

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

ROBERTS CREEK (AREA D) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

September 16, 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.

PRESENT:	Chair	Mike Allegretti
	Members	Cam Landry Marion Jolicoeur Danise Lofstrom Dana Gregory David Kelln Alan Comfort Chris Richmond
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area D Director	Andreas Tize (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Vicki Dobbyn
REGRETS:	Vice Chair	Gerald Rainville
	Members	Heather Conn Bill Page Nichola Kozakiewicz

CALL TO ORDER 7:00 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented with the addition of the draft 2019-2023 Strategic Plan.

MINUTES

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

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of July 31, 2019
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of July 23, 2019
- Planning and Community Development Committee Minutes of July 11, 2019

REPORTS

Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.187, 2019 (Morrissey – 2284 Pixton Rd)

Key points of discussion:

- The Chair gave a brief history of the current zoning. The lots were originally owned by MacMillan Bloedel as privately managed forest lands. The property was subdivided many years ago but the roads were not done correctly. In 2009 there was a plan to create roads but the plan fell apart. Then the idea came up from owners to subdivide and sell and use that money to create roads. CR2 zone was created that allowed 10 acres to be divided into two five-acre lots, with the proviso that you could only put one dwelling on each five-acre lot. On the property in this report, the owner had subdivided and a road was put in. This lot was easier to put in a road as it was lower down the hill.
- There was a public information meeting last week about this zoning amendment with most of the neighbours opposed to the zoning amendment.
- CR2 zone was created in 2009, and is not related to CR1 zoning. Some CR1 zoned lots along the highway are two and a half acres.
- An email sent by APC member, who was unable to attend, was read by the Chair: "It seems that an exception has already been made on these properties to allow subdivision into smaller area units, and Bylaw 310 states very clearly in several places that CR2 zoned properties are limited to one SFD and zero auxiliary dwellings. While OCP seems to encourage auxiliary units for affordable housing in CR zone, this is only possible on CR1 zoned properties, according to Bylaw 310. One question would be, did CR2 zone exist before subdivision of the Private Managed Forest Land, or was CR2 zone created for these smaller properties? Therefore the statement that the "proposal for a second dwelling on the subject property can be considered consistent with the general intent of the OCP" is misleading, as it clearly does not apply to the CR2 zone where this property is located. It would be applicable if the subject property was REZONED as CR1 zone. A question would be, do these subdivided Private Managed Forest Land have to be in CR2 zone or can they be rezoned? To allow a second dwelling on CR2 zoned property, just because the applicant asks for it, would create a precedent for all other CR2 zoned properties. It would be impossible to say no to further applications as there is no compelling or unusual circumstance for such a change offered here. Even if there was some unusual circumstance (like housing for an aged family member), the change applies to the land, not what the current or a new owner uses the second dwelling for. Is increased density in CR2 zone what is needed or wanted in Roberts Creek?"
- Is increased density inevitable?
- What we have in this area is the least sustainable model, with very few dwellings and lots of roads. There is a circular argument that we want density but there are not enough services, then we can't install services because there isn't enough density. Part of the problem is that it is difficult to create any new affordable housing. It was noted that this property does have good access to highway.
- There is an argument against the amendment that people bought property with an understanding that the current density would not change, but also an argument that things will inevitably change.
- One of the neighbours submitted to the public meeting, and to the Chair in an email, calculations that demonstrated it would be inaccurate to say the proposed rancher will create affordable housing given the cost of building and financing.
- The fact is that it is setting a precedent. It is rezoning in disguise.

- This proposed amendment has no solid ground or compelling reason for this one property. It should be one size fits all. Rather than one property at a time, it should be an OCP discussion.
- There were comments about the covenant on these properties for forest cover and it was noted that this property has not maintained forest cover.

Recommendation No. 1 *Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 310.187, 2019 (Morrissey – 2284 Pixton Rd)*

The Roberts Creek Advisory Planning Committee does not recommend supporting the zoning amendment bylaw.

