



Meeting Record

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

Tuesday, November 15, 2016 at 6:30 pm
Lighthouse Community Hall

Members Present:

Candace Cowan	Theresa Crawford	Jim Crawford
Diane Eddy	Bill Friesen	Murray Hamilton
Margie Healey	Ed Hughes	Bob Hunt
Marcie Katz	Bob Leggett	Don Milburn
Joe Nelson	Shirley Petrie	Keith Reid
Dave Simpson	Mac Snobelen	John Stathers
Dick Stubbs	Laurel Webster	Isolde Winter
Manfred Winter	Christo Kuun	

Guests Present: Diane Alexander, Nigel Gray, Janet Tauhey

Others Present: Bill Veenhof, Electoral Area 'H' Director
Courtney Simpson, RDN Senior Planner
Jamai Schile, RDN Planner

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS, REVIEW OF AGENDA

Planner Simpson welcomed everyone and relayed that Director Veenhof would be arriving later in the meeting.

Started meeting with one word check-in around the room.

2. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MEETING RECORD OF OCTOBER 18, 2016

There was a request to mention in the meeting record that Planner Simpson had announced that an archaeological overview assessment would be undertaken as part of the OCP Review. Further to this, Planner Simpson told the group that the request for proposals for this project was issued the day before, and is available on the RDN website should anyone be interested in reading it.

3. INTRODUCTION FROM PLANNER

Planner Simpson provided a brief summary of each of the proposals presented at the Community Development Forum on November 1, and possible policy options being considered at this time for changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). She noted that although the Ryvers rezoning application

for residential development behind Magnolia Court was part of the Development Forum, it doesn't require a change to the OCP and a public information meeting will be held for it in the future.

4. DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FORUM PRESENTATIONS

The following comments were made and questions asked by Working Group members.

Baynes Sound Investment (BSI):

- Who makes decision on land use, such as if a developer doesn't satisfy all of the development criteria in the OCP.
- There are other amenities that would be more desirable in Deep Bay such as a new fire hall.
- Can we seek a cash contribution as an amenity?
- Some of the amenities being discussed are addressed as part of a development application, such as water services. Have to use caution not to make development cost prohibitive.
- Discussion on rezoning / development permit process with respect to satisfy conditions such as water supply, fire services, etc prior to final approval. Further discussion on Development Cost Charges and responsibility of the developer to install infrastructure that satisfies current standards.
- Discussion on water supply capacity for Deep Bay Improvement District. Confirmed by a Improvement District Board member that consumption is decreasing, and that they could double current capacity and still have 50% supply available.
- Both Baynes Sound and Cook proposal have a lot of green space, which would be a large contribution to the community that we don't have now.
- Can conditions be put on zoning application approval?
 - Planner Simpson confirmed that yes this can be done and would be part of the BSI policy changes for the OCP.
- Concerns about piecemeal development. Concerns about road access.
- Jim Crawford confirmed that the first thing that BSI will do is to install an internal road to facilitate development of the site and for future use.
- More focus should be placed on developing the OCP policy (rules that we would have to go by) version focusing on the technical details that any development application would have to undergo as part of an approval process.
- Would the OCP designation change from rural to rural residential for the properties?
 - Planner Simpson explained that the OCP designation would stay the same but there will be a policy specific to the property density contingent on construction of a road, and other amenities being discussed.
- Planner Simpson explained that the BSI properties have existing development rights so they could develop under the current policy/ regulations now, although we understand that is not their intent.
- Discussion that changes to the OCP would not change the current zoning. Property owners would also have to rezone to realize their development plans.

Arrowsmith Golf Course

- Concern that the neighbours are not aware of the proposal and should be made aware of it as part of the OCP process if they're not already engaged. It was noted that there is no representation from that neighbourhood on the Working Group.

Horne Lake

- Comment that the original intent of seasonal cottages should be maintained.
- Concern that septic systems and water quality satisfy requirements for year round use.
- Discussed different jurisdictions, Island Health and septic alarm system to alert owners when tank is close to full.
- Confirmed information about current pump and haul bylaw and water license extraction provisions with capacity to spare. Currently, owners can live there 8 months (240 days) per year, so full time occupancy would only add 4 additional months.
- Discussed lake flow and water levels.
- Current OCP designation and zoning for the Horne Lake strata came about as recognizing historic use.

Qualicum Landing

- Qualicum Landing was intentionally developed as a resort development, which allowed for the density and lack of public beach access and parkland dedication. The 180 day residency rule included as a condition of the zoning. The developer entered in to the original agreement and is no longer involved.
- Qualicum Landing is currently a strata subdivision with a strata council.
- Qualicum Landing development improved the area and replacement of the old septic system is an asset.
- Concern about the difficulty of enforcement. The 180 day rule should not be part of any future development.
- Planner Simpson explained that the 180 day limit is in the zoning bylaw and not required specifically in the OCP, so for it to be changed on this property or any others currently in the Commercial 5 zone, the zoning bylaw would have to be changed.
- There was general frustration with the 180 day rule, enforceability and the prospect that other subdivision can be created this way.
- Comment to get rid of resort commercial use. Planner Simpson explained that designation is currently the only designation for any commercial outside of Village Centres, so includes properties such as the Ship and Shore for example.
- Comment that Tofino has similar experience with this type of development.

