

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION – AGENDA – REVISED

Agenda for the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for Monday, December 18, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at Village Hall, 2697 Sunnyside Road, Anmore, BC



1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the Agenda

Recommendation: That the agenda be approved as circulated.

3. Minutes

page 1

(a) Minutes of the Meeting held on October 16, 2017

Recommendation: That the Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held on October 16, 2017 be adopted as circulated.

4. Business arising from the Minutes

5. Unfinished Business

6. New Business

page 6

(a) Infill Development Review

Review of the Infill Development Policy (draft) and text for OCP Amendment (draft), as provided by the Manager of Development Services.

Attachments:

1. Infill Development Policy (draft)
2. OCP Text Amendment (draft)

7. Adjournment

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING – MINUTES

Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting held on Monday, October 16, 2017 in Council Chambers at Village Hall, 2697 Sunnyside Road, Anmore, BC



MEMBERS PRESENT

Garnet Berg (arrived at 7:09 p.m.)
Steve Hawboldt (Vice-Chair)
Ken Juvik
Sandra Parfeniuk (arrived at 7:12 p.m.)
Mario Piamonte (Chair)
Bruce Scatchard

MEMBERS ABSENT

Herbert Mueckel

OTHERS PRESENT

Mayor John McEwen, Council Liaison (arrived at 8:11 p.m.)
Jason Smith, Manager of Development Services

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Piamonte called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

“THAT THE AGENDA BE APPROVED AS CIRCULATED.”

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. MINUTES

(a) **Minutes of the Meeting held on February 28, 2017**

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

“THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2017 BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.”

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(b) **Minutes of the Meeting held on July 10, 2017**

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

“THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON JULY 10, 2017 BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.”

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Nil

6. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Infill Development Review

Jason Smith presented the Infill Development Policy (draft) and text for the draft OCP Amendment. Highlighted points of discussion were captured as follows:

- Initially, infill development came about during the OCP review in 2014, but was then suggested to be discussed at a later date.
- The Mayors' Task Force on Land Use was created and discussions and recommendations on infill development ensued, including talk of semi-rural character, applying for RS-1 zoning, possibly lots between 1 and 2 acres, 25 metre minimal frontage.
- Community Amenity Charges - What it should look like? Allowable areas?
- BC Assessment created an assessment as to how many lots are in the Village.
- Preservation of semi-rural character - what would that look like?
- Council had given direction to staff to work with the APC, and to draft an OCP amendment and policy that would capture the intent of infill development.
- Infill development on steep lots should not be permitted due to challenges with retaining walls, accessibility, 15% grade driveway requirements.
- Calculating 20% slope is done off Lidar data and is not definitive; a topographical survey would be required.
- Members expressed concerns with inaccuracies with the Lidar mapping.
- There are some concerns with cul-de-sac lots and the inability to have a 25 metre frontage; would be penalized.
- Any lot that does not have the required frontage would be ineligible for infill.
- Panhandle lots do not detract from semi-rural character.
- Criteria for eligible lots need to be established.
- The OCP and Zoning Bylaw would apply – the OCP shows how the Village will grow and the Zoning Bylaw sets regulations.
- An OCP amendment is required to increase the limitation and the policy to set clear

criteria of community expectations.

- Infill could be only serving the interest of a smaller population in the Village and risks certain individuals of not being able to participate.
- Some benefits for the Village could be: completion of trail network; protecting riparian areas; additional green space; additional tax revenue; and potential funds for other community amenities.
- Tree protection could be included within the policy to keep the semi-rural character.
- 47% of lots are a true one acre or larger.
- Avoid driveway sharing thus the 25 meter setback.
- Further public consultation will be offered prior to Council decision.
- Intent for a new policy is for infill development only.

Jason Smith presented information on the Infill Development Policy (draft). Member comments were noted as follows:

Eligible Parcels

- Members agreed with a 10-year old parcel criteria, when the parcel was created as opposed to time of ownership.

Parcel Sizes

- With the conversion of British units to metric, there were rounding down errors which resulted in some owners actually having less than an acre.

Road Frontage

- Concerns with parcels on cul-de-sacs and panhandle lots.
- Parcels with less than 25 metre minimum frontage would still meet with the semi-rural character and green space where a cul-de-sac is involved.
- Consider removing the rationale behind the 25 metre minimum frontage.

Setbacks and lot coverage

- Members had no comments or concerns on this topic.

House sizes

- Members had no comments or concerns on this topic.

Community Amenities

- G.P. Rollo & Associates to provide a draft report to be brought forward to the November 7, 2017 Regular Council Meeting.
- Results of the draft report, at some point, will be discussed with the APC.
- Some concerns over a large amount of CAC's coming from a smaller percentage of the community who take part in infill development to accommodate a new community space/municipal hall, as opposed to the community as a whole.
- Chair Piamonte provided a hand out showing a comparison of municipal CAC's, specifically infill development.
- Concerns over the possibilities of high CAC's which could potentially stop owners from infill development.

- Infill development will benefit the whole community as long as it goes towards something 'good' for the Village as opposed to wasting it.
- Mayor McEwen stated that Council agreed that the purpose of CAC's is to go towards a new municipal hall.
- Is the community aware of all costs associated with infill?
- There will be a fixed dollar amount set in a policy to be revisited every couple of years, as market conditions change.

