

# SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

---

**TO:** Planning and Community Development Committee – October 11, 2018

**AUTHOR:** Julie Clark, Planner

**SUBJECT:** PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PHASE 1 ZONING BYLAW 310 UPDATE

---

## RECOMMENDATION(S)

**THAT the report titled Public Participation Phase 1 Zoning Bylaw 310 Update be received.**

---

## BACKGROUND

The project to update Zoning Bylaw No. 310 is underway. Staff have been working with a consultant (Arlington Group) through the first stage of a public participation plan for the project.

Zoning Bylaw No. 310 was adopted in 1989. It applies to the communities of Halfmoon Bay, Roberts Creek, Elphinstone and West Howe Sound and has been amended approximately 170 times.

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Board adopted the following resolution on February 22, 2018:

075/18    **Recommendation No. 9**    *Zoning Bylaw 310 Review – Summary Paper*

THAT the report titled Zoning Bylaw 310 Review – Summary Paper be received;

AND THAT Zoning Bylaw 310 Review – Summary Paper be referred to all Advisory Planning Commissions (APCs), Natural Resources Advisory Committee (NRAC), Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and the Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Committee (RCOCPC) for comments;

AND FURTHER THAT a report with respect to comments and next steps be provided to Committee in Q2 2018.

In alignment with SCR D's Public Participation Framework, three phases of public participation are planned in order to inform the update of Zoning Bylaw No. 310:

1. Familiarize and Review
2. Focus Groups, Public Workshops and Questionnaire
3. Gather Feedback on Draft Bylaw

This report summarizes the feedback received from Phase 1 of public participation.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Summary Paper

The Arlington Group used information compiled by staff on technical and interpretation questions and challenges reported by the community to prepare a Summary Paper. This paper highlights the key opportunities or community goals that can be implemented through zoning. The Summary Paper was presented to the Planning and Community Development Committee on February 22, 2018.

### Outline of Phase 1

Following Board direction, the Summary Paper was referred to SCRD advisory committees for review and dialogue at two interactive “summit” meetings.

Members from SCRD advisory committee members participated in the summit meetings and/or shared additional written feedback. In addition to providing valuable detailed input on future zoning bylaw needs, Phase 1 also built zoning knowledge and capacity for advisory committees.

Following SCRD’s established public participation practices, the Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Review Phase 1 Public Participation Report is provided for the Committee’s information (Attachment A).

### *Organizational Implications*

An internal cross-functional project team approach is supporting this project. In parallel with the summit meetings, staff shared input received and held focused technical sessions to map opportunities and needs. This work is ongoing.

### *Timeline for next steps or estimated completion date*

Phase 2 of the public participation plan for the Zoning Bylaw No. 310 update project is now underway. This phase involves focus groups, a questionnaire and public workshops.

A follow-up public participation report will be provided to a future Committee at the conclusion of Phase 2. A separate staff report with technical analysis is also anticipated for this time. These steps will enable staff to receive Board direction prior to drafting of a new zoning bylaw.

### *Communications Strategy*

A communications strategy is in place for each of the 3 phases. Newspaper, web and social media notifications will ensure community awareness of this project and participation opportunities.

This report was shared with advisory committee members on publication.

## **STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES**

The Zoning Bylaw No. 310 update supports strategic priorities to Support Sustainable Economic Development, Facilitate Community Development and Embed Environmental Leadership.

**CONCLUSION**

Phase 1 public participation for the update of Zoning Bylaw No. 310 is complete.

Following SCRD's public participation practices, a Public Participation Report is provided for the Committee's information.

Phase 2 is underway now and Phase 3 is planned for Q1 and Q2 of 2019. An updated Public Participation Report and a following staff technical report are planned to be brought to a Committee in Q1 2019.

Attachment:

Attachment A: Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update Phase 1: Public Participation Report

Reviewed by:			
Manager	X – A. Allen	Finance	
GM	X – I. Hall	Legislative	
CAO	X- J. Loveys	Other	

**ATTACHMENT A**

# Sunshine Coast Regional District

**Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update: Phase 1**

**Public Participation Report**

Report to the Planning and Community Development Committee

October 11, 2018

J. Clark, Planner – Sunshine Coast Regional District

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---



## **SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT**

**Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update  
Sunshine Coast, British Columbia  
October, 2018**

### **Public Consultation Summary Report**

The purpose of this report is to present a summary of the comments received during Phase 1 of the Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update.

This report will expand to include summaries of each phase of public participation. The final report will be a complete summary of public participation for the update of Zoning Bylaw No. 310.

### **Background**

Zoning Bylaw No.310 pertains to the communities of Halfmoon Bay, Roberts Creek, Elphinstone and West Howe Sound. The intent of the Zoning Bylaw No. 310 update is to make sure that there is an appropriate range of zones and permitted uses to allow the community to meet its goals and objectives for the future, rather than re-draw zoning boundaries. Since adoption of the zoning bylaw in 1989 several official communities plans have been adopted and community needs and preferences have evolved. Zoning Bylaw No. 310 has been amended on approximately 170 occasions and it is timely to commence an overall review.

The new zoning bylaw can implement sustainable land use principles, and assist the community to achieve goals in several key opportunity areas, including:

- opportunities for diverse housing types and design;
- expanding the number of zones that allow growing food to further develop a sustainable local food system and economy;
- diversifying the range of home occupations to enhance the local economy;
- support for energy efficient buildings, residential-scale energy production and climate change resilience.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update is informed by 3 phases of public participation in addition to review by SCR D, consultant, and SCR D Board review. Each of the phases include the Key Opportunities outlined above. A summary of each phase is below with reference to the SCR D's Spectrum of Public Participation.

