

DRAFT



Meeting Record

Electoral Area 'H' Official Community Plan Review Community Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, May 24, 6:30 pm – 9:00 pm
Lighthouse Community Hall
240 Lions Way, Qualicum Bay

Members Present:

Jim Crawford	Christo Kuun	Dave Simpson
George Dussault	Bob Leggett	Mac Snobelen
Murray Hamilton	Don Milburn	Dick Stubbs
Margie Healey	Joe Nelson	Laurel Webster
Ed Hughes	Shirley Petrie	Isolde Winter
Bob Hunt	Keith Reid	Manfred Winter

Other Guests Presents:

Dave Wiwehar
Jetty Niet
Al Grozel
Monica Kuun
Kelly Morris
Michael Von Hausen
Amar Bains
Audrie Sands

Others Present: Bill Veenhof, Electoral Area 'H' Director
Paul Thompson, RDN Manager of Long Range Planning
Courtney Simpson, RDN Senior Planner
Jamai Schile, RDN Senior Planner

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS, REVIEW OF AGENDA

Director Veenhof welcomed everyone before turning the meeting over to Planner Simpson.

DRAFT

2. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MEETING RECORDS OF MARCH 22, 2016 AND APRIL 4, 2017

The meeting draft meeting record of April 4, 2017 was accepted as final by general consent.

The draft meeting record of March 22, 2017 was considered final by general consent pending small clarification of a question from a member.

3. PRESENTATION FROM PLANNING STAFF

Planner Simpson presented a few housekeeping items:

- Noted that staff heard that a draft version of the Deep Bay Southwest Scenarios was circulated which could create confusion as the draft version has different numbering of the scenarios. She asked that the draft version be disregarded for clarity.
- Reviewed agenda and structure for the evening.
- Reviewed ground rules.

Planner Simpson gave a presentation on Alternative forms of Rural Development (AFRD) Policies and Deep Bay Southwest scenarios as per the handouts.

The following questions were asked and comments were made on the Alternative Forms of Rural Development policies:

- Clarification that donor area doesn't need to be adjacent to receiver.
- Is a covenant registered on the property title? Yes, this would be a condition of rezoning, and it would remain on the land title of the property.
- Some discussion on AFRD in terms of comparing conventional and alternative, it was noted that no additional dwellings with alternative, but gains park/open space.
- Suggestion that donor areas have to be identified. Possibly consider Dunsmuir as a potential donor area. Staff clarified that the AFRD policies do not apply to Village Centres, as increased density is encouraged in those areas.
- Planner Simpson asked group if they had some ideas/locations of potential donor/receiver properties in order to limit those areas beyond what is currently in the draft.
- Planner Simpson clarified density transfer is not considered "down-zoning" because the some density can be transferred and the donor can receive some benefit.
- Comment on the Deep Bay Southwest proposal - there's a lots of reasons to support this proposal, specifically protecting the bay and the oyster industry.
- Comment that the alternative example of AFRD in the Powerpoint presentation enables access to ponds/ old growth to the public that wouldn't be possible using the conventional design. Comment in support for the alternative subdivision design.
- Some discussion regarding the rezoning process, including public involvement.

DRAFT

- Comment the OCP documents are made by and important to the community and should be for the community's benefit and not for the benefit of a developer.
- Comment in support of alternative subdivision design as it enables wildlife corridors, recreation trails and believed to be better for the community.
- Not concerned about mapping donor areas, but the OCP and zoning are supposed to let you know what your neighbor can do, so there should be more clarity about maximum densities or minimum lot sizes on receiver parcels.
- Planner Simpson confirmed that there is some agreement in the room that receiver areas should be further defined beyond the limitation to the Rural Residential and Rural designations in the OCP Draft. She also provided some feedback based on what staff have previous heard - staff have considered a few options such limiting the receiver areas to those within a water Improvement District area.
- Some discussion on alternative design – the open space could be owned by the original owner or different owner or a conservation organization or local government. This is dealt with through the rezoning and covenant which identifies what is to be protected and by what legal mechanism or mechanisms.
- Planner Simpson noted that she is hearing that the term “public good purposes” (Section 5.10 Objective 2) needs to be re-worded to be more clear to the community.