Tree Retention

- Members had no comments or concerns on this topic.

Parking

- Members had no comments or concerns on this topic.

Neighbourhood Impacts

- Members had no comments or concerns on this topic.

Infrastructure

- Members had no comments or concerns on this topic.

Secondary Suites

- Embrace suites to ensure they are built correctly as opposed to refusing them.
- Parking and septic would be built properly if allowing both accessory and secondary suites.

Members expressed opposing views for secondary suites and accessory buildings, as some said that both should not be allowed (i.e. should be one or the other) and some said that, due to growing families, both should be allowed.

Policy RLU-16

- If giving up land due to development, density would stay the same if you had not given up the land.

Area

- Each individual should be able to prove their case to Council.
- If a property is included within the Lidar map as hillside development and is less than 20% steep slope, they should be allowed to come forward.
- The Lidar map should be a guideline only.

On request from members, Jason Smith agreed to bring his draft Infill Development Report to the November 20, 2017 APC meeting for further discussion prior to going to council on December 5, 2017.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

“TO ADJOURN”

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Approved:

Christine Milloy
Manager of Corporate Services

Mario Piamonte
Chair, Advisory Planning Commission

Infill Development Policy

Infill development is the creation of new lots and homes within the already developed area of Anmore. To ensure that this new development maintains and enhances the semi-rural character of the Village the Infill Development Policy has been developed. The policy is intended to provide guidelines and to articulate the community's expectations as to how infill development should take shape.

1. Eligible Parcels – In addition to the requirement that the proposed infill development parcel be located in the Infill Development Area identified in the OCP, the proposed infill development parcel must be at least 10 years old from the date of application for infill development.
2. Parcel Sizes
 - The maximum density that is permitted in the Official Community Plan (OCP) for infill development is 2.04 lots per acre. The expectation is that most new lots created through infill development will be approximately ½ acre in size. Lots as small as 1/3 of an acre will be considered in compelling circumstances such as to enhance tree preservation, the provision of public trails or other community benefit.
3. Road Frontage
 - To maintain the semi-rural character and to maintain green space between homes, all lots created through infill development must have a 25 m frontage on a public highway.
4. Setbacks and lot coverage
 - To maintain the Village of Anmore's semi-rural character and to ensure that new development is consistent with the existing development in the neighbourhood, the RS-1 setbacks and lot coverage requirements must be maintained for all lots.
5. House sizes
 - House size is tied to lot size and homes built on an acre can be twice the size of a half-acre, How to address homes that are larger than what would be permitted on a half-acre. 25%FAR 1 acre – 11000 square feet vs. half acre 5500.
 - Proposal – calculate total permitted FAR for parent parcel, subtract existing built FAR and remainder is what would be permitted to be constructed on new parcel. Consider 10 year covenant restricting FAR and then revert to 25%.

6. Community Amenities

- To ensure that infill development enhances the larger community amenities will be expected, the following amenities are seen as particularly desirable for the community:
 - o Trails – provision of trails, dedicated as part of a public right of way, will be considered to enhance connectivity throughout the Village;
 - o Riparian Areas – Protection of the natural environment is an important value for the Village and preserving riparian areas in public ownership is an important component of protecting this valuable resource; and/or
 - o New Community Space/Municipal Hall – The Village needs a community gathering space and a new municipal hall. This is a costly project for a Village with limited financial means, a financial contribution towards this project would benefit the community, based on an analysis provided by G.P. Rollo and Associates a Community Amenity Contribution of \$XXXXXX would be expected.

7. Tree Retention

- Trees and green space are an important component of the semi-rural character of the Village. Infill development proposals should pursue tree retention and protection plans that exceed to current 20% retention requirement in the Tree Cutting Bylaw for both lots. Trees along the road frontage and between homes are particularly important in maintain the semi-rural character.

8. Parking

- Is there a desire to require different parking requirements or locations beyond RS-1 requirements?

9. Neighbourhood Impacts

- Restrictions beyond what is in the current zoning bylaw for the location of accessory buildings, pools, sport courts or other structures that might impact neighbours.
- Restrictions, beyond those currently governing construction, on the timing of construction (eg. no construction on weekends)

10. Infrastructure

- Financial sustainability is imperative for the Village, therefore any proposed infill development must not require the expansion of public infrastructure, in particular new roads and water lines.

11. Secondary Suites

- Is there a desire to restrict secondary suites or secondary suites in accessory buildings (coach houses) on infill lots?

Policy RLU-16

The Village supports infill development and subsequent creation of a new residences that support the existing semi-rural nature of Anmore. Infill development is the creation of new lots within the existing developed area of the Village of Anmore that are serviced by existing infrastructure. The intent of infill development is that it will enhance and not take away from the look and feel of the neighbourhood – it is expected that any new infill homes will blend into the existing neighbourhood, minimize the disturbance to natural environment and will adhere to the same setbacks as the existing neighbourhood. Infill development should be guided by an Infill Development Policy that outlines the specific requirements that the community expects from infill development to ensure that it meets the intent of this policy.

The density allowed for infill development is 2.04 lots per acre.

Do we want to allow for increased density for infill development proposals that offer to dedicate greenspace be it riparian areas and/or trail corridors?

Area

Infill development RS-1 Zone that is not Hillside Residential

Or

RS-1 Zone and areas that can show that new lots being created is less than average
20%