### **Phase 1 Familiarize & Early Review (*inform, gather information*)**

Goal: facilitate understanding of the bylaw and the update process, focused on SCR D Advisory Committees and cross functional review by SCR D Departments. Gather feedback.

---

### **Phase 2 Focus Groups, Public Workshops & Questionnaire (*inform, gather information, discuss, engage*)**

Goal: Gather feedback in a series of 3 public information workshops followed by online questionnaire. Participation input from Phase 1, 2 is used to draft the new bylaw. In addition to public meetings, engage experienced users of the bylaw to gather feedback to inform the new draft.

---

### **Phase 3 Gather Feedback On Draft Bylaw (*inform, gather information, discuss*)**

Goal: to present and gather feedback on the draft bylaw through formal referrals. There are two main audiences: a) specific sectors/agencies/users of the bylaw and b) the general public. Participation input is used to refine the draft bylaw, before further consideration by the SCR D Board.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### **Overview of Phase 1 Public Participation**

Advisory Committee members were the primary audience for Phase 1 of public participation associated with the update. The Advisory Committees include: all 5 Advisory Planning Commissions (APC), The Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC), the Natural Resources Advisory Committee (NRAC) and the Roberts Creek Official Committee Plan Committee. Advisory committee members from Egmont Pender Harbour were included in Phase 1 to support familiarization with zoning bylaws, planning processes and with consideration for possible future review of Zoning Bylaw No. 337.

The first phase of public participation included a preliminary referral of a Summary Paper (described below) to all SCRD Advisory Committees, as well as hosting Advisory Summit 1 and 2. An overview of each is below.

#### **Summary Paper and Preliminary Referrals**

A Summary Paper was produced to provide background information on each of these community goals, titled Key Opportunities. The Summary Paper will be used as the foundation to the public participation process for updating the bylaw. The Summary Paper was drafted by The Arlington Group Planning Consultants in collaboration with SCRD. As per Board direction on September 6, 2018, cannabis production and sales will also be included in Phase 2.

A draft of the Summary Paper was referred to Advisory Committees in March 2018. Minutes from Advisory Committees were received by the Board in March and April. Comments are attached (Appendix A). Feedback from the Advisory Committees was used to refine the draft Summary Paper as well as plan for the Advisory Summit.

#### **Advisory Summit**

Two Advisory Summit meetings were held in June 2018, designed to bring together members from all SCRD Advisory Committees and the Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Committee to learn about zoning bylaws and share feedback about areas of interest, concern, confusion. The goals of the Advisory Summit meetings were to:

- Assist Advisory Committee members in their preparation to provide feedback on Zoning Bylaw No. 310
- Guide the SCRD in refining public participation planning for broader community participation.

Comments received during and after the summit meetings are summarized in this report.

## Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### Overview of Results

#### ADVISORY SUMMIT PART 1

The Advisory Summit Part 1 took place on June 4, 2018 at the Seaside Centre in Sechelt. Twenty three advisory committee members participated.

The Summit Part 1 was facilitated by both SCRD and the Arlington Group. The format included short presentations and facilitated small group discussion. Each small group discussion was focused on one of the three key opportunity areas for Zoning Bylaw No. 310: Housing Diversity, Home Based Business, and Residential Agriculture. Participants selected their topic of choice for each of two rounds of conversation. The Summary Paper and a series of the same questions were used at each table for consistency. Table hosts captured participant feedback which is summarized below.

#### General Feedback

- Enforcement of regulations was a concern across all topic areas.
- Need to see that the values of each OCP area are maintained through the bylaw.
- The broader community will need to be provided detailed information about topic areas before being asked to answer specific questions.

#### Housing Diversity

- Brings up broader questions around desired density for the community.
- Concerns about increased housing diversity include:
  - Impacts from increased density and home businesses
  - Impact on views and property values
  - Impact of Short Term Rental (STR)
- Consider the minimum/maximum sizes for homes. Need to gauge community tolerance for mobile homes but small, pre-fabricated homes generally seem accepted. Need to also consider the potential for larger homes to provide multigenerational housing.
- Diversity of auxiliary dwelling types generally supported (e.g. coach homes)
  - Property should have suitable sewerage capacity
  - Auxiliary dwelling size should respond to property size.
- Consider increasing density of multiple residential zone (apartment) zone but the appropriate upper limit of density/housing type would need to be determined.
- A need to include clear explanations for the community about what the zoning bylaw can control.

#### Residential Agriculture

- Rethink how to provide suitable regulation for the safe and sustainable keeping of honeybees - consider mechanisms for registration of hives.

## Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

- The number of hens permitted should be limited in relation to parcel size. Consider maintaining the domestic consumption clause.
- Ensure that farm gate sales only include food grown on the property or nearby properties.
- Comments pertaining to future regulation and support of residential agriculture included:
  - Managing odours, noise, traffic and dust
  - Ensuring properties are wildlife safe
  - Managing resources, such as water use
  - Loss of canopy cover and ecosystems due to land clearing.
- Consider potential for community gardens to be included in the bylaw.
- Consider how can the bylaw be more enabling of residential agriculture while addressing concerns – where should the bylaw be most prescriptive?

