

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT
HALFMOON BAY (AREA B)
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, July 25, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting will be Held Online via ZOOM

CALL TO ORDER

AGENDA

1. Adoption of the Agenda

DELEGATIONS

MINUTES

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 2. Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of April 25, 2023
<i>May 23, & June 27, 2023 Meetings Cancelled</i> | Pages 1 - 3 |
| 3. Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of April 26, 2023
<i>May 31 & June 28, 2023 Meetings Cancelled</i> | pp 4 - 6 |
| 4. Roberts Creek (Area D) APC <i>April 17, May 15 & June 19, 2023 Meetings Cancelled</i> | |
| 5. Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of April 26, & June 28, 2023
<i>May 24, 2023 Meeting Cancelled</i> | pp 7 - 13 |
| 6. West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of April 25, & May 23, 2023
<i>June 27, 2023 Meeting Cancelled</i> | pp 14 - 19 |

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 7. Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research | pp 20 - 21 |
| 8. Planning Enhancement Project (PEP) 2 Phase 1 Policy Fix Micro Project:
Amendment Zoning Bylaw No. 722.9 and 337.123 Watercourse and Shoreline
Protection Amendments | pp 22 - 33 |

NEW BUSINESS

DIRECTORS REPORT

NEXT MEETING

ADJOURNMENT

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 25, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Nicole Huska
	Members	Len Coombes Ellie Lenz Matt Garmon Suzette Stevenson (part) Barbara Bolding (Recorder)
	Director, Electoral Area B	Justine Gabias (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
ABSENT:	Members	Kim Dougherty Alda Grames Kelsey Oxley

CALL TO ORDER 7:03 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented

MINUTES

Halfmoon Bay (Area B) Minutes

The Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC minutes of March 28, 2023 were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023

REPORTS

Re-Referral of Board Policy—Official Community Plan Amendments

The APC continued discussion the Staff Report and draft policy that began at the meeting of March 28, 2023.

The following broad concerns/points/issues were noted:

- Many terms lack definitions and/or descriptions of baselines e.g. affordable housing, climate change, environment. Without an understanding of accepted definitions and relevant baselines, it is impossible to move forward and to assess progress or benefit.
- While the documents refer to the need for “innovation” multiple times, it is not clear how innovation would and should be addressed. E.g. How would an innovative proposal that conflicts with the area OCP be dealt with?
- The staff report explicitly states that the policy “...is not a yardstick, prescription or requirement.”, but the format as presented makes it very difficult for any reader to view it as anything other than some type of checklist of requirements.
- The document does not address the cumulative impact of a proposed OCP amendment
- Last sentence of -first paragraph of the Intent should clearly state that the OCP remains an evaluation criterion.
- The document needs to be reorganized/reordered for a more logical flow and to help clarify priorities. Grammar, use of jargon and repetition need to be tightened up. However, there is not much point in providing specific comments at the moment because presumably the document will evolve through a number of iterations. It is frustrating and disappointing to have been told that the only opportunity for APCs to comment is at this very early stage. There are community members who have knowledge and skills to provide helpful editorial comment that would likely be of benefit to the document.

Additional points were noted:

- 4C—Protecting or enhancing farmland is not applicable as most ALR land is forested and not farmable.
- 4F—can’t force landowner to maintain a wildlife corridor.
- 5—Climate/Climate Resilience. Need to quantify (or at least define).
- 5B—Resilient design as a requirement will be a barrier to housing creation.
- 6—Need baseline data to ensure Community Health and Equity is achieved.
- 6—Lead this section with e) Childcare and i) Affordability (and define affordability).
- Additional costs to developer/development. Does the SCRD Board and Planning Department. acknowledge more costs to the developer equals higher cost of housing on the coast?
- How many of these “criteria” does a development have to meet?

Recommendation No.1 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that more fulsome definitions of terms used in the policy document be incorporated into the document or be cross-referenced with terms that currently exist in other SCRD documents.

Recommendation No.2 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that staff explain how “innovative criteria” will be considered and incorporated into a review of an amendment application.

Recommendation No.3 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that:

- a) “Considerations” replace “Criteria” as the second, level 1 heading in the draft policy
- b) The bullets under the level 2 headings 1-10 be changed to a narrative that clearly indicates the items are examples for proponents to consider.

Recommendation No.4 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that **Cumulative Impact** be added to the policy as an additional “Consideration”, and that cumulative impact take into account effects on the:

- Immediate area
- Neighbourhood
- Electoral area
- Other Electoral areas/entire lower Sunshine Coast

Recommendation No.5 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that the wording of the last sentence of the 1st paragraph be changed to “...evaluated against the OCP and the criteria below.”

Recommendation No.6 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that a revised draft of this policy be referred to all APCs for a 2nd review.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

The Director’s report was received.

