

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

**ROBERTS CREEK AREA D -  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**May 13, 2019**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ROBERTS CREEK (AREA D) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE ROBERTS CREEK LIBRARY READING ROOM LOCATED AT 1044 ROBERTS CREEK ROAD, ROBERTS CREEK, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair Members	Mike Allegretti Dana Gregory Cam Landry David Kelln Chris Richmond Alan Comfort
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Electoral Area D Director Recording Secretary Applicant	Andreas Tize Vicki Dobbyn Jim Green
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Area D Alternate Director Members	Tim Howard Bill Page Marion Jolicoeur Heather Conn Gerald Rainville Nichola Kozakiewicz
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Members	Danise Lofstrom

---

**CALL TO ORDER** Vice Chair Mike Allegretti chaired the meeting in the absence of Chair Bill Page. The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

**AGENDA** The agenda was adopted as presented

**MINUTES**

Area D Minutes

Roberts Creek (Area D) APC minutes of April 15, 2019, were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of April 24, 2019
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC of April 23, 2019
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of April 24, 2019
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of April 24, 2019
- Planning and Community Development Committee Minutes of April 11, 2019

## REPORTS

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

#### Key points of discussion:

- MoTI involvement – they took a covenant for Porter Road previously. They will comment on application and will consider access off of Leek Road.
- SCR D wants a trail (4-metre-wide gravel path) put down Sullivan Road to meet a transit point.
- Concern that this may create a precedent about re-zoning Z Zone. There are parcels owned by Island Timberlands previously subdivided by Weyerhaeuser. Z Zone began when Forest Land Reserve (FLR) ended. There are bits of Z Zone land in close proximity to residential areas. There are Z Zones in Wilson Creek. Response from applicant about precedent concerns was that if someone else wants to do this they would have to go through the same process.
- Applicant met with SCR D planning department as they worked on the application.
- APC member distributed pages 28 and 29 of the OCP to keep in mind what the OCP was looking for in regard to increasing density. Most options are about dividing land up rather than other models such as stratas and condensed housing. Sections 6.4.5 a to j on page 29 were referred to.
- In regard to this subdivision, the area proposed to re-zone would come under riparian regulations.
- In regard to affordable housing, the SCR D could develop the land or sell and use the money for affordable housing.
- The land above the power line is rugged and suitable for woodlot and recreation.
- The SCR D report was very thorough. It is hard to take a position as there are advantages and disadvantages.
- The challenge of condensed housing is creating a community water system. This is currently not possible as the current situation is that each property needs its own well. Minimum size for well and septic field is 2.5 acres. You can build more wells on the same property.
- SCR D is not in the business of designing co-housing or condensed housing or stratas. These initiatives have to come from people.
- The upper portion is not on the radar for development. Having the land is a benefit for future, and subdivision proposal seems like best use.
- This application makes sense so positive on the proposal. SCR D will have land that can be open for proposals.
- After review of the OCP, it is hard to see where this proposal fits. It doesn't align with the OCP and climate change concerns. Development should be in core, not in ALR and Z Zone, so people are going shorter distances.
- If you are trying to increase housing it should be done by infill, although infill currently doesn't have enough incentive. The economics don't work.

- Amenity bonusing is really meant for downtown core.
- These lots are surrounded by lots that are five acres or greater. If you look at the plan for Roberts Creek, lot sizes get bigger above highway. What is to stop Island Timberlands from subdividing, or people with five or ten acres wanting to subdivide.
- Doesn't seem to fit in this location. Section 17.15 from OCP deals with rural lands north of highway – what happens if we do chop up Z Zones.
- Re amenity bonusing – there could be a four-lane highway going down the middle which would detract from the value of the land.
- If every property is on a well what will happen to water supply below when there are 12 additional wells.
- Applicant commented that there is significant water supply.
- APC members are interested in comments of the neighbours
- Applicant commented that amenity bonusing (donation of 70 acres) only applies for 2.5-acre subdivision and wouldn't be offered if lot size doubled.
- Current mechanism for density doesn't work. It is too cumbersome for developers.
- We heard about the Dynamic Rural Zone proposal at the last meeting and think that it would be good for SCR D to move long with the approval of this sort of zone, then consider whether it could be applied to DL1312.
- Dislike the large number of lots proposed for DL1312. They maybe should be about two times the size proposed. We need to talk about the purpose of the lots and benefit to the community. Lot price and the gift of land cannot be the only plusses! If SCR D has no use for the land (asset vs liability?) then it's not much of a gift.

The Roberts Creek OCPC provided the following comments to the APC in a letter dated April 18, 2019 that was received at the meeting:

- For the reasons set out below and cited from the RC OCP, the RC OCPC does not support either the Rezoning or the Subdivision of DL1312:
  - Section 5 of the OCP refers to the SCR D's document "Our Coast, Our Climate" which puts forth the goals of protecting the forest environment and reducing greenhouse gases.
  - Section 5 of the OCP states Roberts Creek can contribute to the success of these goals by
    1. Focusing on residential development near the Village Core
    2. Reducing and avoiding settlement into ALR, rural and resource landscapes.
  - One of the main goals of the OCP (Sec. 3.7) is "To avoid land use that results in suburban sprawl." The OCPC notes that this property lies outside of the area designated for densification in the OCP (Blackburn Rd to Marlene Rd, Highway to Beach/Lower Rd). Densification through infill of the area in Map 1A of the OCP should be achieved before small lots of 1 ha are created in Resource designated land.
  - Section 17.13 states, "Minimum parcel size requirement for subdivision purposes for rural shall be 1.75 hectares to provide a buffer of larger parcels to adjacent resource lands.
  - Section 17.15 goes on to state rural parcels of 1.75-hectare minimum lots will have one dwelling and 20% left covenanted as forested.
  - Section 19, objective A is "to keep as much forest as possible in the watershed area and uplands of the OCP area and beyond..."
  - After a thorough discussion of this proposal, the RC OCPC does not support the rezoning of the Remainder of DL1312 or the amendment of the RC OCP for this

---

purpose. We feel that the intent of the OCP is clearly to avoid urban sprawl and concentrate residential land use close to the Village Core.

- APC Members concluded by consensus not to provide a recommendation.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Director Tize informed the Area D APC members that Bill Page is resigning from the position of chair, but will continue to be a member of the APC. At the next meeting, Director Tize will chair the meeting and conduct the election of a new chair. Members interested in the chair position are requested to email Director Tize prior to the June 17, 2019 meeting.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

The Director's Report was received.

**NEXT MEETING**      June 17, 2019

**ADJOURNMENT**      8:50 p.m.