

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA B - HALFMOON BAY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 23, 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA B ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
HELD IN THE COOPERS GREEN COMMUNITY HALL AT COOPERS GREEN PARK, 5500
FISHERMAN ROAD, HALFMOON BAY, BC

PRESENT:	Chair	Frank Belfry
	Members	Elise Rudland Guy Tremblay Bruce Thorpe Barbara Bolding Alda Grames Jim Noon Eleanor Lenz Catherine Ondzik
ALSO PRESENT:	Area B Director Recording Secretary Public	Lori Pratt Katrina Walters 3
REGRETS:		Marina Stjepovic Nicole Huska

CALL TO ORDER 7:03 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented with requested addition under New Business: Wood Bay Heights. Additional request for information on Tiny Homes and Toma Subdivision to be discussed during the Director's Report.

ELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Nomination of current chair Frank Belfry; election by acclamation. Nomination of current Co Vice-Chairs Elise Rudland and Eleanor Lenz; election by acclamation.

MINUTES

Area B Minutes

The Area B APC minutes of June 26, September 25, and November 27, 2018 were adopted as presented.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont / Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes, September 26, November 28, 2018; January 30, & February, 27 2019
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes, September 17, October 15, & November 19, 2018; January 21, February 18, & March 18, 2019
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes, September 26, & November 28, 2018; January 23, February 27, & March 27, 2019
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes, September 25, 2018; February 26, & March 26, 2019
- Planning and Community Development Committee Minutes, September 6, October 11, November 15, December 13, 2018; January 10, February 7, & March 14, 2019

REPORTS

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

Note: The applicant, an APC member, declined to attend due to conflict of interest.

The APC discussed the staff report regarding the Proposed Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.3 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.174 for Remainder District Lot 2392. The following concerns/points/issues were noted as two distinct issues:

1. Density
2. Dynamic Rural Zone

1. Density:

- This area was originally part of the private forest land and it is problematic not having a larger scale plan which controls development and density with regards to private forest lands. Traditionally, the minimum lot size on Private Forest Lands was 100 hectares and Halfmoon Bay has historically been supportive of the SCRD's position (of the 100 hectare minimum).
- The density that was established in the Official Community Plan (OCP) was developed with great community consultation and this proposal is inconsistent with the OCP.
- There are other suitable locations for higher density growth (the 300 acre parcel at the South end of Highway 101 & Redrooffs)
- Considering the suggestion of supporting families: there is no bus system or school bus servicing this area; if migrant workers were employed, they would have to be housed.
- How is the 'dynamic rural zone' defined? Is this proposal a test case or is it to be applied as a new zone throughout the Sunshine Coast?
- More clarity is needed about the dynamic zone concept; it appears to be a conflict of interest when the developer is formulating a new zone that will be applied specifically to their development proposal.

- Considering the 10 acre parcel size: until there is a broader scale plan for connecting our parks with our waterways in the land North of the highway, we should consider this land, the waterways, etc. to be a public amenity that is managed as a commodity for the greater public interest.
- With a 10 acre parcel size, see strata as an affordable option for housing. Bigger lots become more affordable with the sharing of hydro, septic, etc.
- First Nations' contributions are extremely important particularly in regards to input on creeks, roads, etc. The proposal is lacking information on roads and on access to lands beyond or in consideration of a possible future Highway 101 bypass.
- Being a part of the OCP process for 4 years, we listened to the people of Halfmoon Bay and in favour of keeping Halfmoon Bay "rural by nature".
- Should consider the problem with urban interface and fire: trying to control fire; the larger lots created by forestry reduce the hazard of spreading fire.
- When this application came to the APC two years ago we had 11 comments; 7 of these comments reflected concerns over spot density. There is not enough of a change in the current proposal to negate these prior concerns.

Recommendation No. 1 *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*

Regarding the 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, the APC supports Option 3 in the staff report to 'refuse the OCP amendment and rezoning as proposed'.

2. The Dynamic Rural Zone:

- Like the idea of a dynamic zone; see it as a scaled up version of home business, just don't think that this is the right location for it.
- There is a concern regarding having unrelated employees: five unrelated people and four workers means up to 9 people in a building and people/neighbours should be informed.
- There may be an issue of noise pollution with home-based businesses: for example people in rural areas might want to do woodworking, which may cause a noise problem. With the smaller proposed lot size, would have to limit the types of business; including keeping of poultry, livestock etc.
- Disturbances in the neighbourhood need to be taken very seriously.
- Like the idea of a dynamic rural zone; of picking the best from the agricultural and rural residential; but unsure whether something like this should come from an outside source (developer) or from the SCRD.
- Think we would like to see this idea located closer to the 'hub'.
- Need a more defined vision of what this zoning mixing would allow.
- Doesn't seem right that it would come this way (from the developer).
- Would like to see the SCRD define what this is and how it would be integrated in a zoning map: need more information and where it might happen.
- There is general support for this zoning concept but need a more rigorous study of lot size permitted, land use, building size, infrastructure, services that are available, and circulation of natural drainage.

- Arsenic is a problem: when you build, it is reported, but after that, there is no reporting. If 12 wells are built, these wells will affect the existing wells in surrounding areas, and possible arsenic content.
- The soils in Gibsons and Roberts Creek are better suited to this type of zoning.
- Suggest that the SCRD look into this further come up with a new zoning, and where it could go.
- Was this dynamic zone only proposed because of this particular subdivision? Are we only asking the SCRD to further define the dynamic zoning concept so that the developer can apply again?

Recommendation No. 2 *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*

Regarding the 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, the APC recommends that the SCRD provide more context for the proposed Dynamic Rural Zoning by defining, more specifically, what the rural dynamic zone is to be and where it may be applied throughout the Sunshine Coast.

NEW BUSINESS

Wood Bay Heights Subdivision

There is concern because the original developer dedicated a wetland on the adjacent property as parkland, which is managed by the SCRD as an ecological reserve. Two years ago the current owners cleared trees and removed the dam under the assumption that it was their property. Would like the developer to restore the wetland reserve.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's Report was received.

NEXT MEETING May 28, 2019

ADJOURNMENT 9:15 p.m.