SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Planning and Community Development Committee – September 6, 2018

AUTHOR: Yuli Siao, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: OCP Amendments – Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing – Public Hearing Report and Consideration for Third Reading and Adoption

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report titled OCP Amendments - Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing – Public Hearing Report and Consideration for Third Reading and Adoption be received;

2. AND THAT Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 641.8, 2017, Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 600.8, 2017 and West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 640.2, 2017 be forwarded to the Board for Third Reading and Adoption.

BACKGROUND

On June 28, 2018, the Planning and Community Development Committee adopted Recommendation 201/18 as follows:

Recommendation No. 6  Halfmoon Bay OCP Amendment Bylaw 675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek OCP Amendment Bylaw 641.8, 2017, Elphinstone OCP Amendment Bylaw 600.8, 2017 and West Howe Sound OCP Amendment Bylaw 640.2, 2017

THAT Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No.675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.8, 2017, Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 600.8, 2017 and West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 640.2, 2017 be forwarded to the Board for Second Reading;

AND THAT the bylaws as of the date of the report be considered consistent with the SCRD’s 2018-2022 Financial Plan and 2011 Solid Waste Management Plan;

AND THAT staff monitor and report the implementation and densification impacts of the bylaws with respect to the SCRD’s 2018-2022 Financial Plan and 2011 Solid Waste Management Plan and the future versions of these Plans;

AND THAT a Public Hearing to consider Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.8, 2017, Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 600.8, 2017 and West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 640.2, 2017 be scheduled for July 23, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the SCRD Board Room, located at 1975 Field Road, Sechelt, BC;
AND THAT Director Winn be delegated as the Chair and Director Lebbell be delegated as the Alternate Chair for the Public Hearing;

AND FURTHER THAT the revised Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing, if adopted by the Board, be incorporated into the Egmont/Pender Harbour Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 708, 2017 for consideration at Second Reading.

Following the Second Reading of the revised bylaws, they were referred to all Advisory Planning Commissions (APC), and a public hearing was held on July 23, 2018. This report analyzes comments received from the APCs and the public hearing, and recommends that the further revised Bylaws be forwarded to the Board for consideration of Third Reading and Adoption.

DISCUSSION

APC Comments (June 2018)

The revised bylaws considered at Second Reading were referred to all APCs in June, 2018. Previously the APCs also reviewed the draft bylaws considered at First Reading (October, 2017). Areas D, E and F APCs indicate support for the revised bylaws considered at Second Reading. Areas A and B APCs discussed the bylaws but did not provide recommendations on the bylaws.

- Egmont / Pender Harbour APC:
  
  The APC did not provide a recommendation on the bylaws. No further comments have been received to date.

- Halfmoon Bay APC:
  
  Regarding Revised OCP Amendments-Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing-Considerations for Second Reading, the APC requests a copy of the document that may be used for review and returned to the SCRD. No further comments except minor grammatical suggestions have been received to date.

- Roberts Creek APC:
  
  APC recommended that the Revised OCP Amendments be supported, and the SCRD develop a communication strategy and material regarding density bonusing so that applicants are aware of this option early in the process of consideration;
  
  And that the SCRD seek funding from the federal and provincial governments for affordable housing projects.

- Elphinstone APC:
  
  The APC recommended that Revised OCP Amendments – Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing be supported for the following reasons:
  
  o This reads well and seems to cover everyone’s concerns;
  
  o Area E OCP bylaw looks like it has dealt with everything the APC has talked about.
• West Howe Sound APC:

The APC recommended that the revised bylaws considered at second reading be supported as the policies strike a balance between competing interests and provide a practical strategy to support affordable housing development while maintaining a sustainable environment and the character of the rural areas.

Public Hearing Summary

Twelve members of the public attended the public hearing. The Public Hearing Report can be found in Attachment A. Four written submissions were received prior to the closing of the public hearing (Attachment B). A number of issues were raised. They are discussed below.

Densification and Affordability

In one of the submissions, densification is regarded as a way to fuel short term rental instead of support affordable housing.

Housing affordability is an issue which requires many solutions. Densification is a strategy adopted by many communities worldwide to reduce housing cost per unit by sharing space, infrastructure and amenities. It is a responsible and sustainable way to manage growth and optimize the use of resources and reduce environmental footprint.

Short term rental is a phenomenon of the shared economy enabled by better communication between supply and demand, especially through internet technology. It is adopted by home owners as a means to tap into the unused or underused real estate potential of their properties. It supports the livelihood and makes housing more affordable for some, while reduces the supply of long term and affordable rental for others. Short term rental is not known to be a result of increased density, as it can easily occur in densely or sparsely populated neighbourhoods. In a separate project, the SCRD will consider policies to address regulations for short term vacation rental.

Densification and Infrastructure

Another submission equates densification with growth, and raises concerns about impacts on the environment and existing infrastructure such as water supply, transportation, public transit, waste disposal, etc.

Densification is distinct from growth (i.e. growth in population, business, development, etc.). While growth represents the overall increase in population in a region, densification is the concentration of population in certain parts of the region. A densification strategy optimizes the distribution of growth. While growth inevitably imposes pressure on the environment, infrastructure and available space, the proposed policies for densification are a strategy to manage growth wisely and distribute growth to the right places so that existing infrastructure and resources can be more efficiently utilized, costly expansion to other areas can be avoided and impact on the environment can be reduced.
Consistency with Halfmoon Bay OCP and LGA

One submission opposes the proposed policies, specifically for the Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan (OCP), based on the belief that these policies are inconsistent with the OCP, and Sections 478 and 428 of the Local Government Act (LGA) regarding the effect of official community plan and the purpose of regional growth strategy respectively.

The submission believes that the essence of the Halfmoon Bay OCP is “low density”. However, there are diverse land uses in different areas of Halfmoon Bay in addition to low density residential uses, including mixed multi-family, commercial, institutional, tourist commercial, resource, recreation, and so forth. Although Halfmoon Bay is generally characterized by a low density residential settlement pattern, the OCP designates three Community Hubs where multiple land uses converge, including a mix of residential, commercial, tourism and recreation uses.