NEXT MEETING Tuesday, May 23, 2023 via Zoom

ADJOURNMENT 8:30 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA A - EGMONT/PENDER HARBOUR ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 26, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PENDER HARBOUR/EGMONT (AREA A) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD AT PENDER HARBOUR SECONDARY SCHOOL, 13639 SUNSHINE COAST HIGHWAY, MADEIRA PARK, BC

PRESENT:	Chair	Alan Skelley
	Members	Yovhan Burega Jane McOuat Dennis Burnham Gordon Littlejohn Catherine McEachern Bob Fielding
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area A Director	Leonard Lee (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Area A Alternate Director	Christine Alexander (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Kelly Kammerle
REGRETS:	Members	Sean McAllister Tom Silvey

CALL TO ORDER 7:00 p.m.

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Sean McAllister was acclaimed as Vice Chair

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

Area A Minutes

The Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023 were approved as circulated.

The following minutes were received for information:

- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023

REPORTS

Re-Referral Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

The Area A APC discussed the staff report regarding Re-Referral Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments with the following comments:

- Has the potential to discourage developers as it is too detailed.
- More general terms are needed and should be opened for new ideas from developers.
- Written well but is not practical for all OCP's.

Recommendation No.1 *Re-Referral Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area A APC recommended that the Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments as presented not be supported for the following reasons:

- A “one size fits all Areas policy” does not seem appropriate for the rural areas, in particular Area A, because we have no public transit and over 50% of homes are recreational or “second” homes where affordable housing (or any increased density) may not be compatible with large minimum area subdivision requirements.
- In an effort to assist with housing and climate change issues, the proposed policy is creating an additional level of compliance, beyond those identified in the OCP. This could deter development initiatives.
- It is hard to discern what “best planning practices” are or where they have come from. They go well beyond the community vision and objectives set out in the Area A OCP, which were developed after extensive community consultation and legally adopted through the public hearing and by-law adoption process. Many of the policies venture into social engineering policies beyond the jurisdictional authority of regional Districts.
- Many terms used in the draft policy have no specific meaning: For example:
 - 2 (e) What are “complete community and low-carbon land use attributes?”
 - 5 (a) “Climate Risk Assessment?”
 - 6 (a) an “equity lens?”
 - How do you define an “equity-deserving group?”
 - “Affordable Housing?”
- The criteria needs to be specific, measurable and relevant to the specific land location. If this cannot be achieved, it is rather meaningless. Broader wording (closer to that in the DVP amendment policy) would be more relevant.
- The criteria should be prioritized. Which considerations are critical? Which are preferred, but not essential? Are any safe to ignore because they have no relevance? Which are merely desired?
- Suggest adding “compatible with existing nearby community character, land use and density” as a criteria.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING May 31, 2023

ADJOURNMENT 8:55 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA E – ELPHINSTONE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 26, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ELPHINSTONE (AREA E) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD AT FRANK WEST HALL, 1224 CHASTER ROAD, ELPHINSTONE, BC

PRESENT:	Chair	Mary Degan
	Members	Rod Moorcroft Nara Brenchley Arne Hermann Clinton McDougall Anthony Paré Michael Sanderson Laura Macdonald (by zoom)
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area E Director	Donna McMahon (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Alternate Director	Ashley St. Clair (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Vicki Dobbyn

CALL TO ORDER 7:04 p.m.

AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

MINUTES

Area E Minutes

The Area E APC minutes of March 29, 2023 were approved as circulated.

It was noted the minutes were amended to align with SCRD's corporate minute standard and did not entirely reflect the concerns expressed at the meeting. There is a training planned for APC Chairs and Recording Secretaries where we should get clarity on the content and format of minutes. Director McMahon has asked for flow charts to explain Planning processes. Questions that arose from this discussion included:

- Is there a protocol for giving input to MOTI?
- Why doesn't planning staff attend APC meetings? It is probably an issue of capacity.
- Has there been consideration of the SCRD becoming a municipality? This is a complex

issue with many cost implications.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023

REPORTS

Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

This draft policy was referred to the APC for feedback. Feedback included the following key points of discussion regarding OCPs and how they are revised:

- OCPs are usually updated every five to ten years, with the process for each update taking about two years.
- What is the specific process for updating the OCPs? The *Local Government Act* is the starting point, but there are details not covered in the Act.
- The APC would like to see a “roadmap” of how OCPs are reviewed that would include an itemized checklist including how community consultation is achieved and how members for a consulting committee are chosen.
- What is the role of the Elphinstone Community Association in OCP review or other planning matters?
- It was noted that the District of Sechelt has one OCP but there are sections for the different neighbourhoods. It was suggested that in the SCRDP OCP updating process one consolidated OCP be developed for sections that are the same in all areas, thereby eliminating the need to duplicate certain sections. OCP sections that are unique for each rural area could be added.
- A unified OCP was just completed in the Cowichan Valley Regional District and this may be a model for the SCRDP.
- It is suggested that all APCs get together for discussion.