### Home Based Businesses

- Clearly state a definition - what Home Based Business includes/prohibits before asking questions of the broader community. Also define differences between home offices/home occupations.
- Concerns about enabling more home businesses included:
  - Parking and traffic from employees or visitors
  - Noise and odours
  - Increased resource use – water, energy
  - Waste production and management
  - Environmental consequences from more intensive land use
- Regulation based on neighbour complaints – often difficult to do anonymously.
- Benefit in focusing on what should be regulated, rather than trying to anticipate all the likely scenarios that should be permitted. Subjective nature of what is acceptable in a neighbourhood makes it difficult to navigate prohibited uses. Need to be careful not to be overly prescriptive to create barriers to appropriate home businesses.
- Need to determine the thresholds that shift enterprises from being home businesses to triggering a rezoning of the property.
- Regulation of STRs and cannabis production needs to be considered.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### **ADVISORY SUMMIT PART 2**

The Advisory Summit Part 2 took place on June 20, 2018 at the Roberts Creek Community Hall. Twenty three advisory committee members participated.

Summit Part 2 was also facilitated by SCRD and the Arlington Group. The format included short presentations and dialogue at ‘key opportunity’ stations. Each station focused on one of the three key opportunity areas for Zoning Bylaw No. 310: Housing Diversity, Home Based Business, and Residential Agriculture, with a fourth station open for reviewing the project’s public participation plan as well as any additional ideas. Participants were invited to visit their stations of choice for three rounds. The resources at each station included a member of the project team, a copy of the Summary Paper, Zoning Bylaw No. 310, an information poster and a list of the draft questions to be used in the public participation campaigns in fall 2018.

Participants were asked to provide insight on:

- 1) How the consultation questions could be refined for the upcoming public participation (for example: is the question easily understood? What language adjustments are needed for clarity? Are these the right questions? Are there additional questions we should ask?)
- 2) Community tensions that might be associated with the key opportunity areas and questions
- 3) Individual responses to the questions

Feedback was gathered via posters on the wall where participants recorded their specific comments. Feedback sheets were also provided at the stations for those who preferred individual writing and made available after the event for those who needed more time with their comments. Three emails were received with feedback after Summit Part 2. Information collected is summarized below.

#### **General Feedback**

Participants were asked to share why they chose to participate in the Advisory Summit and what they wanted the project team to know. Comments included:

- More general knowledge about Zoning Bylaw No. 310
- Specific issues of interest

General themes reflected in comments during the Summit:

- Express the intentions of the individual OCPs, create a Zoning Bylaw that is clear, concise and usable.
- Use language that is enabling, rather than restrictive.
- Use tabular format for better comparison of regulations in each zone.
- More diagrams and images should be used to demonstrate concepts, such as how building height is calculated.

## Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

- Concerns about the impacts of development that is not regulated through zoning such as blasting, tree retention and stormwater management.
- Consider environmental protections, infrastructure improvements and bylaw enforcement as part of planning for future development of the Sunshine Coast.

### Housing Diversity

The housing diversity station provided information on the current regulations around auxiliary dwelling units, mobile and pre-fabricated homes, carriage houses, the width requirements for houses, density of multi-family homes. Draft questions on these topics were provided to participants. The summarized questions and answers are provided below.

1. Should mobile homes and small, prefabricated homes should be permitted in all residential zones?
  - Question should be broken into two parts:
    - Should mobile homes be permitted in all residential zones?
    - Should small, prefabricated homes be permitted in all residential zones?
  - Consider how the concept of “tiny homes” and “mobile homes” fit within the definition of dwelling.
  - Consider if the question should relate to specific zones.
2. Should be either a minimum or maximum size requirement for houses?
  - Separate the questions for clarity:
    - Should there be a minimum size requirement for houses?
    - Zones currently provide maximum allowable parcel coverage for buildings and structures. Consider an additional maximum allowable size for houses.
3. What about secondary housing such as secondary suites within a dwelling or detached auxiliary dwelling units?
  - SCRD should explore different regulations for attached and detached auxiliary dwelling units. Exploration should include where secondary suites are permitted, where detached auxiliary dwellings are permitted, maximum size for secondary suites, maximum size for detached auxiliary dwellings (for example, increase from 55m<sup>2</sup> to 90m<sup>2</sup>), whether carriage houses should be allowed as a form of detached auxiliary dwelling.
4. Should the Residential Multiple zone regulations be adjusted to more clearly enable apartments or townhouses as a form of housing?
  - Apartments or townhouses are generally supported.
5. How can housing diversity be increased?
  - Explore how zoning provisions relate to building multiple small homes on one parcel vs. one large home.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### **Residential Agriculture**

The residential agriculture station provided information on the current regulations around the keeping of hens, livestock and honey bees, appropriate set-backs for uses and related structures, the difference between domestic and commercial raising of livestock, and farm gate sales in residential zones. Draft questions on these topics were provided to participants. The summarized questions and answers are provided below.

1. Should the keeping of honeybees be permitted in all zones, except multi-family residential zones, with appropriate regulations?
  - Diversity of responses received.
  - Agricultural Advisory Committee and specialists offered to provide input on specific regulations and recommendations if community support is shown.
  - Keep regulations broad to allow rearing of a diversity of animals.
2. Should hens be permitted in all residential zones, except multi-family residential zones, with appropriate regulations?
  - Diversity of answers received.
  - Agricultural Advisory Committee and specialists offered to provide input on specific regulations and recommendations if community support is shown.
3. Should roosters be permitted anywhere there are chickens or only on rural properties?
  - Question needs to be more specific, such as “should roosters only be allowed on properties with rural and agricultural zoning?”
4. Should the sale of food produced on a property, such as eggs or honey be restricted?
  - Reverse the question to ask if the sale of food produced on a property should be encouraged, rather than restricted.
  - Explore the current “domestic consumption” clause.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### **Home Based Businesses**

The home-based business station provided information on the current regulations around indoor and outdoor uses, retailing or wholesaling, signage, employees and ensuring home based business stays within residential parameters. If the business grows beyond these parameters, it must move to an appropriate commercial or industrial zone. Draft questions on these topics were provided to participants. The summarized questions and answers are provided below.

