

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:

C.MILLOY

Christine Milloy
Manager of Corporate Services

Approved:

M.PIAMONTE

Mario Piamonte
Chair, Advisory Planning Commission