The current OCP sets density standards for various residential designations, focuses multi-family residential development in identified Community Hubs, and allows consideration of smaller parcels in residential designations. Developed upon the principles of these existing OCP policies, the proposed new policies provide stronger and clearer guidance for densification developments. They call for the continual application of existing standards for infill residential developments, direct higher density and multi-unit residential developments to Community Hubs, and set criteria for consideration of subdivisions of higher density in residential designations. These policies are consistent with the existing OCP and therefore consistent with Section 478 of the Local Government Act.

The proposed policies do not set specific density levels or call for a blanket density increase to alter the “low density” landscape of Halfmoon Bay, but rather provide criteria to evaluate densification developments based on location, technical feasibility and character of each area, and provide tools such as development permit area for form and character to ensure appropriate design and integration of higher-density developments, and density bonusing and housing agreement to support affordable housing. To clarify the intent of the policies, further revisions to the policies are recommended in the following section.

Densification in Halfmoon Bay

Several submissions oppose the proposed amendments to the Halfmoon Bay OCP based on concerns with inadequate infrastructure, service and amenity to support densification in Halfmoon Bay and the Community Hubs.

Similar to other areas of the Sunshine Coast, densification and infrastructure in Halfmoon Bay must go hand in hand. While the lack of infrastructure limits densification, improvement of infrastructure relies on densification. For example, without sufficient density to support ridership, new public transit facilities will not be viable; without sufficient density to generate revenue, new community sewage treatment plants will not be practical.

The proposed policies recognize such balance between densification and infrastructure. The availability of infrastructure such as sewage treatment, water supply, waste disposal, transportation and access to public transit and amenity is an important criterion in evaluating densification proposals in community hubs and other areas.
Need for Consistent Policies

There are submissions which question the need for consistent policies across the four OCPs.

While each community across the Sunshine Coast has a unique character, there are many similarities amongst them. They share the common challenge of affordable housing shortage.

The OCPs within SCRD rural communities share similar land use planning principles and have similar land use designations and policies. The four communities are under one single zoning bylaw. However, as these OCPs were developed over different times, terminology, structure and detail are different in each Plan. Although some policies related to density and affordable housing already exist in these Plans, there is a need to strengthen them. The purpose of a set of consistent policies is not to alter existing Plans, but to put the diffused policies of these Plans into clear focus through the lens of a densification approach. These policies provide common standards and tools that are applicable to similar situations across different areas. The application of common policies will not harm the individual character of each area, because each development proposal will be evaluated through consultation with each community and should reflect the needs of each community.

Additional Dwellings without Subdivision

A submission suggests that consideration should be given to allowing more dwellings on a larger lot (more than 1 acre) without subdivision to create separate parcels of land. For example, on a 1-acre lot, two dwellings are allowed by the zoning bylaw. In order to create four dwellings on this lot, it must be subdivided into two 0.5 acre lots, each containing two dwellings. The potential benefit of this scheme could be opportunities for shared utility, common elements (such as driveway) and open space and savings in not having to go through the subdivision process while achieving the same number of dwellings. This scheme will involve a different standard for lot size and density, and will require different criteria for lot layout, setback, as well as other technical requirements. It is best suited for a potential zoning regulation. Along with other suggestions on lot configuration received from previous consultations, this option should be further examined through the Zoning Bylaw 310 update process currently underway.

Further Revised Policies

Based on the above discussion, it is recommended the proposed polices be further revised to clarify the intent of the densification strategies in the preamble of the policies, and incorporate a minor grammatical enhancement. The further revised policies are as follows:

Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing

Densification is vital to increasing housing supply and providing diverse housing choices. Densification can create land use opportunities and favourable conditions for developing affordable housing through a number of strategies including residential infill, cluster and mixed-use development and density bonus in appropriate areas. The intent of these strategies is to provide a set of criteria for evaluating densification proposals and tools to support and secure contribution to affordable housing.
Objectives

a. Increase the supply of housing units through infill development on existing eligible parcels.

b. Direct cluster housing, multi-unit and mixed-use development to village hubs and similar settlement cluster areas.

c. Integrate housing development with the rural context.

d. Use density bonus in appropriate areas to encourage density increase and affordable housing contribution.

e. Use housing agreements to secure affordable housing.

Policies

a. Infill development of auxiliary dwellings, duplexes and second dwellings shall be encouraged on existing eligible parcels in accordance with zoning bylaw parcel size requirements. To fully utilize the infill potential of such parcels, the existing minimum parcel size requirements to qualify for multiple dwellings on a parcel, as defined in the zoning bylaw, shall be reflective of the residential or rural residential designation.

b. Subdivision creating lots smaller than 1000 m², cluster residential development such as townhouse and multi-unit building and mixed-use development that combines residential use with commercial, retail, service and office uses are encouraged to be located in village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas.

Developments exceeding density limits of the Official Plan and or the zoning bylaw are encouraged in these areas, subject to amendments to the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, traffic circulation and provision of or access to community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhoods; and

ii. With the exception of any other applicable density increase policies of this Plan, a contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

c. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of 3 lots or less, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas where water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment.

d. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of more than 3 lots, may be considered through
an amendment to the Official Community Plan and/or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas, subject to all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment; and

ii. A contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

e. Affordable or higher-density housing shall be developed in a way that integrates with the rural communities and strengthens community identity and character. This can be achieved by creating developments that are complementary to the scale, layout, architectural design, landscaping and view of neighbouring properties and the surrounding natural environment. Specific design criteria may be imposed by establishing a development permit area for form and character for a development site.

f. Housing agreements pursuant to the Local Government Act shall be used wherever applicable to secure the provision of affordable housing in appropriate areas and the long term affordability of housing.

A housing agreement shall determine the terms, conditions and forms of provision or contribution of designated affordable or special needs housing and shall use concurrent criteria of the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and data of Statistics Canada to define housing affordability.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

The following SCRD Strategic Plan objectives and success indicators relate to the subject of this report:

- Incorporate land use planning and policies to support local economic development.
- Collaborate with community groups and organizations to support their objectives and capacity.
- Land use policies and regulations are supporting affordable housing.

The subject of this report is aligned with the sustainable land use principles that were developed in 2016.