Following are key points of discussion on the draft policy:

- There was positive support for the draft policy as it indicated a direction to harmonize some sections of OCPs.
- Accessible active transportation promotes sustainable, resilient, and affordable transportation options which have positive environmental impacts. Therefore, the policy needs more emphasis on accessibility for active transportation, that is, non-car transportation that includes cycling and pedestrians.
- There is also a need for connectivity for active transportation, linking neighbourhoods, and providing access to commercial and community locations.
- There is lot of subjective language (for example, “significant” and “appropriate”) so it would be clearer if some metrics were added.
- There should be a requirement for developers to meet the higher levels of the BC Energy Step Code, and include consideration for the carbon emissions under the new provincial Zero Carbon Step Code.

- How will SCRD prioritize the 13 criteria? Which is most important? Is it in the order presented in the draft? Section 4 Environmental Enhancement should be a priority.
- The APC members would like SCRD staff to bring this draft policy to a meeting and give examples of how they would apply it. This would be done by going through an actual application and weighing and assessing the application against the criteria.
- It was noted that there are lots of good ideas in the draft policy.
- Will developers get this policy ahead of time to facilitate getting better applications?
- APC members are grateful for the opportunity the draft policy creates for a more positive development direction and hope these criteria are reflected in the updated OCPs.
- The APC would like to see the final version of the draft policy. It will show up in the agenda for the Electoral Area Services agenda.
- As structured the proposed OCP Amendment Framework is too open to varying interpretation by an applicant preparing an amendment and the municipality reviewing the submission. The framework includes a long list of criteria covering a wide range of planning, quasi planning, and non-planning matters. Greater clarity is required on how it should be interpreted and reviewed. Are the criteria to be interpreted/reviewed subjectively, quantitatively, or both? Will some/all of the criteria be weighted, ranked, scored out of 10, etc. or will some be a simple yes/no response, etc.? A framework that provides consistency in interpretation, preparation and review of an application is essential to successful use by both the municipality and industry when considering an amendment to the senior municipal planning document.

Recommendation No. 1 *Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area E APC recommended that feedback on the draft policy wording be considered as follows (in italics):

1. Location

d) Proposed development eliminates direct vehicular driveway access to the Sunshine Coast Highway and seeks to limit or reduce direct vehicular driveway access to other arterial roads *Add “and seeks to redirect vehicular access to a secondary feeder road”*

Add f) create transportation corridors and trail networks so people can freely and safely move using active transportation.

2. Land Use Compatibility and Density

f) If located at or near a rural-municipal edge, proposal responds to adjacent municipal land use planning *Add “that includes consideration for multi-modal transportation options”*

4. Environmental Enhancement

Add g) “The application includes best management practices (BMPs) for Integrated storm management, and also use BMPs for environmental management, road construction (grades), tree preservation, and ensuring stable slopes. Technical information related to these matters should also be included with the application for SCRD review and provided to the APC for its review of the application.

5. Climate Resilience & Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

5. a) iv. *Delete “opportunity”*

8. Affordable Housing

8. a) ii. *Add “and creates higher density near transportation hubs.”*

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING – WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2023, 7:00 PM BY ZOOM.

ADJOURNMENT 9:24 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA E – ELPHINSTONE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 28, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA E ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT FRANK WEST HALL, 1224 CHASTER ROAD, ELPHINSTONE, BC

PRESENT:	Chair	Mary Degan
	Members	Laura Macdonald Nara Brenchley Arne Hermann Clinton McDougall Anthony Paré Michael Sanderson
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area E Director	Donna McMahon (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	ALR00024 Applicant	Mohammad Charkhchi
	Recording Secretary	Vicki Dobbyn
	Public	2
REGRETS:		Rod Moorcroft

CALL TO ORDER 7:02 p.m.

AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

MINUTES

Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of April 26, 2023 were approved as circulated.