Crosley Rd Re-alignment

- Discussion in relation to the Magnolia Court rezoning application and their proposed road access beside the ambulance station, and that a better road access would be linked with the new Crosley Road realignment for the Seniors Housing.

Magnolia Court (Ryvers) rezoning application

- Road access is the biggest concern.

- Can the units be more diverse – 1, 2 bedroom units and phased in over time.
- Market may dictate different housing types/size.
- Discussion on tenancy arrangements: rental, ownership, leasing, etc.
- Comment about building in flexibility to allow a proposal to change.
- Planner Simpson clarified that this proposal is subject of a rezoning application, doesn't require a change to the OCP, and that there will be a public information meeting held for it specifically in the future.

Faye Road

- Confirmed proposal and zoning. Rail trail crossing desirable.
- In favour of the proposals because of the road access for the school where if left as 5 acre lots wouldn't get the school access.
- Parents Advisory Council want linkages from the school which are safe, which this proposal would support.

Horne Lake Interchange

- Discussed that the Vancouver Island Highway Agreement, doesn't necessarily prohibit development.
- General support for a petrol station at the proposed location.
- Comment that service / development may address safety concerns as no place to stop between Courtenay and Nanoose.
- Discussion on possible commercial uses that wouldn't detract from Bowser's businesses.
- Discussion on future uses commercial, residential, rest stop as an amenity or a visitor's center like in Cumberland / Courtenay.
- A visitor's center would help to direct travelers to Bowser, etc.
- Can be difficult to grow a business here once it out grows a home based business. Additional, light industrial lands may help to address this.
- Travelling public already using area as a rest stop.
- Need to engage the Spider Lake community regarding this proposal.
- Comment would prefer to limit development to 1 of the 5 lots to avoid creating another village center. Worried about too much development.
- Two types of travelers on the Island. If we want people to come to Bowser you need to slow them down and draw them into Bowser. It worked in Nanoose and there may be an opportunity for Bowser and area, too.

Cook Property

- Support removal from ALR.
- Fabulous opportunity for the community.
- Don't want to lose opportunity with current property owner.
- Unique opportunity to protect low elevation Douglas firs.
- Fortunate to have people in area willing to invest in the community.
- Opportunity to work with the current property owner.
- Comment about road access – is there an opportunity to take BSI Road through Cook Property?

5. REFRESHMENT BREAK

6. DISCUSSION OF DENSITY TRANSFER POLICY

Planner Simpson explained the concept of density transfer and how this can be used for keeping rural lands rural by transferring density from one lot to another and there by leaving the donor lot protected from development in one way or another. Illustrated with a few examples from Denman Island and Gabriola Island.

Planner Simpson referred to handout “draft density transfer policy guidelines” regarding gross and net density calculations. The following questions were asked and comments made:

- How much density can you move?
 - Planner Simpson responded that dependent of servicing, character of neighbourhood. This policy does not set out the density and would leave that to the rezoning, but the transfer has to be density neutral meaning that the number of densities added to a property is equal to the number removed from another property. It is intended to be enabling not limiting.
- Concerned about allowing high density in a rural area.
- In terms of overall land, there not net growth, but it can feel like growth because growth would occur in a concentrated area.
- Concerned that the infrastructure and amenities currently here can't support this type of growth.
 - Planner Simpson added that it is possible to make the policy more complex by limiting it to certain areas or density.
- Discussion on density, how it is calculated and potential implications for overall density.
- Confirmed wouldn't change the overall density just location.
- Can you sell your density?
 - Planner Simpson confirmed yes, density could be bought and sold by private agreement, ie the RDN would not be involved.
- Seems confusing when there isn't a map that identifies where this can happen.
 - Planner Simpson explained that the map on display includes a development potential map showing which parcels currently have density available that could be transferred.
- Confirm that it wouldn't apply to the Bowser Village Center.
- For BSI, could they transfer from Lot A to Lot B to further increase their density from 300 to 600?
 - Planner Simpson confirmed that no, this isn't the intent of this and wouldn't be permitted.
- Confirmed that density transfer would take place as part of a rezoning application and process.
- Concern that Area H would be the first electoral area to include this within their OCP.
- Comment that density transfer provides more opportunity for property owners.
- Planner Simpson confirmed that the remainder parcel would be protected from future development through zoning change plus covenant or transfer to conservation organization.

- There was a discussion about protecting a parcel in “perpetuity” and how long that really is and if there are mechanisms to change that should the wishes of the community change.
- Reference to no. 6, request to ensure there are no high rises.

7. SUMMARY AND CLOSING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 pm