The subject of this report is also aligned with the following land use principles of the Regional Sustainability Plan: ‘We Envision’ for the Sunshine Coast:

We envision complete, compact, low environmental-impact communities based on energy-efficient transportation and settlement patterns.
CONCLUSION

The public hearing regarding the proposed bylaws revealed concerns from members of the community as well as suggestions for enhancing housing affordability. In response to these comments, this report clarifies the relationships between density and affordability, infrastructure and short term rental, the intent of the proposed policies and the need for a consistent approach. Further revisions to the bylaws have been recommended to address these comments.

Staff recommend that the revised bylaws be presented to the Board for Third Reading and Adoption.

Attachments

Attachment A – Public Hearing Report
Attachment B – Written Submissions
Attachment C – Revised Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 675.4 for Third Reading
Attachment D – Revised Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 641.8 for Third Reading
Attachment E – Revised Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 600.7 for Third Reading
Attachment F – Revised West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 640.2 for Third Reading

Reviewed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X – A. Allen</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>X – A. Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>X – I. Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>X – J. Loveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing for Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.8, 2017, Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 600.8, 2017, and West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 640.2, 2017 was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

I. Winn, Chair

The Chair introduced staff in attendance and read prepared remarks with respect to the procedures to be followed at the public hearing. The Chair then indicated that following the conclusion of the public hearing the SCRD Board may, without further notice or hearing, adopt or defeat the bylaws or alter and then adopt the bylaws providing the alteration does not alter the use or increase the density. The Chair asked Yuli Siao, Senior Planner, Planning & Development, to introduce Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.8, 2017,

PURPOSE OF BYLAW

Yuli Siao, Senior Planner

The main purpose of the proposed Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaws are to strengthen and improve existing densification strategies to support affordable housing.

The bylaw amendment process timeline was summarized as follows:

- Preliminary Research for the proposed OCP Amendments started in February 2017
- OCP Amendments initiated in September 2017
- OCP Amendments received First Reading in September 2017
- Three Public Information Meetings were held in November 2017
- Referrals to All Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commissions and Agencies took place in November 2017
- OCP Amendments received Second Reading on June 28, 2018
- **Second Referral to all** Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commissions took place in July 2018
- Public Hearing held on July 23, 2018
- Next Steps in the Process will be, Staff Public Hearing Report and recommendations to the SCRD Board. Consideration for Third Reading and Adoption will follow.

**What is an Official Community Plan (OCP)?**

The OCP is an official document of a local government on high level policies and broad vision to guide development and land use of the community.

**What is affordable housing referred to in the proposed policies?**

Affordable housing can include: rental or ownership housing, suite, second dwelling, etc. The goal is to help to make housing more affordable.

**Are these policies meant to provide affordable housing?**

The policies will support development of affordable housing and create opportunities and favourable conditions.

**What is the SCRD’s role in supporting affordable housing?**

The SCRD may develop land use planning policies to direct housing development to the right places, facilitate community engagement through development approval process, and improve infrastructure and service to support affordable housing.

The SCRD does not provide direct funding and programs or manage housing projects.

**What can land use planning policies do?**

The OCP Amendments focus on land use planning policies. Planning policies can direct housing development to the right place, optimize the use of land resources and infrastructure and provide strategies for densification.
Why increase density?
Increasing density is a common strategy in response to growth, but not the only solution. The benefits of increasing density are: more sustainable approach to development, smaller environmental footprint, more fully utilize existing infrastructure and resources, may help increase supply, sharing space, structure, utility and amenity, and reduce cost per residential unit for land, construction, infrastructure, servicing and maintenance.

Where should densification go?
Primary focus:
- Infill in existing eligible lots where an auxiliary or second dwelling is permitted.
- Village hubs or similar settlement clusters as defined in the OCPs, where amenities are more readily available to support higher density.

Secondary consideration:
- Other residential areas with moderate growth potential subject to conditions.

The New Policies
The policies are a balanced approach to address public consultation input and strengthen and improve existing policies. The context of each OCP is maintained.

The focus on densification as a land use tool to support affordable housing is as follows:
- Utilize infill potential in existing residential lots
- Encourage higher density in village hubs
- Accommodate modest growth in other residential areas
- Set location and technical criteria for density increase
- Density bonus incentive in exchange for affordable housing contribution
- Integration through Development Permit Area for form / character
- Housing agreement to secure affordable housing contribution, as part of the development approval process.

PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS PRIOR TO PUBLIC HEARING
The Senior Planner noted that three letters were received prior to public hearing. The submissions will form part of the public record and attached to the public hearing report as Appendix 1 – 3. The submissions were summarized as follows:

Brenda Sopel, Roberts Creek, B.C. (Appendix 1)
- Question the correlation between densification and affordability
- Concern about impact of density increase (growth) on water supply
- Concern about other impacts such as road, parking, landfill, environment, etc.

Stephen McLaren, 5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay (Appendix 2)
- Concern about impact on low density and property value
• Proposed policies inconsistent with Halfmoon Bay OCP
• Proposed policies inconsistent with Local Government Act regarding growth strategy

Joan Wagner, 5619 Mintie Road, Halfmoon Bay (Appendix 3)

• Concern with lack of infrastructure in Halfmoon Bay to support densification

The Senior Planner addressed questions from the public regarding density bonus and Development Permit Area for Form and Character.

Density Bonus: If the proposed density is more than what is permitted in the Zoning Bylaw or OCP, the developer could provide a contribution towards affordable housing in exchange for the higher density.

Development Permit Area for Form and Character ensures that the design is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood with respects to architectural design, landscaping, etc.

PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS AT PUBLIC HEARING

The Senior Planner concluded his presentation and the Chair called a first time for submissions.

Donna Shugar
1076 Crowe Road, Roberts Creek

A written submission was provided at public hearing to accompany the verbal submission at public hearing. (Appendix 4)

Asked a general question as to how the infill development will be encouraged as per the Policies Section (a) in each of the proposed Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaws.

The Senior Planner stated Policy (a) is not a new policy, it reinforces the infill development of auxiliary dwellings, duplexes and second dwellings where it is already permitted in the zoning bylaw. The proposed policy provides a more consistent approach to infill development throughout each OCP document. The Senior Planner summarized Policies b – f.