1. What are the barriers to establishing a home occupation or business in SCRD rural electoral areas?
  - Remove references to “home office” and use “home based businesses” to include/regulate all.
  - Keep regulations to a minimum don't try to identify every type of business.
  
2. What concerns could there be about a broader range of home occupations and businesses being supported through the Zoning Bylaw?
  - Reframe as: “what are the main concerns about home businesses operating in your neighbourhood?”
  - Need to protect R1 zone with the intended residential use. Low impact businesses (such as web-designers, bookkeepers, tutors, musicians, and artists) should be allowed.
  - Ensure residents can practice or teach a skill, craft or art from home that doesn't involve creation or sales of products.
  - Short term rentals (STR) should not be allowed on R1 properties under 2000m<sup>2</sup> due to noise and parking impacts. Consider STR regulations similar to current B&B regulations for R1.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### **Public Participation and Other Ideas to Consider**

The fourth station provided an opportunity to look at the schedule for public participation as well as the list of groups and agencies to invite to participate. This station was also a place for other ideas and considerations to be presented. Comments included:

- The environmental effects related to land clearing as a consequence of increased density and agricultural activity need to be considered, including storm water runoff management and tree canopy preservation.
- Neighbour impacts of increased density, such as loss of views, privacy and light.
- Consider mechanisms to encourage smaller homes and cluster housing developments.
- Reduce the number of zones and make Zoning Bylaw No. 310 more user friendly.
- Suggestions of groups and agencies that should participate in future phases of Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update.

## **Zoning Bylaw No. 310 Update, Phase 1**

Sunshine Coast, British Columbia

Report Date: Oct 11, 2018

---

### **Overview of Written Feedback**

A total of ten hardcopy written feedback submissions were received: 3 related to housing diversity, 2 related to Agriculture, 4 related to home based business.

A total of 3 feedback submissions were received by email after Summit Part 1.

A total of 2 feedback submissions were received by email after Summit Part 2.\*

(\*specific request to share verbatim was made Appendix B)

Hardcopy and email submissions were reviewed with the feedback from each Summit meeting. This report provides an integrated summary of all feedback received in Phase 1.

### **Summary**

In Phase 1 of public participation for Zoning Bylaw No. 310 update, the Summary Paper was used to conduct preliminary referrals to the Advisory Committees. Feedback was received via minutes from each Advisory Committee during March and April 2018.

Advisory Summits 1 and 2 were held in June 2018. Feedback on questions to be explored in the next phase was gathered. Some specific comments on aspects of the current or a new zoning bylaw were also shared.

### **Supporting Documents**

The following documents are attached to this report:

- Appendix A: Preliminary Advisory Committee Feedback on Summary Paper
- Appendix B: Email submission

Appendix A: Preliminary Comments on Summary Paper, compiled from Advisory Committee Minutes

April 2018

Area	Housing Diversity	Home Based Business	Residential Agriculture	Usability	Other
<p><b>A APC</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This APC feels all Housing Diversity questions regarding mobile homes, pre-fabricated homes, size requirements and secondary housing all depend on the property size and the zoning. Each region on the Sunshine Coast is specific and questions would depend on what region you are referring to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The APC feels concerns with home based businesses for neighbours are parking, noise and traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This APC feels honeybees should be permitted depending on parcel size and fencing put up for bears.</li> <li>Hens should be allowed depending on parcel size and what the setbacks would be.</li> <li>Roosters should not be allowed in residential areas.</li> <li>Homegrown products from a property should be allowed to be sold.</li> <li>A barrier to producing food on the Sunshine Coast outside the ALR would be Elk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The APC would like to see all Bylaws include links so navigating through the topics you are looking for would become user friendly.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>B APC</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feel that the housing types really follow zoning bylaws and currently don't have flexibility: right now we are restricted by minimum dimensions. Changing the zoning bylaws would automatically create new housing types; if you can break the buildings up, you can create more positive space.</li> <li>The bank (mortgages) are the biggest restrictors to new housing types.</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Invasive Species</i> Would like a regional and corporate policy to address the issue of invasive species and property boundaries; specifically, the implication of knotweed across property boundaries.</li> <li><i>Blasting Regulations</i> (changing the natural grade of the land) Should there be a bylaw about blasting and the re-structuring of land through blasting, considering the impact on neighbouring properties and on surface runoff.</li> <li><i>Retaining Walls</i> (changing the natural grade of the land) The ability of landowners to change the natural topography of the land with the construction of retaining walls has greatly impacted the flow of the land across properties and sight lines from neighbouring properties.</li> </ul>