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of April 26, 2023
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of April 25, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of April 25 & May 23, 2023

REPORTS

Proposed Agricultural Land Reserve Exclusion (ALC67287, SCRDLR00024) 508 Pratt Road, Elphinstone

Key points of discussion:

- This report was referred to the APC at the request of the Area E Director as a good learning opportunity about example of the pressures on our ALR.
- The applicant was under the impression that the zoning permitted commercial uses based on a document received from an accountant from the estate from which the property was brought. The estate was handled by the Office of the Public Trustee. The applicant may not have understood the limitations of the ALR designation or the challenges of obtaining an exclusion from the ALR.
- The applicant and his party described uses for the property that they were proposing. It was clarified to the applicant that the APC was not considering uses for the property, but was only considering the application for exclusion from the ALR. It was suggested to the applicant that he research what is permitted in the ALR, that he use the services of a planning consultant to explore permitted uses in the ALR, and that he look at examples locally and in other jurisdictions.
- Members discussed the importance for our community to maintain ALR zoning in order to preserve food security into the future.
- Members requested that the following input from a member be included in the minutes as reasoning for its recommendation:

Regarding the Exclusion Application at 508 Pratt Road:

Elphinstone OCP Objective 1: Preserve Class 1 to 4 Agricultural Land. The property has the following CLI (Canada Land Inventory Ratings for Agricultural Land):

Unimproved Classification: 5:4AWD-3:4W-2:4A

What this means is that without any improvements the land is designated **Class 4** with various limitations (50% with AWD Limitations, 2% with W Limitations and 20% with A Limitations): A- Soil Moisture Deficiency, D-Undesirable Soil Structure, W-Excess Water.

The Agricultural Land Commission looks very closely at the CLI Classification in making a decision. More important for the ALC than the Unimproved Classification is the **"Improved" Classification**. This reflects the assumption that the noted limitations can be overcome with appropriate soil improvement techniques by the owner.

Improved Classification: 5:2AD-3:2WA-2:2AT.

With some type of improvement, even though some of the limitations may still be present, the Improved designation is **Class 2 Soil**.

Elphinstone OCP Objective 5: Protect Existing and Future Agricultural Activities. The property is immediately south of the Banditry Cider Farm/Orchard. The "Plans" submitted, particularly the long-term plan, provide no buffers to either the Banditry Cider Orchard to the north or the agricultural lands to the south.

Elphinstone OCP Objective 6: Support the ALC in protecting agricultural lands and opportunities. The proposed exclusion, if approved, would result in another "island" of non-agricultural residential uses surrounded by ALR lands. The Fircrest Road subdivision will likely

not be viewed by the ALC as a precedent.

Recommendation No.1 *Proposed Agricultural Land Reserve Exclusion (ALC67287, SCRD ALR00024) 508 Pratt Road, Elphinstone*

The Area E APC recommends supporting Option 1 of the report, the staff's recommendation to deny the application.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING JULY 26, 2023

ADJOURNMENT 8:30 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA F – WEST HOWE SOUND ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 25, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WEST HOWE SOUND (AREA F) ADVISORY PLANNING
COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair (Acting)	Miyuki Shinkai
	Members	Dave Haboosheh Kevin Healy Ryan Matthews ^[1] _{SEP} Jonathan McMorran
ALSO PRESENT:	Director, Electoral Area F	Kate-Louise Stamford (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Diane Corbett
REGRETS:	Members	Susan Fitchell Tom Fitzgerald Katie Thomas ^[1] _{SEP}

Prior to the meeting, it was arranged by email that Miyuki Shinkai would assume the Chair position in light of the anticipated absence at this meeting of the Chair and Vice Chair.

CALL TO ORDER 7:05 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

West Howe Sound (Area F) Minutes

The West Howe Sound (Area F) APC minutes of March 28, 2023 were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments

APC members commented on themes in the minutes of the APCs with regards to the draft Official Community Plan Amendments Board Policy; there were similar ideas and struggles across the APCs, and issues, questions and complexity around “affordable” housing and densification.

REPORTS

Re-Referral Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments

The APC discussed the re-referred draft Board Policy on Official Community Plan Amendments. The following observations and comments were noted:

- Am wrapping mind around what it means for an OCP to be “renewed”.
- There is a contrast or contradiction to wanting the area to stay this way forever, and needing a place for the grandkids to live. The evolving nature of OCPs is related to having more people. Every person added needs more water.
- Metro Vancouver is more defined, saying: we are going to have x amount of people here over next x years; who will take what? If you want transit and community services, you’ll have to accept this many people, and will have to put them on a route that has transit. My experience is there is too much money spent on studies going in circles, rather than saying: here’s money for water, or build a trail.
- Water supply issue is something that can be solved, but is an extensive solution. There are opportunities there. There is a need to tie new development to progressing towards more water.
- Inquiry about exploring development of Squamish Nation lands on the Sunshine Coast and consulting with Squamish Nation. Do they have to comply with OCPs? Will the land be exclusively for First Nations? Could that be a source of truly affordable housing for development close to transit?
- Comment received by email prior to meeting was read aloud: Would like to see criteria that more clearly prohibits the planting of invasive species if the property is adjacent to a water source such as stream, creek, river, lake, or ocean, as well as crown land.
- Invasive species are normally an issue whether or not it’s a riparian area. It is throwing off the historical balance of what was there before. Would want that criterion broad-based.
- Invasive species are everywhere... It is hard to determine what is an invasive species.
- Like the way the Board Policy is laid out; it is easy to go through.
- Appreciation that staff included for consideration in the report the piece on current trends in inquiries, new applications and recent application reviews.
- I like the idea of being bold in providing housing, and not just densifying to solve the housing problem, but also bringing a community benefit.
- The report seemed to be pointing toward directing applicants to say: additional housing is great, but there needs to be something more, like trails or other community amenities. I didn’t like that part of it. Say why would I want this in my neighbourhood, other than the greater good? There are 8 billion people now. Where are you going to put these people?
- This policy requires a bit more responsibility from applicants. They have to read through this amendment policy to see if their desire to create investment is the right place to be. We are asking for stewardship on their part. It will encourage applicants to be more responsible and consider the future of the Sunshine Coast and support for each other’s