Suggestion to consider ways to create new housing without subdivision and creating new lots while keeping existing density requirements and community character. The subdivision process is an extra layer of complexity, cost and time. Suggestion to introduce language in the zoning bylaw and OCP that would permit the same density allowed by zoning to be achievable with or without subdivision.

If the same number of dwellings that would be permitted on 2 half acre lots could be built on the one acre lot without going through the subdivision process – it could provide opportunities for cluster housing, saved green space, shared infrastructure, out-building and gardens. This would enable adult children to build on family property and encourage young families to remain on the Coast.

The two dwelling maximum is arbitrary. There could be language that would permit properties that are larger than the permitted minimum lot size, but too small for subdivision to add an extra dwelling or 2 while retaining the character of the neighbourhood. For example, a 7.5 acre lot in the 5 acre zone being permitted 3 houses instead of just 2.

Further suggestion to consider how this could be done without the rezoning process.
Stephen McLaren
5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay

A written submission was provided prior to the public hearing to accompany the verbal submission at public hearing. (Appendix 2).

Asked a question regarding the Halfmoon Bay OCP. What percentage of properties in Halfmoon Bay that could have a second dwelling at the moment? Are changes to the OCP necessary or are there already enough properties that could potentially have a second dwelling.

The Senior Planner noted that staff estimate that 90% of the eligible parcels with the SCRD that could have a second dwelling have not built a second dwelling.

The Halfmoon Bay OCP emphasizes low density and this proposal would change the essence of the OCP to higher density.

Noted Local Government Act Section 478 (2) All bylaws enacted or works undertaken by a council, board or great board, or by the trustees of an improvement district, after the adoption of (a) an official community plan, must be consistent with the relevant plan.

Questions if there is other language in the Local Government Act that allows the SCRD to ignore Section 478 (2) and change the OCP from low density to high density?

Noted Division 2 - Application and Content of the Regional Growth Strategy 428 (2) without limiting subsection (1), to the extent that a regional growth strategy deals with these matters, it should work towards but not be limited to the following:

(a) avoiding urban sprawl and ensuring that development takes place where adequate facilities exist or can be provided in a timely, economic and efficient manner;

(b) settlement patterns that minimize the use of automobile and encourage walking, bicycling and the efficient use of public transit;

Commented that Halfmoon Bay does not have the public facilities to support densification or the means to encourage walking, bicycling or public transit. Believes that Halfmoon Bay is not an appropriate place to densify. Density should be limited to other areas where it is already developed: Gibsons, Sechelt, and Madeira Park.

Celyse McLaren
5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay

Concerned with proposed development at Rockwater Resort and the designation of this area as a “community hub”. Has concerns with high density developments in Halfmoon Bay. Feels there is a layer of protection in the OCP around the type of developments allowed and that the proposed policies would allow for larger developments in rural areas where there are no amenities or public facilities to support it. Supportive of infill development or increasing density near centres such as Gibsons, Sechelt, Davis Bay/Wilson Creek.

Linda Weight
5623 Mintie Road, Halfmoon Bay

Concerned with the designation of village hubs in Halfmoon Bay – Mintie Road area with general store and Wildwood area with general store and nursery. Noted that during the OCP review process there was consensus that future development in Halfmoon Bay be kept compact and that each proposal be evaluated with careful consideration. Does not support the Halfmoon Bay OCP being changed with a blanket policy for increasing density in all rural areas. There is a
need for local amenities first before larger development. Supportive of secondary dwellings on smaller sized lots and considering each proposal on a case by case basis.

**Stephen McLaren**

**5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay**

Asked when the current Halfmoon Bay OCP came into effect.

It was noted that the Halfmoon Bay OCP was adopted 2 years ago (2014).

Concerned that after only two years of being in effect, the OCP will be going in a total different direction from low density to high density. Asked how long the current Halfmoon Bay OCP will be in effect for.

**Donna Shugar**

**1076 Crowe Road, Roberts Creek**

Asked for clarification regarding the clause “Subject to amendments to the Official Community Plans and/or zoning bylaws” which appears multiple times throughout the proposed bylaws. For example, if an applicant wanted to exceed the established density limits in the OCP, then the applicant would have to go through the public engagement process – public information meetings and public hearings. Is it correct that this is not a blanket permission, it is subject to certain conditions.

The Senior Planner noted that yes this is correct. Each development proposal would be looked at on a case by case basis and have to undergo the public engagement process.

**Celyse McLaren**

**5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay**

Asked what exactly the change to the OCP is if the proposed amendment goes ahead.

The Senior Planner stated that the change would include a new section in each OCP titled “Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing”. The policies are not entirely new. The purpose is to strengthen what is already there and improve consistency. The high level policies will provide direction and tools available to evaluate each development proposal. Each proposal will have to meet the development criteria and be subject to the public process.

**Charles Hardy**

**5635 Mintie Road, Halfmoon Bay**

Asked that if there is no change then why change the OCP. If all the provisions are still there and each proposal needs to go through public process, then why the change. Asked for clarification.

The Senior Planner clarified that while the policies are meant to strengthen and use more consistent language for all Electoral Area OCPs, they introduce tools and technical criteria which are not currently specified in some OCPs, such Development Permit Areas for Form and Character for higher density developments, Density Bonusing and Housing Agreement.

**Celyse McLaren,**

**5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay**

Concern with the SCRD removing low density policies from the OCP and allowing larger developments. Feels that there needs to be more specific rules outlined about what the changes to the OCP will be before the amendments are made.
Linda Weight  
5623 Mintie Road, Halfmoon Bay  
Does not support the change to the OCP, as the current OCP represents the desires of the community. Would prefer to have developments reviewed on a case by case basis.

Donna Shugar  
1076 Crowe Road, Roberts Creek  
Noted the challenges to addressing four OCP amendments in one public hearing.  
With respect to the deletion of Section 17.9(i) from Roberts Creek OCP, asked if the comprehensive set of lists of criteria to be met in order to consider an increase in density and a list of amenities that would have to be provided by the developer based on the size and scope of the development, still included in the OCP or have they been eliminated. Believes the set of criteria are very valuable to evaluate a project and hopes that they are still included.  
The Senior Planned noted that staff would look into this.

