, 2019

**ADJOURNMENT**     9:10 p.m.