well being.

- Are there any guidelines for potential developers?
- Was unsure of what we were to do with this report. Was unsure about what this is about. Would like more time for discussion and feedback. What was asked for us for this meeting was not intuitive.
- Point 9, Economy: the economy part is important for the next generation to continue; would like to see a bit more detail on that.
- Reconciliation and Heritage Conservation sections: could have more criteria.
- Topography section: perhaps could have more information.
- This will be a guideline to start to fill the gap with the old Official Community Plans.

Interest was expressed in an opportunity to get together with other areas' APCs to hear the presentation of the amendments.

Director Stamford responded to APC members' inquiries and comments. The Director invited APC members to send to her any further ideas they may have on the draft Board policy that she could pass to the Board.

Recommendation No. 1 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area F APC recommended support for the outline and the value statements as presented in the report titled Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING Tuesday, May 23, 2023

The Director thanked Miyuki for taking on the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT 8:30 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA F – WEST HOWE SOUND ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 23, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WEST HOWE SOUND (AREA F) ADVISORY PLANNING
COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Susan Fitchell
	Members	Ryan Matthews Miyuki Shinkai Katie Thomas
ALSO PRESENT:	Director, Electoral Area F	Kate-Louise Stamford (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	SCRD Planner II	Alana Wittman (part)
	Recording Secretary	Diane Corbett
	Public	2 (part)
REGRETS:	Members	Jonathan McMorran Kevin Healy
ABSENT:	Members	Tom Fitzgerald Dave Haboosheh

CALL TO ORDER 7:05 pm

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

West Howe Sound (Area F) Minutes

The West Howe Sound (Area F) APC minutes of April 25, 2023 were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of April 26, 2023
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of April 25, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of April 26, 2023

REPORTS

Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 722.6 for 268 Stella Maris Road

The APC discussed the staff report regarding Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 722.6, a proposal to amend the zoning and subdivision district to enable subdivision and future residential development at 268 Stella Maris Road in West Howe Sound.

Planner II Wittman gave an overview of the current and proposed zoning and the application process, and responded to APC members' inquiries. It was noted the applicant was looking at bringing the zoning into compliance with the Official Community Plan.

Dustin Christmas of Landev Consulting provided comments related to the proposed development in response to APC inquiries. The owner was present as an observer.

Comments from APC members included:

- Attended the public information meeting. Two or three people at the meeting were concerned about even existing traffic, especially in the snow. I do walk the neighbourhood in question quite a bit. I counted the number of cars that did go past me while I walked at different times (4pm, 5pm, a long weekend), cognizant of how much traffic there was. It was one vehicle every 45 minutes. It is possible that what the person at the meeting was concerned about is that quite a few people have put hedges at the edge of the road, and not left an area to get off the road; this can make people nervous. Maybe when subdividing, make sure there's a shoulder to get off the road.
- I favour the R2 zoning because it allows two separate buyers for a property. That would make it quite a bit more affordable. There aren't many of the existing owners in this area who have put in an auxiliary dwelling; but there is a huge cost to that. Not being able to stratify that, with two separate titles, puts a lot of stress on the other buyer if doing something together. R2 does give more options for making it "affordable", for people that are looking to have a bigger property. .5 acre makes it quite expensive.
- If it is to be rezoned and the OCP is supporting it, R2 zoning is preferred. Think it is necessary to allow for those duplex homes, because house prices are ridiculous.
- Regarding traffic: not many cars come down St. Andrews; it is a quiet road. The issue with residents on the road is they are used to a quiet road. Also in recent years a subdivision went through. It has made a bit of a through road section. Sometimes at night some people drive as quickly as they can down the road. The road is really wide; if there is only one car, it makes you drive faster. If you want people to slow down, make the road narrower. If people park on the road, people slow down, and make it safer for pedestrians. It is a bit of a route for cyclists now so they don't have to go around North Road bend.
- People are worried about water supply; we are heading into summer, and it is big issue. Having fourteen homes and more people living in the area: do we have enough water supply? Can we sustain water supply in the summer time? This is a concern of residents in the area.
- I have concerns about the storm water. It might not go to a public hearing because it is a zoning bylaw amendment. If it goes to R2, it might be good idea for the SCRD to do a public hearing – it seems to be a bit scary for people to go to that... it is more of a perceived difference in density.
- On St. Andrews, there are a few houses that were supposed to have 10-year rain retention. But there are a lot of houses that don't retain the water. I am at the beach below St. Andrews; there is a pipe into ocean, with dirty water. There is eelgrass getting