Stephen McLaren  
5389 Ole’s Cove Road, Halfmoon Bay  
Recognizes that densification on the Sunshine Coast is going to happen, however feels that density should be confined to the places that already have the facilities to support it (Sechelt and Gibsons). Does not feel that Halfmoon Bay is a proper fit for densification as there are not proper facilities to accommodate it.  
The Chair called a second time for submissions.

CLOSURE  
The Chair called a third and final time for submissions. There being no further submissions, the Chair announced the public hearing for proposed Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.4, 2017, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.8, 2017, Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 600.8, 2017, and West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 640.2, 2017 closed at 8:10 p.m.
Attachment B  Written Submissions

July 23, 2017

Attention:
Yuli Siao, Senior Planner
Email: yuli.siao@scrd.ca
Fax: 604-885-7909
Sunshine Coast Regional District
1975 Field Road, Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A1

Dear Mr. Siao:

RE: Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 675.4, 2017,
Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 641.8, 2017,
Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 600.8, 2017 and
West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 640.2, 2017

I am writing to express my opposition to the Amendment of the OCP’s pertaining to the
densification of our community. I do not believe you have addressed key issues related to
existing density on the Sunshine Coast.

In order to understand whether you have done sufficient investigation I would like to ask the
following:

How does “densification” actually contribute to “affordable housing”? What studies have
been done locally and actually show that densification truly assists in providing affordable
housing?

My experience shows that additional rental opportunities within the same property have merely
increased housing values, rental cost and more importantly fueled short term rentals/vacation
usage as opposed to providing “affordable housing”.

What is the SCRD and all levels of government doing collaboratively to address the most
important fundamental issue of water? I have not yet seen any short or long term sustainable
solution to this matter. You ask developers to landscape, spending thousands of dollars, your
OCP’s identify the need for gardens to be self-sufficient for food, chickens (natural disasters
and all) however water is limited/or restricted at critical times in the growing season. What
about farms – no wonder the ALR land is disappearing. How exactly does this make any sense
at all and then to boot we live in a rain forest the majority of time.
July 23, 2018

RE: Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 675.4, 2017,
Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 641.8, 2017,
Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 600.8, 2017 and
West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 640.2, 2017

I challenge you (as many others have already) to first demonstrate pro-active ways in how the
SCRD and all coast governments are now increasing water collection and delivery in a
sustainable way year round with no water restrictions. And most especially before you
consider any further amendments to zoning and densification.

Water meters don’t count because then your “affordability” argument doesn’t hold water
at all since people on fixed budgets can’t afford the premiums you most assuredly will
justify for “water service” or in the end the wealthy will subsidize – either way it’s a
lose/lose.

Finally, (though I could go on with other issues but instead I will list them at the end) – what
about road safety and infrastructure management. With the “densification” how will you
manage to move people from one end of the coast to the other – or even within the same smaller
communities? For people needing “affordability” if they can afford cars, how will the current
road system accommodate them (the current systems can’t accommodate the density we have).
If they cannot afford cars how about transit? Transit will need to expand – who will pay for
this? Why not figure that out first before you go adding too many things to the long list of
problems not yet solved?

Other items to be considered in the name of “densification and affordable housing”:

- Landfill issues
- Recycling (all items previously recycled and no longer being taken by China are now
g going directly into the landfill (this includes glass, soft plastic etc)
- Ferries
- Parking (at Langdale there is the majority of time no parking for locals who want to take
 transit in the city and pretty much anywhere else there is limited parking for shopping)
- Environment impact of more development
- Light pollution
- Noise pollution
- Delivery of goods and supplies (trucks to bring all the materials etc and extra traffic on
 the roads (see previous point)
- Emergency preparedness

...
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In my opinion, there is much more that needs to be done before you can consider amending the OCP’s in such a broad and sweeping manner. Why don’t we try something different on the Coast? Why don’t we stop densification BEFORE we get to unliveable, not after? It’s just like a boat – there are only so many people you can pack on board before it gets unsafe and unenjoyable and maybe eventually it sinks...sooner or later the rural atmosphere and breathing space we have here will be no more. There are all sorts of studies that show a direct correlation between density and the increases in stress and other problems. Let’s be a little more strategic about it and limit the mad dash to densification.

There are critical issues at stake here with long term impact on the coast – as stewards of this great community you have a serious responsibility and need to take a step back on this matter.

Most sincerely,
Brenda Sopel
Roberts Creek BC

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Xiao et al,

In regards to the proposed changes to the Halfmoon Bay OCP (HBOCP), I am concerned it could have an effect on my quality of life and property value. As you are aware the HBOCP emphasizes low density, I assume there is no need to quote the many examples. If the HBOCP was distilled down to its essence, it would say LOW DENSITY.

The emphasis on low density is the reason we bought in Halfmoon Bay. I am unfamiliar with the other OCPs in the SCRD so my comments may or may not apply to them.

I would like to point out parts of BC’s Local Government act;

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT**

[RSBC 2015] CHAPTER 1

*Deposited with Clerk of the Legislative Assembly on December 16, 2015*

478 (1) An official community plan does not commit or authorize a municipality, regional district or improvement district to proceed with any project that is specified in the plan.

(2) All bylaws enacted or works undertaken by a council, board or greater board, or by the trustees of an improvement district, after the adoption of

(a) an official community plan, or

(b) an official community plan under section 711 of the Municipal Act, R.S.B.C. 1979, c. 290, or an official settlement plan under section 809 of that Act, before the repeal of those sections became effective.
must be consistent with the relevant plan.

It seems the proposed changes to the HBOCP are absolutely inconsistent with the OCP.

Is there language somewhere else in the Local Government Act that allows the SCRD to ignore section 478 (2) ?

I noticed while reading the Act a reference to:

**Division 2 — Application and Content of Regional Growth Strategy**

**Purpose of regional growth strategy**

428 (1) The purpose of a regional growth strategy is to promote human settlement that is socially, economically and environmentally healthy and that makes efficient use of public facilities and services, land and other resources.