Area	Housing Diversity	Home Based Business	Residential Agriculture	Usability	Other
<b>D APC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing diversity – There was a question about whether the bylaw would increase density. There was concern that, if widespread commercial activity such as short-term rentals is permitted within residential areas, there can be problems. Parking and traffic would be issues. Increased density in the Roberts Creek “core” area as identified in the OCP was discussed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If a second building is constructed, it is not a home-based business and should be required to go through a development process to receive neighbours’ input. Potential issues include traffic and parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that farm gate vegetable sales should not include vegetables from other locations off the farm. There was a question about if there would be a hazard in including the sale of meat as a permitted use.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Themes missed in the Summary Paper – short-term rentals; climate change resilience through residential energy production and efficiency; consideration for “night sky” friendly lighting.</li> </ul>
<b>D OCPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should mobile homes and small, pre-fabricated homes be permitted in all residential zones? <i>Yes.</i></li> <li>What are your thoughts on size requirements for houses? Should there be either a minimum or maximum size requirement? <i>Yes, there should be a max. but not a min.</i></li> <li>How should we accommodate secondary housing (i.e. secondary suites within a dwelling and auxiliary or 2nd dwelling on a property)? Should such housing be permitted in any residential zone and property size? <i>These are two separate issues. We should encourage and accommodate secondary suites in all zonings and property sizes, but not secondary dwellings in all. Any larger property should be able to have a secondary dwelling, taking tree retention and habitat into consideration. Further discussion is needed regarding the issue of having a greater number of secondary dwellings than two on some properties.</i></li> <li>Should the maximum size of an auxiliary dwelling (guest cottage) be increased from 55m2 (592ft2) to 90m2 (969ft2)? <i>Yes.</i></li> <li>Should carriage houses (an auxiliary dwelling combined with a garage) be permitted? <i>Yes.</i></li> <li>Apartments are currently permitted in the Residential Multiple zone. However, the current zoning regulation in this zone only allows one unit per 750 square metres. This regulation effectively prevents any form of residential multiple development. Should the regulations be changed to allow townhouses or apartments in this zone? <i>The general feeling was that apartments and townhouses wouldn't be suitable, but this requires further discussion.</i></li> </ul> <p>Consider the possibility of stratification to increase density on certain lots and achieve denser infill.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the barriers to establishing a home occupation or business in the Sunshine Coast Regional District? <i>This needs to be explored, as people have voiced their concerns regarding this issue.</i></li> <li>What concerns could there be about a broader range of home occupations and businesses being supported through the Zoning Bylaw? <i>Parking and traffic concerns are the largest. This needs to be discussed as there may be other barriers. Businesses that create noise should be contained in buildings.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the keeping of honeybees be permitted in all zones, except multi-family residential zones, with appropriate regulations? If so, what regulations would you suggest? (parcel size, setback, number of beehives). <i>The general feeling is yes, but more info is needed regarding wild vs cultivated bees. The Sunshine Coast Beekeeping Group should be consulted in this regard.</i></li> <li>Should the keeping of hens be permitted in all zones, except multi-family residential zones, with appropriate regulations? If so, what regulations would you suggest? (parcel size, setback, number of hens) <i>Yes.</i></li> <li>What are your thoughts on roosters? (permitted anywhere there are chickens, rural properties only, etc?) <i>Yes, though they should be kept inside at night. Noise bylaws are in place to handle noise.</i></li> <li>Should the Zoning Bylaw restrict the sale of the food produced on a property, such as eggs or honey? <i>Yes, the One Straw Society and Vancouver Coastal Health's Food Charter should be consulted heavily.</i></li> <li>Are there other barriers to producing food on the Sunshine Coast that the Zoning Bylaw should address, particularly on lands located outside of ALR? <i>Yes, please consult the Food Charter. Do you have any additional thoughts on this topic? Sustainability is very important – this is a major issue that warrants attention.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zoning bylaw needs to be more accessible.</li> <li>Interactive website perhaps, where you plug in your address and see what applies to you.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community engagement ideas: social media, educating the public as to what they can and cannot do on their property is important. Mail-outs tailored to each zone could be distributed, and a conversation could be invited regarding, “How could we change the zoning in your area to help you accomplish your goals?” A world café–style event could be held at Roberts Creek Hall with neutral facilitators to increase the public's knowledge of zoning.</li> </ul>

Area	Housing Diversity	Home Based Business	Residential Agriculture	Usability	Other
<b>F APC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was agreed there should be housing diversity.</li> <li>• Regarding proposed increase in densification:</li> <li>• Concern that increasing density will be controversial.</li> <li>• SCR D is rural by nature. To increase density, if you believe in Smart Growth, the town centres are where multi-family should be – in Gibsons and Sechelt.</li> <li>• Langdale and Roberts Creek OCPs also have areas proposed for increased density near a “core” area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would small-scale assembly home occupations (agenda page 86, bullet 1) be supported? Give examples.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of setbacks in the AG zone (Bylaw 310, pages 102-103): some of the setbacks are too big, especially if you are in the AG zone and all the properties around you are in the AG zone. Some would require constructing buildings in the centre section of the property. Why such a big setback? It would make sense if the property were beside residential.</li> </ul>		