flooded out by mud. Have concern with the slope of the hill coming out of Langdale. It is a steep hill with a lot of blow downs. Have concerns about storm water management. Is anyone looking at: "you have to put in a containment tank, and take rainwater off the house and save it to sprinkle the yard"? Are you looking at making this mandatory? Why isn't SCRD saying "if you build, put in water retention"?

- Regarding storm water management, SCRD doesn't have anything on the footprint of the impermeable area. Maybe SCRD should consider the footprint of the impermeable area, and lots shouldn't be fully impermeable. Water should run into soil rather than ditches and storm drains. Reduce run-off.
- Affordable housing contribution: the report talks about \$6500 per lot. I think that is too small. Policies in Gibsons and Sechelt for a single family lot are looking at \$10,000 per new lot; that is something we should be looking at, especially when looking at house prices now. We have a housing crisis now.
- Occasionally you can go through a process and create a term sheet; it is negotiated with the Regional District and the developer as a way to negotiate things for the community. The developer is allowed to have the zoning amendment if they follow through with the asks for these requests. The housing contribution would be part of that. Request for rainwater retention: if this lot were to be subdivided, then the development would need a covenant that has rainwater retention. Have something for the developer about land left for trails. Requests that have been asked for would go ahead if the zoning goes through.
- Looking between the dotted yellow and the gray-coloured lots (north of the subject parcel, page 18 of agenda), it is really steep, but once down around Langdale Creek, there are incredible trails. A lot of the land is owned by MOTI down there. Trails going through there over to Langdale Creek area could create quite a trail network.
- The primary affordable housing contribution, created between staff and applicant, is not enough for development of a new lot. These days rental is \$2000+ per month. Have it higher.
- APC received comments from member by email before the meeting:
 - I do support carriage houses on these sites to give some diversity of use.
 - The terrain is quite steep so I expect that tree retention will be difficult. It would be beneficial to break up the ongoing clear cut sense up along there if there could be a cluster of trees that are maintained, but customizing some of the building envelopes and/or a commitment to planting as part of the development works, even if it is lower canopy plantings to break up the hillside.
 - I think stormwater features will be critical on that hillside as there have been issues of wash out below; this can be achieved if integrated with proper sediment and erosion control measures.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING Tuesday, June 27, 2023

ADJOURNMENT 8:52 pm

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT REFERRAL

TO: Halfmoon Bay Advisory Planning Commission - July 17, 2023

AUTHOR: Yuli Siao, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the referral be reviewed and feedback be provided.

This referral is made as per SCRD resolution below regarding the SCRD Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research adopted on June 8, 2023.

The SCRD Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research Reports can be found at:

<https://letstalk.scrd.ca/growth>

Please note that these reports, as in their final form as submitted by the consulting firm which prepared them, are for information only. The SCRD is seeking feedback on accuracy and completeness of the data in the reports, to help to prepare a supplemental document.

SCRD Resolution on Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research

THAT the report titled Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research Reports be received for information;

AND THAT the following recommendations be approved as the next steps for the SCRD Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research project:

1. Refer the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research Reports to other local governments, Islands Trust, Gambier Local Trust Committee, First Nations and Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commissions inviting feedback.
2. Refer the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research Reports to School District 46, Vancouver Coastal Health, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Sunshine Coast Resource Centre, Sunshine Coast Community Services Society, Sunshine Coast Farmers' Institute, BC Ferries Corporation, Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Committee, inviting feedback.
3. Continue development of a Let's Talk SCRD page to gather comments and ideas from community groups and the community.
4. Refer the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Regional Growth Framework Baseline Research Reports to the SCRD Strategic Planning process.
5. Staff to use the Regional Growth Baseline Framework as a key input for the PEP2 (Official Community Plan Renewal) project.
6. Encourage other local governments to use the Regional Growth Baseline Framework as a key input for any upcoming Official Community Plan updates or renewals.