(2) Without limiting subsection (1), to the extent that a regional growth strategy deals with these matters, it should work towards but not be limited to the following:

(a) avoiding urban sprawl and ensuring that development takes place where adequate facilities exist or can be provided in a timely, economic and efficient manner;

(b) settlement patterns that minimize the use of automobiles and encourage walking, bicycling and the efficient use of public transit;

(c) the efficient movement of goods and people while making effective use of transportation and utility corridors;

(d) protecting environmentally sensitive areas;
(e) maintaining the integrity of a secure and productive resource base, including the agricultural land reserve;

(f) economic development that supports the unique character of communities;

(g) reducing and preventing air, land and water pollution;

(h) adequate, affordable and appropriate housing;

(i) adequate inventories of suitable land and resources for future settlement;

(j) protecting the quality and quantity of ground water and surface water;

(k) settlement patterns that minimize the risks associated with natural hazards;

(l) preserving, creating and linking urban and rural open space, including parks and recreation areas;

(m) planning for energy supply and promoting efficient use, conservation and alternative forms of energy;

(n) good stewardship of land, sites and structures with cultural heritage value.

Please note 428 (2) a, b, d, f, g, and j.

In regards to subsections a and b;

There are next to no facilities of consequence in Halfmoon Bay; no public library, no real community centre, no swimming pool, no full sized food store, no shopping of consequence, and no doctor's offices. The lack of these facilities would seem to indicate the directive, in subsection a above, would not be followed with an increase in density practically anywhere in Halfmoon Bay.
Now please note subsection b. The use of an automobile is necessary to access all of the above mentioned facilities from a good portion of the area, as there is no regular year around public transportation. Also there are next to no sidewalks or bike lanes in Halfmoon Bay. I do not believe Redroofs or Mercer are safe roads to bike on.

Subsections d, f, g, and j also do not lend themselves to densification.

I would assume the subsections are organized in order of priority. It seems the density changes to the HBOCP are absolutely inconsistent with the BC Local Government Act.

Again, is there language somewhere else in the Local Government Act that allows the SCRD to ignore section 428 (2)?

I understand the need for housing on the Sunshine Coast. I believe there is a broad public understanding of the need for a small urban footprint and the benefits of densification.

It seems to me densification should take place according to Division 2 — Application and Content of Regional Growth Strategy, which would mean NOT in Halfmoon Bay.

Best regards,

Stephen McLaren
Yuli Xiao

From: Joan
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 3:11 PM
To: Yuli Xiao
Subject: Halfmoon Bay OCP Amendment Bylaw 675.4

To the SCRD,

I am unable to make it to the Public Hearing this evening and wanted to make my opinion known to you. I have reviewed the supporting literature about the proposed changes to the Bylaw and want you to know I am adamantly opposed. While I find the spirit of the caveats to the plan (ie water, roads, ‘fitting in’ with the neighbourhood, etc) to all meet my core values I know there simply is not the infrastructure in the Halfmoon Bay area to fulfill them in reality. You can call it an official community hub if you like but it does not change the fact that what that actually is is currently a tiny community hall with scarce parking, a store & bakery with a porta potti 200ft away for a bathroom, and roads barely wide enough for cars to pass let alone a safe place to walk. Until such times as the District can bring a plan to brings us widened roads, safe sidewalks and community sewage treatment, at the least, - and without significant changes to the neighbourhood - I do not support any plan which increases the population regardless of what demographic it may serve.

Sincerely,

Joan Wagner.
5619 Mintie Rd.
Halfmoon Bay.

This email was scanned by Bitdefender
Donna Shugar  
1076 Crowe Rd  
Roberts Creek, BC  
V0N 2W3  

July 23, 2018  

SCRD Rural Area Directors,  

I have had a look at the staff report on the proposed changes to Zoning Bylaw 310 dated June 14, 2018. Thank you for examining the current regulations and OCPs to try to discover ways of making housing on the Sunshine Coast more affordable and encouraging the development of new housing stock.  

I have a further suggestion which I ask you to consider. There is a lot of language in the proposed amendments which equates increased building opportunity with subdivision. However, there are ways to create new housing without subdividing and creating new lots while keeping existing density requirements and community character. Not every property owner wishes to subdivide. Subdivision creates an extra layer of complexity, cost and time. What I am suggesting is the introduction of language in the zoning bylaw and OCPs that would permit the same density that would be allowed in the zoning to be achieved with or without subdivision. For example, a property owner may have a one acre lot in an area that would permit subdivision to 1/2 acre. If the same number of dwellings that would be permitted on 2 half acre lots could be built on the one acre, the property owner could achieve considerable savings. This could also provide opportunities for clustering and the saving of green space, shared infrastructure such as out buildings and shared gardens. It would also enable adult children to build on family property encouraging young families to remain on the Coast.  

Somehow we have decided that 2 is a magic number. A one acre parcel or a 5 acre parcel are treated the same. Two dwellings, maximum. This seems quite arbitrary. There could even be language that would permit properties that are larger than the permitted minimum lot size, but too small for subdivision, to add an extra dwelling or 2 while retaining the character of the surrounding neighbourhood. For example, a 7.5 acre lot in the 5 acre zone being permitted 3 houses instead of just 2.  

I have had some email correspondence with planning staff who seem to think this might be a viable idea, at least one that is worth considering. Thank you for giving it some thought.  

Sincerely,  

Donna Shugar, Roberts Creek
Attachment C	Revised Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 675.4 for Third Reading

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

BYLAW NO. 675.4

A bylaw to amend the Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 675, 2013

The Board of Directors of the Sunshine Coast Regional District, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

PART A – CITATION

1. This bylaw may be cited as Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 675.4, 2017.

PART B – AMENDMENT

2. Halfmoon Bay Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 675, 2013 is hereby amended as follows:
   i. Insert the following section immediately following Section 10:

11. Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing

Densification is vital to increasing housing supply and providing diverse housing choices. Densification can create land use opportunities and favourable conditions for developing affordable housing through a number of strategies including residential infill, cluster and mixed-use development and density bonus in appropriate areas. The intent of these strategies is to provide a set of criteria for evaluating densification proposals and tools to support and secure contribution to affordable housing.

11.1 Objectives

a. Increase the supply of housing units through infill development on existing eligible parcels.

b. Direct cluster housing, multi-unit and mixed-use development to the Community Hubs and similar settlement cluster areas.

c. Integrate housing development with the rural context.
d. Use density bonus in appropriate areas to encourage density increase and affordable housing contribution.

e. Use housing agreements to secure affordable housing.