Area	Housing Diversity
E APC	<p>Area E APC focused on housing diversity questions only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't have small pre-fabricated homes in all residential zones; the look is not conducive with a small home next to a large one.</li> <li>• Maybe have form and character in association with this.</li> <li>• A lot of homes are too big. Many people are desperate for somewhere to live. I can't count the number of people who want to camp in my back yard or bring a mobile to live in. Maybe not appropriate next to a large house. Want to see openness to the need for shelter.</li> </ul> <p>1. <i>What are your thoughts on size requirements for houses? Should there be either a minimum or maximum size requirement?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would depend on the size of lot and on the zoning.</li> <li>• Currently there is a maximum coverage in the zoning. Do not have a minimum/ maximum other than regarding where you are putting it on your property.</li> <li>• There are places on the Agricultural Land Reserve that have been eaten up with monster houses. No one will be able to afford to buy.</li> <li>• There should not be a minimum.</li> <li>• Current permitted coverage of 30% of a lot is fine, unless they apply for a variance, and unless it is more than ½ acre.</li> <li>• Am opposed to a maximum size in the AG zone, in light of young people not being able to afford a home and where there may be generations living in the same home.</li> <li>• Have to be able to handle the septic field.</li> <li>• Would like a maximum size, and that people could apply for a variance.</li> <li>• The question is difficult to answer without knowing all of the variables.</li> </ul> <p>2. <i>How should we accommodate secondary housing (i.e. secondary suites within a dwelling and auxiliary or second dwelling) on a property? Should such housing be permitted in any residential zone and property size?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is already happening.</li> <li>• It is nicer to have secondary housing within the house, as compared to outside the house.</li> <li>• On medium sized lots, allow secondary suites. Keep auxiliary dwellings to larger lots.</li> <li>• Bylaw 310 allows a secondary dwelling based on property size; it is appropriate and works well.</li> <li>• Such housing should be permitted in any residential zone as long as the property can hold it and it is in the regulations. It comes back to septic capacity and parking.</li> </ul> <p>3. <i>Should the maximum size of an auxiliary dwelling (guest cottage) be increased from 55m<sup>2</sup> (592ft<sup>2</sup>) to 90m<sup>2</sup> (969ft<sup>2</sup>)?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be increased but they would have to apply for a variance. Add a variance application, with permission from the neighbours.</li> <li>• You could do the increase of the footprint. If it is 969, you could control that by saying "on two floors."</li> <li>• When you go from 592 to 969, you change from an uncomfortable little house to a complete full-time residence. It would double the living density of the area. It would change what I would look at. It would be potentially a two-storey building; it could have impact on the view. There is a limitation with changing bylaws after people have already built. Suddenly your life changes totally, not what I signed on for. We need to look at alternative ways of providing affordable housing. Right now, you could have density increases throughout the area. It would make more sense to do it near transit and shopping. This shifts the opportunity to owners to sort it out between themselves, a bit messy.</li> <li>• Near shopping centers is agricultural land in Area E. Areas for increased population are fairly limited in Area E. Some cluster areas were identified for the OCP. Area E was developed backwards; density is near water where the shopping isn't and where there are the smallest properties.</li> <li>• Allow only on larger lots that the auxiliary dwelling could be made larger; with smaller lots, not so much. Make it proportional.</li> <li>• In Area E, lots jump from ½ acre to 2.5 acres.</li> <li>• Don't know if Area E has proper circumstances to encourage that density of housing.</li> <li>• Think a lot more properties could handle this if they were level, flat; there is plenty of land for this, provided that it doesn't restrict the view corridor.</li> <li>• Have something that looks at the siting.</li> <li>• Provide some safeguards/guidelines so they do not impact adversely on neighbours.</li> </ul>

Area E APC comments continued:

- You will get a lot of trees coming down, and more driveways entering the roads. Do we need to disrupt this neighbourhood to have existing housing provide more housing? We have land elsewhere to deal with these things. I live on a steep gravel road going down to the Esplanade; it is dusty. More people would impact that. This is an opportunity to keep things the way they are. This idea is not good for my neighbourhood.
- This place will be the next White Rock. They have to open up more land. Allow a smaller structure for in-laws or parents. 592 is pretty small.
- The APC likes the idea of increasing the auxiliary dwelling size, but it is difficult to make this a blanket statement. It will depend on various guidelines and other factors. In certain circumstances, it would be appropriate. Some APC members think this would work, some don't. In some areas there would be significant negative impacts to this policy. In some circumstances it won't work.
- There needs to be a way to determine if this is appropriate; it is case by case. There need to be some safeguards around view corridors, height, siting, not obtrusive.

4. *Should carriage houses (an auxiliary dwelling combined with a garage) be permitted?*

- Yes. It would depend on the situation.

Would need to have guidelines. Are interested in it.

**Julie Clark**

---

**From:** TROOEDEN TROOEDEN <  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 12, 2018 9:57 AM  
**To:** Andrew Allen; Julie Clark; Ian Hall  
**Subject:** Re: Advisory Summit Part 2: Tomorrow - June 20 6:30-8:30. Roberts Creek Hall

hi  
At the June 20, 2018 Advisory Summit part 2,  
--I asked Julie regarding my request to email my June 20th email in this link to all invited to the summit.  
--Julie informed me that Andrew who'd make the decision, has agreed to to so.  
-- It's been 3 weeks, -I thought the email would have been emailed to all invited by now.  
-- Please update me when the email will be emailed to all invited to the summit.  
--regards, Ulla

On Wednesday, June 20, 2018 3:07 PM, TROOEDEN TROOEDEN < -- wrote:

-- Hello Advisory Summit organizers, Julie, Ian, Andrew  
--- and to Selina, Nicholas, Justin, John  
--- and to All the Members of the Various Committees Invited to this Advisory Summit Part1 and Part 2  
--(I request Julie Clark to share this email with all the invited members of the various committees to this Advisory Summit parts 1 and 2))

-----

You are family, could be one.... could be 5 people.... without a home, in search of another space to call home.  
You are daughter, son, sister, brother, grandma, grandpa, woman, man, child, unborn baby, single parent, two working parents with kids, ...  
... all without a home, without homes, looking for another place to settle into to call home.

We know that the average house price in Vancouver is over1 million dollars.  
In June 2018, the current Sechelt MLS stats indicate an average house price of \$739,570

--"The number of people spending more than half 50% of their entire income on rent is 40 per cent higher on the Sunshine Coast than the B.C. average.