7. Staff to prepare a set of options for next steps / implementation to consider, beyond integration with strategic plans and Official Community Plans, following receipt of referral comments and Let's Talk input for a timeline of Q3/Q4 2023.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF MEMO

TO: Advisory Planning Commissions, 2023 Quarter 3

AUTHOR: Alana Wittman, Planner II

Julie Clark, Senior Planner

**SUBJECT: PLANNING ENHANCEMENT PROJECT (PEP) 2 PHASE 1 POLICY FIX MICRO
PROJECT: AMENDMENT ZONING BYLAW NO. 722.9 AND 337.123
WATERCOURSE AND SHORELINE PROTECTION AMENDMENTS**

RECOMMENDATIONS

**THAT the report titled PLANNING ENHANCEMENT PROJECT (PEP) 2 PHASE 1 POLICY
FIX MICRO PROJECT: AMENDMENT ZONING BYLAW NO. 722.9 AND 337.123
WATERCOURSE AND SHORELINE PROTECTION AMENDMENTS be received;**

**AND THAT the Advisory Planning Commissions review and provide recommendation(s)
to SCRD Board.**

This referral is related to proposed changes to SCRD zoning bylaws, as part of initial stages of the PEP 2 (OCP renewal) project. Phase 1 of this project involves several micro projects over the coming months to address urgent policy and regulation needs. The focus of this micro project is updating SCRD riparian regulations to recognize watercourses and shorelines as critical community assets for climate resilience. Staff are interested in APC feedback on these proposed zoning bylaw amendments and expect that the feedback will be insightful for this project as well as other upcoming policy work.

SCRD EAS Committee of the Board is scheduled to review and provide direction on this report on July 21, 2023. You may wish to watch the meeting live or recorded to see the Committee's discussion. <https://www.scrd.ca/agendas/>

If staff receive direction to proceed with the process to amend the zoning bylaws, the intention is to bring the next report to Committee in the fall 2023, after APC referral comments are received. APC referrals for this item are scheduled in July (Areas A,B,E,F) and September (Area D), based on available APC scheduling at the time of report authoring.

Please see the attached report.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Electoral Area Services Committee – July 20, 2023

AUTHOR: Alana Wittman, Planner II
Julie Clark, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: **PLANNING ENHANCEMENT PROJECT (PEP) 2 PHASE 1 POLICY FIX MICRO PROJECT:
AMENDMENT ZONING BYLAW NO. 722.9 AND 337.123 WATERCOURSE AND
SHORELINE PROTECTION AMENDMENTS**

RECOMMENDATION(S)

- (1) THAT the report titled Planning Enhancement Project (PEP) 2 Phase 1 Policy Fix Micro Project: Amendment Zoning Bylaw No. 722.9 and 337.123 Mitigation Watercourse and Shoreline Protection Amendments be received for information;**
 - (2) AND THAT Zoning Bylaw No. 722.9 and 337.123 be considered for First Reading;**
 - (3) AND FURTHER THAT Zoning Bylaw No. 722 and 337 be referred to agencies and Advisory Planning Commissions for comment.**
-

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to present amendments to Zoning Bylaw 722 and 337 to the Board for consideration of First Reading.

The proposed housekeeping amendments will:

1. Align with Provincial legislative requirements and guidelines;
2. Operationalize OCPs; and
3. Enhance consistency, clarity, and efficiency in the development approvals process.

These amendments were identified through the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Planning Enhancement Project 2 (PEP2). PEP2 is a multi-year project to review and update the SCRD's Official Community Plans (OCP) and all related bylaws and policies that operationalize the OCPs.

An update on this project, including reference to forthcoming proposals for emergency micro-policy amendments, was provided to the May 18 Electoral Areas Services Committee. Several emergency policy fixes are underway. SCRD recently repealed the Board Policy on Geotechnical Risk as it was outdated and misaligned with current Provincial Geotechnical best practices. Additionally, an OCP Amendment Board Policy is under development to foster best practices in developing and reviewing OCP amendment applications.

Policy Context

SCRD land use policies (OCPs) express a strong commitment to protecting sensitive ecological areas, which is not fully operationalized through the zoning bylaws. In proposing to fix this gap,

the zoning amendments would implement a key element of the community's vision. This fix has significant benefit to the community and SCRD: by protecting green infrastructure, we strategically foster climate resilience and mitigate organizational risk.

Clarity & Efficiency

In addition, the proposed amendments enhance efficiency in the development approval process by providing consistency with provincial regulations and guidelines as well as amongst SCRD Electoral Areas. This consistency creates regulatory clarity for developers, property owners, and staff. Such improvements to SCRD's policy framework have been identified as a need through the Development Approvals Process Review (DAPR).