NEW BUSINESS

Members received by email on September 16, 2019 the following:

“On behalf of the SCRD Interim CAO,

The following Resolution was adopted at the September 12, 2019 regular Board meeting:

Strategic Plan **It was moved and seconded**
220/19 (part)

THAT the draft 2019-2023 Strategic Plan be forwarded to municipal partners, Advisory Planning Commissions, the Agricultural Advisory Committee and the Natural Resource Advisory Committee for comments;

AND THAT staff be authorized to use the draft 2019-2023 Strategic Plan as presented to provide direction for the purpose of developing preliminary budget proposals;

AND FURTHER THAT the draft 2019-2023 Strategic Plan be forwarded to the October 10, 2019 Board meeting with comments received by partners and advisory committees.

Please find attached the draft 2019-2023 Strategic Plan for comment by October 1, 2019.”

Key points of discussion:

- Who has jurisdiction on some aspects of transportation? Ministry of Transportation has responsibility to implement active transportation such as bike paths, but is trying to shift responsibility to municipalities. Gas tax funds are federal and are for tangible capital projects, such as Grantham’s Hall. We have one million dollars for Area D but there isn’t an agreement in place on how to use funds. The whole Board of the SCRD decides how funds will be used.
- Regarding the strategic focus area of Engagement and Communications, it was suggested that it would be useful to have a dialogue about what is allowed and what is not allowed under the various zoning and bylaws. It is now very complex to find and understand this information. There are lots of illegal things done on properties but nothing is done until there is a complaint so the process is complaint driven. It would be helpful to have proactive communication about the bylaws. It is important to know your zone at time of purchase.
- One tactic is to ensure realtors give purchasers accurate details on zoning. The Director is suggesting that on the SCRD maps online that the zoning is identified for each property and that there be a link to the zoning regulations.
- It was good to see the housing issue included in the plan. The question was raised - do we want

subsidized housing in Roberts Creek? Do we want income diversity in Roberts Creek?

- Larger supportive and subsidized housing projects are better suited to Gibsons and Sechelt which are closer to services.
- Bike lanes continue to be an area that needs attention as many areas of the highway are unsafe for cycling.
- Shared resources between the Sunshine Coast governments, such as a shared building inspection department would be good idea to increase efficiency and consistency.
- The following input was received by email:
“I would like to see a greater sense of urgency reflected in a plan for the next five years. Scientists say we are running out of time in regards to climate change, and for many people on the Coast the unaffordability of housing is reaching crisis proportions. Conditions require some really bold initiatives.
- The following input was received by email from a member unable to attend the meeting:
“The goals and focus areas cited in the SCRD strategic plan are laudable but do not adequately address the urgency needed to address climate change within our region. Under Infrastructure Management, there is much mention of “plans” and “policies” but little of implementation. Yes, we need clear plans and policies, but this is only a first step. We needed the implementation done yesterday. If this strategic plan is to serve for five years, we need more than plans and policies over that time frame, considering the fire and drought issues we have already suffered.

Having a viable, adequate water source for our region should be our number one survival strategy. In my view, it supersedes everything else. Hence, the language should be made stronger in 2.1 to say “development of water supply sources,” not just “investigate.” The choice between “investigate” or “develop” and water “plans” or “sources” is too limited and short sighted. We can’t afford either-or. We need development of water supply sources now full stop.

The plan mentions risk assessment in various places. I would like to see a risk assessment that ties ongoing development to drought factors, water availability and population rates over the next five, and 10 years, respectively. In my view, the SCRD continues to approve new housing developments without fully addressing how this will impact our existing water shortages and apply increased stress to existing infrastructure. Yes, the SCRD needs a tax base but new development shouldn’t continue in a vacuum without these other factors identified and shared with the public.

As one small point, I recommend that as part of its strategic plan, the SCRD order affordable rain barrels or catchment systems in bulk and make them available at a discount to residents, like what was done with low-flush toilets here and with compost bins on the Lower Mainland.

Under Climate Change and Resilience, I would like to see a policy that prevents and controls wholesale clearcutting of private property, along the lines of what the City of Vancouver has. There is no mention of this here. Wiping out trees or forest affects emissions, yet this factor is not addressed.

Beyond the environmental impacts, making our region sustainable should factor in the social elements such as having more affordable and safe housing. Although this is primarily a provincial responsibility, it goes hand in hand with approving new developments. Does the SCRD have in place a regulation that requires a certain percentage of housing in new developments be rental units? I’m not sure what the SCRD’s mandate is in this area, but it should be factoring this in.

DIRECTORS REPORT

The Director's Report was received

NEXT MEETING Monday, October 21, 2019

ADJOURNMENT 8:40 p.m.