11.2 Policies

a. Infill development of auxiliary dwellings, duplexes and second dwellings shall be encouraged on existing eligible parcels in accordance with zoning bylaw parcel size requirements. To fully utilize the infill potential of such parcels, the existing minimum parcel size requirements to qualify for multiple dwellings on a parcel, as defined in the zoning bylaw, shall be reflective of the residential or rural residential designation.

b. Subdivision creating lots smaller than 1000 m², cluster residential development such as townhouse and multi-unit building and mixed-use development that combines residential use with commercial, retail, service and office uses are encouraged to be located in the Community Hubs or similar settlement cluster areas.

Developments exceeding density limits of the Official Plan and or the zoning bylaw are encouraged in these areas, subject to amendments to the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, traffic circulation and provision of or access to community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhoods; and

ii. With the exception of any other applicable density increase policies of this Plan, a contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

c. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of 3 lots or less, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas where water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment.

d. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of more than 3 lots, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas, subject to all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment; and
ii. A contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

e. Affordable or higher-density housing shall be developed in a way that integrates with the rural communities and strengthens community identity and character. This can be achieved by creating developments that are complementary to the scale, layout, architectural design, landscaping and view of neighbouring properties and the surrounding natural environment. Specific design criteria may be imposed by establishing a development permit area for form and character for a development site.

f. Housing agreements pursuant to the Local Government Act shall be used wherever applicable to secure the provision of affordable housing in appropriate areas and the long term affordability of housing.

A housing agreement shall determine the terms, conditions and forms of provision or contribution of designated affordable or special needs housing and shall use concurrent criteria of the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and data of Statistics Canada to define housing affordability.

ii Renumber all subsequent sections and subsections accordingly.

PART C – ADOPTION

READ A FIRST TIME this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

PURSUANT TO SECTION 475 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS CONSIDERED this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

READ A SECOND TIME this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT FINANCIAL PLAN AND ANY APPLICABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 23rd DAY OF JULY 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

ADOPTED this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

________________________________________
Corporate Officer

________________________________________
Chair
PART A – CITATION

1. This bylaw may be cited as Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 641.8, 2017.

PART B – AMENDMENT

2. Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 641, 2011 is hereby amended as follows:

   i. Delete the following portion of Section 17.9.i:

   “Proposals to increase residential development density beyond that established in the OCP may be supported where the additional development capacity is to provide:

   a) Affordable housing; and/or

   b) Special needs housing

   subject to consultation with local residents through an OCP and rezoning amendment application process with public information meeting(s). Specific design criteria may be established and if so the site should be included within a development permit area for Form and Character, such as DPA 6. Cluster housing will be encouraged to minimize land use. ”

   ii. Insert the following section immediately following Section 17:

18. Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing

Densification is vital to increasing housing supply and providing diverse housing choices. Densification can create land use opportunities and favourable conditions for developing affordable housing through a number of strategies including residential infill, cluster and mixed-use development and density bonus in appropriate areas. The intent of these
strategies is to provide a set of criteria for evaluating densification proposals and tools to support and secure contribution to affordable housing.

18.1 Objectives

a. Increase the supply of housing units through infill development on existing eligible parcels.

b. Direct cluster housing, multi-unit and mixed-use development to the Village Amenity / Density Bonus Area and similar settlement cluster areas.

c. Integrate housing development with the rural context.

d. Use density bonus in appropriate areas to encourage density increase and affordable housing contribution.

e. Use housing agreements to secure affordable housing.

18.2 Policies

a. Infill development of auxiliary dwellings, duplexes and second dwellings shall be encouraged on existing eligible parcels in accordance with zoning bylaw parcel size requirements. To fully utilize the infill potential of such parcels, the existing minimum parcel size requirements to qualify for multiple dwellings on a parcel, as defined in the zoning bylaw, shall be reflective of the residential or rural residential designation.

b. Subdivision creating lots smaller than 1000 m², cluster residential development such as townhouse and multi-unit building and mixed-use development that combines residential use with commercial, retail, service and office uses are encouraged to be located in the Village Amenity / Density Bonus Area or similar settlement cluster areas.

Developments exceeding density limits of the Official Plan and or the zoning bylaw are encouraged in these areas, subject to amendments to the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, traffic circulation and provision of or access to community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhoods; and

ii. With the exception of any other applicable density increase policies of this Plan, a contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

c. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of 3 lots or less, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas where water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads
and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment.

d. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of more than 3 lots, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas, subject to all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment; and

ii. A contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

e. Affordable or higher-density housing shall be developed in a way that integrates with the rural communities and strengthens community identity and character. This can be achieved by creating developments that are complementary to the scale, layout, architectural design, landscaping and view of neighbouring properties and the surrounding natural environment. Specific design criteria may be imposed by establishing a development permit area for form and character for a development site.

f. Housing agreements pursuant to the Local Government Act shall be used wherever applicable to secure the provision of affordable housing in appropriate areas and the long term affordability of housing.

A housing agreement shall determine the terms, conditions and forms of provision or contribution of designated affordable or special needs housing and shall use concurrent criteria of the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and data of Statistics Canada to define housing affordability.

ii Renumber all subsequent sections and subsections accordingly.

PART C – ADOPTION

READ A FIRST TIME this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

PURSUANT TO SECTION 475 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS CONSIDERED this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT FINANCIAL PLAN AND ANY APPLICABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 23rd DAY OF JULY 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

ADOPTED this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

_____________________________________

Corporate Officer

_____________________________________

Chair
PART A – CITATION

1. This bylaw may be cited as Elphinstone Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 600.8, 2017.

PART B – AMENDMENT

2. Elphinstone Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 600, 2007 is hereby amended as follows:

   Insert the following section immediately following Section B-9:

   **B-10 Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing**

   Densification is vital to increasing housing supply and providing diverse housing choices. Densification can create land use opportunities and favourable conditions for developing affordable housing through a number of strategies including residential infill, cluster and mixed-use development and density bonus in appropriate areas. The intent of these strategies is to provide a set of criteria for evaluating densification proposals and tools to support and secure contribution to affordable housing.