-- As a result, the Canadian Rental Housing Index rates the Sunshine Coast as "severely unaffordable."

-- The average rent on the Sunshine Coast is \$1,031, but that figure is a poor reflection of what is actually available.

-- Rentals on Craigslist range from \$1,200 to \$3,500, and most listings cost between \$1,450 and \$2,000.

Many are in remote locations, far from Gibsons and Sechelt." from Sunshine Coast renters face 'severely unaffordable' market

<http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/sunshine-coast-renters-face-severely-unaffordable-market>

Are you going to build social housing for everybody who lives here in Canada who can't afford to buy a house?

On Sunshine Coast, BC, even some people with an organization that promote themselves as the educators and promoters of long term rentals for landlords make public statements like : -

- "we aren't taking a stand on for or against the short term rentals"

- "short term rentals and long term rentals are separate issues"

- "we aren't trying to change the direction of the landlords with the Airbnb short term rentals to the long term rentals"

OR

- "it's just anecdotal that the short term rentals Airbnb affect the long term rentals"

In the meantime, ya, the reality is that there's another one -- there's another Airbnb after the family is kicked out of their long term rental homes....

--These days, the reality is that the landlord can make more money during just the few months in the summer with Airbnb than with the long term rentals.

--The fact is that it's very cheap.... like \$50 or \$100 to get a legal Airbnb license and it's legit home business of moneymaking Airbnb.

--The fact is that many landlords don't want paper trails, --so it's not even the license fee,-- but it is all the money that's made from the Airbnb businesses, that's legalized, --and very difficult to manage the busy airbnb businesses and the majority of the airbnb-landlords will continue without ever being confronted.... and the Airbnb-short term rental businesses continue to grow and continue to make money....

-- AT What COST? --- just human lives, just homes, just communities, just family .....

I get it too.

The other day, when someone I know is wondering how to continue to pay mortgages on their house, I said

- "you'd make the most money with airbnb for the shortest time".

- "with airbnb, you don't have to have somebody else living on your property all the time".

I get it too, in other ways.

- When the Roberts Creek OCPC as a board looks at the municipal SCRD Bylaw 310 Reviewing of the housing AFFORDABILITY,

- When this municipal level Advisory Summit Part1\$Part2 as organized by the organizers looks at the municipal SCRD Bylaw 310 Reviewing of the housing AFFORDABILITY,

- When the provincial and the federal government-industry-politician-workers look at the housing AFFORDABILITY,

--- the Crisis of RENT, the Crisis of housing prioritized as COMMODITY instead of human right is and has continues to be the elephant in the room...

(landlord is a feudal terminology and practice)

This is about homes-housing as a commodity.

This is about human rights.... the policy and the reality about the Self of the Human

--either YES, having the right to have a home

--or NO, the home, the housing will continue to be prioritized as COMMODITY MONEY \$, and the housing &\$ RENT is NOT a human right.....

--In the early 2000s in British Columbia, the timeline which coincides with the Housing Crisis and RENT Crisis, the BC government amended the BC Tenancy Act that removed significant tenant's rights, and installed laws with a loophole that legally permitted property owners/landlords to raise rent without limit.

--And this legal rental increase loophole not only affected/increased the rent without limit ( no accident that the housing prices at the same time for all these years since the same early 2000s increased without limit, -- this of course is a global business making few 1% to 10% and wantabes rich comfortable and the majority in stress struggle crisis) - obviously, what was also affected was the quality of the home-living for the renters.

--Hence, our Housing Crisis/ RENT Crisis have already been imbedded since the early 2000s, -- in 2018, the NDP removed the loophole....

-- BUT what the NDP also did in 2018 was that the BC NDP government increased the Annual Allowable Rental Increase from the Liberal's 2017's 2% to the NDP's 2018 4% Allowable Annual Rental Increase.

-- In 2019, The BC NDP again allows 4% Allowable Annual Rental Increase.

-- **IF people created a new and different government management system with the different priorities that genuinely is proactively working for the community, the Allowable Annual Rental Increase would be at 0% in 2018, -- RENT CONTROL would be put in place, and some of the legally unhealthy RENTS would be reduced..... and yes, this would definitely affect everybody and everything....**

FACT CHECK: Did the CEO of Nestlé Say Water Is Not a Human Right?

<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/nestle-ceo-water-not-human-right/>

**FACT CHECK: Did the CEO of Nestlé Say Water Is Not a Human Right?**

The CEO of a multinational company that makes billions annually selling bottled water called the idea that human...

If people can't afford to work in Vancouver, what happens to the city?

<https://globalnews.ca/news/3851268/if-people-cant-afford-to-work-in-vancouver-what-happens-to-the-city/>

**This Advisory Summit part1 \$ part2 (of Bylaw 310) is for the benefit of the community..... for the benefit of all community.**

- This Advisory Summit's summary pdf that you emailed to us does not appear to adequately include the INPUT-Summary from those of us committee members who attended the Advisory Summit Part 1. on the Sunshine Coast, BC, on June 4th 2018

- For example,

--I phoned and communicated with Julie Clark, SCRD before the Advisory Summit Meetings - requesting that this Summit make room to discuss our Crisis of RENT, our Crisis of Non-Affordable Housing:

--The reality is that the municipal government, and the municipal Bylaw 310 has very little power to deal with RENT, because other than the very significant community citizens' voices-inputs-no inputs,- the Crisis of RENT and the Healing of RENT involve the provincial and the federal governmental inputs.