The following questions were asked and comments were made on the Deep Bay Southwest scenarios:

- Planner Simpson discussed gross/net density and provided some local examples that may be familiar to attendees to help illustrate what different densities look/ “feel” like.
- Question: do you have an example of the density of Lighthouse Landing? Planner Simpson confirmed that she did prepare one, but wasn't able to confirm some of the parkland dedication details in time for the meeting so it hasn't been included in the presentation. She did however pull up a slide she had prepared with Lighthouse Landing density but hadn't previously to show the group.
- Member confirmed that the covenant at Lighthouse Landing protects public access to trails.
- Planner Simpson explained the change in reference name to “Deep Bay Southwest” and what items have been discussed so far as part of the OCP review process.
- Comment on height restriction with respect to fire services. Confirmed images in the presentation are two stories. A Working Group member confirmed that fire department planning on purchasing a ladder truck.

Planner Simpson introduced scenarios and explained that scenario no. 4 (250 additional dwelling units) is what the property owner is proposing. She explained the existing policy (scenario 1) and the new policies scenario 2, 3, 4.

Planner Simpson highlighted the differences between the scenarios in terms of lot size, density, open/public space. She also discussed what was common to all being: access existing and potential future access points temporary access to full public road access.

DRAFT

Planner Simpson added scenarios 2 & 3 don't require amendment to Regional Growth Strategy; scenario 4 would require a Regional Growth Strategy amendment.

Additional comments and questions followed:

- Comment that the numbers don't include secondary suites and need to be more clear/definitive on these matters to be able to make a decision on these different scenarios.
- Comment that the option of secondary suites can be addressed at rezoning in terms or restricted or set minimum parcel size to permit secondary suites.
- Discussion on road access – is the second access in case Gainsburg Road is blocked necessary? Also, considering that the area will only have 6 -7 new dwellings per year.
- Planner Simpson explained that to help focus the discussion on the 4 scenarios we'll go through each scenario and list the pros and cons.

Refreshment Break

Continuation of Deep Bay Southwest scenario discussion. Comments from working group members and guests as recorded on flip charts:

Scenario 1

Pros:

- Lot sizes reason for rural feel we have right now
- Second road for emergency access and possibly construction access
- Accommodates boat trailer traffic
- Possibly small scale development supports local trades (employment) more than a large scale development

Cons:

- No road access to Highway 19a
- Concern about inclusion of sewage disposal and implication of failing systems to aquaculture industry. No post-installation inspections (ex. annual)
- May not be attractive scenario for developer

Comments:

- Current on-site sewer systems of a high standard; water produced is almost drinkable. Cost about \$30,000
- Can include a condition of approval – on-site sewer inspection (ex. annual) – independent contractors
- possible conflict since septic inspectors are also septic installers.
- BSI lands current zoning permits 50 - 60 units including secondary suites. Doesn't require any amenity, so what would the community receive.

DRAFT

Scenario 4 – Comments

Michael Von Hausen, planning consultant for the Deep Bay Southwest property owner, stated that scenario 1 & 2 are off the table as they are not economically viable. He explained that he doesn't build subdivision, he builds communities. Scenario 3 – density transfer is fantastic in certain circumstances. Scenario 4 – provides more certainty for the developers.

Michael Von Hausen went on to say that transfer density is ok if you're working with a conservation organization. But from a developers stand point it's uncertain. Ok if a small area, but challenging for a master planned community. They would need to investigate it further as it may be an additional cost.

Scenario 3

Cons

- Too expensive for transfer
- Escalating costs for transfer

Comments:

- Suggest an alternative scenario somewhere between 50 – 300 .
- Comment that how can the developer say that scenarios 1 and 2 are off the table. Are we being black mailed here and being led to believe that only scenarios 3 & 4 are acceptable? Comment that the examples that Michal Von Hausen suggested from Chillwack/ Vancouver are not necessarily applicable here.
- No more traffic off of Crome Point Road
- Comment that not a threat; not black mail, purely scenarios 1 & 2 are not financially viable. The proposal is designed for future generations to accommodate more diversity of housing and affordability.
- This is a cluster conserving all of the natural features on the site. It's an extension of the Deep Bay community. It's not about numbers it's an intentionally designed community that attracts young people into your community.
- Comment on the community value associated with scenario 4 such as road access. Further reassurance that this is going to be a nice community and the designer/developer has put their heart and soul into it.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 9:00 pm to reconvene the following evening to continue the discussion.