   **B-10.1 Objectives**

   a. Increase the supply of housing units through infill development on existing eligible parcels.

   b. Direct cluster housing, multi-unit and mixed-use development to the Comprehensive Development Cluster Housing Areas and similar settlement cluster areas.

   c. Integrate housing development with the rural context.
d. Use density bonus in appropriate areas to encourage density increase and affordable housing contribution.

e. Use housing agreements to secure affordable housing.

B-10.2 Policies

a. Infill development of auxiliary dwellings, duplexes and second dwellings shall be encouraged on existing eligible parcels in accordance with zoning bylaw parcel size requirements. To fully utilize the infill potential of such parcels, the existing minimum parcel size requirements to qualify for multiple dwellings on a parcel, as defined in the zoning bylaw, shall be reflective of the residential or rural residential designation.

b. Subdivision creating lots smaller than 1000 m², cluster residential development such as townhouse and multi-unit building and mixed-use development that combines residential use with commercial, retail, service and office uses are encouraged to be located in the Comprehensive Development Cluster Housing Areas or similar settlement cluster areas.

Developments exceeding density limits of the Official Plan and or the zoning bylaw are encouraged in these areas, subject to amendments to the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, traffic circulation and provision of or access to community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhoods; and

ii. With the exception of any other applicable density increase policies of this Plan, a contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

c. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of 3 lots or less, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas where water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment.

d. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of more than 3 lots, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas, subject to all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment; and
ii. A contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

e. Affordable or higher-density housing shall be developed in a way that integrates with the rural communities and strengthens community identity and character. This can be achieved by creating developments that are complementary to the scale, layout, architectural design, landscaping and view of neighbouring properties and the surrounding natural environment. Specific design criteria may be imposed by establishing a development permit area for form and character for a development site.

f. Housing agreements pursuant to the Local Government Act shall be used wherever applicable to secure the provision of affordable housing in appropriate areas and the long term affordability of housing.

A housing agreement shall determine the terms, conditions and forms of provision or contribution of designated affordable or special needs housing and shall use concurrent criteria of the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and data of Statistics Canada to define housing affordability.

ii    Renumber all subsequent sections and subsections accordingly.

PART C – ADOPTION

READ A FIRST TIME this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

PURSUANT TO SECTION 475 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS CONSIDERED this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

READ A SECOND TIME this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT FINANCIAL PLAN AND ANY APPLICABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 23rd DAY OF JULY 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

ADOPTED this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

____________________________________
Corporate Officer

____________________________________
Chair
PART A – CITATION

1. This bylaw may be cited as West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 640.2, 2017.

PART B – AMENDMENT

2. West Howe Sound Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 640, 2011 is hereby amended as follows:

   i. Insert the following section immediately following Section 6:

7. Densification Strategies to Support Affordable Housing

Densification is vital to increasing housing supply and providing diverse housing choices. Densification can create land use opportunities and favourable conditions for developing affordable housing through a number of strategies including residential infill, cluster and mixed-use development and density bonus in appropriate areas. The intent of these strategies is to provide a set of criteria for evaluating densification proposals and tools to support and secure contribution to affordable housing.

7.1 Objectives

a. Increase the supply of housing units through infill development on existing eligible parcels.

b. Direct cluster housing, multi-unit and mixed-use development to the Langdale Neighbourhood Village Centre and similar settlement cluster areas.

c. Integrate housing development with the rural context.
d. Use density bonus in appropriate areas to encourage density increase and affordable housing contribution.

e. Use housing agreements to secure affordable housing.

7.2 Policies

a. Infill development of auxiliary dwellings, duplexes and second dwellings shall be encouraged on existing eligible parcels in accordance with zoning bylaw parcel size requirements. To fully utilize the infill potential of such parcels, the existing minimum parcel size requirements to qualify for multiple dwellings on a parcel, as defined in the zoning bylaw, shall be reflective of the residential or rural residential designation.

b. Subdivision creating lots smaller than 1000 m², cluster residential development such as townhouse and multi-unit building and mixed-use development that combines residential use with commercial, retail, service and office uses are encouraged to be located in the Langdale Neighbourhood Village Centre or similar settlement cluster areas.

Developments exceeding density limits of the Official Plan and or the zoning bylaw are encouraged in these areas, subject to amendments to the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, traffic circulation and provision of or access to community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhoods; and

ii. With the exception of any other applicable density increase policies of this Plan, a contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

c. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of 3 lots or less, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas where water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment.

d. Developments exceeding established density limits of the Official Community Plan and or the zoning bylaw and creating a total of more than 3 lots, may be considered through an amendment to the Official Community Plan and / or the zoning bylaw for areas designated Residential outside of village hubs or similar settlement cluster areas, subject to all of the following criteria:

i. Water supply, solid waste collection, storm water management, sewage treatment facility, regional fire protection, traffic circulation and convenient access to major roads and community amenities can all be appropriately provided and the development design is compatible with the surrounding rural environment; and
ii. A contribution to affordable or special needs housing must be made in the form of housing unit, land, money or other types of provision and registered with a housing agreement in accordance with the Local Government Act and approved by the Regional District Board.

e. Affordable or higher-density housing shall be developed in a way that integrates with the rural communities and strengthens community identity and character. This can be achieved by creating developments that are complementary to the scale, layout, architectural design, landscaping and view of neighbouring properties and the surrounding natural environment. Specific design criteria may be imposed by establishing a development permit area for form and character for a development site.

f. Housing agreements pursuant to the Local Government Act shall be used wherever applicable to secure the provision of affordable housing in appropriate areas and the long term affordability of housing.

A housing agreement shall determine the terms, conditions and forms of provision or contribution of designated affordable or special needs housing and shall use concurrent criteria of the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and data of Statistics Canada to define housing affordability.

ii Renumber all subsequent sections and subsections accordingly.

PART C – ADOPTION

READ A FIRST TIME this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

PURSUANT TO SECTION 475 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS CONSIDERED this 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

READ A SECOND TIME this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018

CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT FINANCIAL PLAN AND ANY APPLICABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 28th DAY OF JUNE 2018
PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT this 23rd DAY OF JULY 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

ADOPTED this DAY OF MONTH YEAR

____________________________________
Corporate Officer

____________________________________
Chair