--The municipal Bylaw 310 can review and make changes to tiny homes and/or mobile homes on properties, STR short term rentals licensed ,-- BUT THIS does not address RENT.

-- The ongoing request has been that the Advisory Summit dealing with the Municipal Bylaw 310 which includes the Review of the Affordability actually make room for the discussion of the Crisis of RENT and the Crisis of Non-affordable Housing--- with the discussion to help initiate to establish the ways that the Municipal Level of Government can be in pro-active co-conversations with all necessary bodies to evolve to acquire the adequate real power to have a real say regarding RENT.

- At the June 4th 2018 Advisory Summit Part 1.

It was a well organized presentation by the organizers. The committee members discussed in groups the 3 topics chosen by the organizers with the organizer's representatives as the group chair, and at the end the organizer's reps presented the summary briefings.

For example - the Home Based Business Summary re-mentioned the topics discussed but there was no specific indication of what we the committee members commented and requested.

- Hence, at the end,

--I raised my hand and I shared 1 specific consensus input from the group discussions which was that **--we with consensus request that the STR Short Term Rentals due to its immense significance have a Separate Bylaw of it's Own in the Home Based Business Classification of the municipal SCRD Bylaw 310.**

- The Crisis of RENT has been habitually neglected, bypassed with "well organized acknowledgments that affordability is a part of community".

--BUT No real room is made for a proper discussion for the Affordability Crisis of RENT --

**-- MAKE ROOM for an official pro-active conversation with goals to HEAL RENT - is my request.**

-- The continuation of THIS NEGLECT is similar enough as the continuation of the consequences of the harms of the abuses.

-- This Advisory Summit's Part 1 Summary pdf, has again left out what has been the ongoing requests and continues to neglect RENT,

-- for example, your "Regulation of STRs and cannabis production needs to be considered" is an inadequate representation of what the group consensus requested.....

**-- What we at This Advisory Summit can do is simply officially address the elephant in the room. : --**

**-- A) - Hence, instead of the normalized systemic neglect, what This Advisory Summit reviewing the municipal SCRD Bylaw 310 can do is simply address the RENT Crisis at this Advisory Summit,**

**--- which would include the reality of the STR affecting the LTR, that this is not mere anecdotal.... but part of the crisis...**

**--- B) - And also officially communicate to the current provincial and the federal governments in Canada that:--**

**-----The Affordability RENT Crisis of the Housing Crisis cannot and is not genuinely being dealt with**

**----- including, by the municipal level SCRD Bylaw 310 that deals with THIS Topic in the name of AFFORDABILITY only in the terms such as that of house sizes, and what type of houses... but that absolutely does NOT deal with RENT nor RENT CONTROL.**

**----- Hence, what is clear is that the Affordability is significantly neglected. ....**

**----- At this time, the Affordability is still inadequately looked at/ dealt with...**

**----- At the very least, begin with officially communicating this, and the municipal-provincial-federal changes that are necessary.....**

--Ulla Shine

On Tuesday, June 19, 2018 7:31 AM, Julie Clark <Julie.Clark@scrd.ca> wrote:

Hello Advisory Committee Members,

**As promised, here is an updated message that includes the Summary Notes from Summit Part 1, and the agenda for tomorrow evening's Summit Part 2 meeting. We look forward to seeing you there.**

Many thanks to the participants of Advisory Summit Part 1 on June 4. We're looking forward to building on the valuable feedback from the first Summit at Advisory Summit Part 2 on this Wednesday evening:

**June 20, 6:30pm-8:30pm at Roberts Creek Hall, 1309 Roberts Creek Rd.**

**The Project:** The Advisory Summit meetings are part of the early stages of participation for updating Zoning Bylaw 310. The SCRCD will use the feedback from Advisory Committee minutes and the Summit meetings to refine the plans for broader public participation later in 2018 and early 2019. Please see the anticipated schedule of public participation below, which highlights the types of opportunities for advisory committees and the public to provide feedback.

**RSVP:** If you have not yet RSVP'd for Advisory Summit Part 2 and you would like to join us, you are welcome to join, please let us know.

**Preparation for Summit Part 2:** In preparation for Advisory Summit Part 2 please review:

1. The Summary Paper & Questions for Zoning Bylaw 310 (attached)
2. Advisory Summit Part 1: Summary Notes (attached)
3. Current Zoning Bylaw 310 : in particular Section 502-505: choose one topic area to familiarize with:
  - i. Home Based Business
  - ii. Residential Agriculture
  - iii. Housing Diversity

### **Advisory Summit Part 2 Agenda**

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| 6:15pm | • Doors open.                                  |
| 6:30pm | • Welcome, introductions and project overview  |
|        | • Feedback from Summit Part 1                  |
|        | • public participation plan                    |
| 7:15pm | • Key Opportunity stations and discussions (4) |
|        | • Provide individual feedback                  |

- 7:50pm • Station host summaries
- 8:10pm • Event feedback, next steps, wrap up
- 8:30pm • End

\*\* please note – The Farm Gate Market wraps up at 6pm. Parking on the street may be necessary if they are still cleaning up.

Best,  
julie

Julie Clark, MAeec  
Planner, Planning and Development

Sunshine Coast Regional District  
1975 Field Road, Sechelt, BC V0N 3A1  
Tel: 604 885 6800 ext 6475

Visit us: [www.scrd.ca](http://www.scrd.ca)  
Follow us on Twitter at [sunshinecoastrd](#)  
Like us on [Facebook](#)

---

This email was scanned by Bitdefender