DISCUSSION

Analysis

Currently, SCRD's two Zoning Bylaws 337 and 722 are not aligned with each other or provincial requirements and guidelines when it comes to development regulations related to sites containing or adjacent to waterbodies and watercourses. Of note, both Zoning Bylaw 337 and 722 currently allow for Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEAs) to be considered developable area at time of subdivision.

SCRD Planning staff have received direct guidance from Provincial Riparian Biologists that zoning amendments to rectify this policy conflict are required. Similarly, Zoning Bylaw 337 and 722 do not consistently apply setbacks from waterbodies and watercourses, and neither bylaw provides adequate protection from development adjacent to SPEAs.

Specific proposed changes include:

1. Parcel area calculation in Bylaw 722 and Bylaw 337;
2. Buffer from SPEA in Bylaw 722 and Bylaw 337; and
3. Enhanced setbacks from waterbodies and watercourses in Bylaw 337.

Proposed Amendment 1: Parcel Area Calculation

Staff propose amendments to Bylaw 722, Section 4.3.1 as well as Bylaw 337, Sections 402 and 404, related to calculating parcel area when subdividing land. The proposed amendment aims to enhance climate resilience through protection of natural assets and reduce the organizational risk of approving proposed lots that are susceptible to increasingly frequent and intense precipitation events (atmospheric rivers). By aligning SCRD policies with provincial regulations and best practices, subdivision application processing times could be reduced by providing clear expectations to applicants and limiting back-and-forth referrals between SCRD Planning and the Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulation (RAPR) Team.

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 722, Section 4.3.1:

Current:

The calculation of minimum parcel area shall not include:

- a) Area to be used for community sewer field and equipment;

- b) Area to be dedicated for public open space, park or returned to the Province, except as permitted by the *Strata Property Act*; or
- c) Area to be dedicated as a highway

Proposed Add:

- d) Area of land covered by flowing or standing water, including, without limitation, a lake, pond, river, creek, spring, ravine, or wetland, whether or not usually containing water;
- e) Area of land that contains a Stream Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), as established under the *Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations*.

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 337, Section 402

Current:

The minimum parcel area shall be determined by:

- (1) the minimum average parcel size, the minimum individual parcel size, the minimum usable parcel area and other subdivision options in the applicable subdivision district;
- (2) the minimum site area required under this bylaw for the intended use of the parcel; and
- (3) the servicing requirements applying to the parcel.

Proposed Add:

- (4) excluding the following areas from the calculation of minimum parcel area
 - (i) area to be used for community sewer field and equipment;
 - (ii) area to be dedicated for public open space, park or returned to the Province, except as permitted by the *Strata Property Act*;
 - (iii) area to be dedicated as a highway;
 - (iv) area of land covered by flowing or standing water, including, without limitation, a lake, pond, river, creek, spring, ravine, or wetland, whether or not usually containing water; or
 - (v) area of land that contains a Stream Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), as established under the *Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations*.

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 337, Section 404:

Current:

The calculation of average parcel area shall not include land:

- (a) used or dedicated for public open space, park, returned to crown, highway, or community sewer field and equipment; or
- (b) lying beneath a waterbody.

Proposed replacement for (b) and add (c):

- (b) covered by flowing or standing water, including, without limitation, a lake, pond, river, creek, spring, ravine, or wetland, whether or not usually containing water; or
- (C) that contains a Stream Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), as established under the *Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations*.

Precedent for the proposed amendment:

- City of Surrey Zoning Bylaw 12000
- District of Mission Consolidated Zoning Bylaw 2940-2020

Proposed Amendment 2: Buffer from Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEA)

Staff propose amendments to Bylaw 337, Section 515 and Bylaw 722, Section 5.16 related to protecting the long-term integrity and health of the SPEA. Given that existing and future trees within the SPEA have roots and branches that extend into the developable portion of a property, the proposed bylaw amendment would require all buildings, structures, and hardscaping to be situated a minimum of 5 m away from the SPEA boundary to ensure that there is adequate space for protecting natural assets and ensuring that land alteration activity does not intrude on the SPEA.

This proposal results from Planning, Building and Bylaw staff observations that a lack of regulatory clarity contributes to a pattern of land alteration infractions. Land alteration in the SPEA triggers bylaw compliance investigations and remedial development permit processes, which are time consuming and expensive for property owners and staff alike.

The implementation of a mandatory 5m SPEA buffer will provide community clarity around the protection of critical natural assets. To implement the regulation, the following definition is proposed to be added to Bylaw 337 and 722:

Hardscaping means any human-made element made from inanimate materials like gravel, brick, wood, pavers, stone, concrete, asphalt, or similar material. Examples of hardscaping include landscaped elements (e.g., patio, deck, stone wall, pavers, etc.), retaining walls, roads/parking lots, campground pads, and fill placement.

The amendment is also aimed at providing more efficient processing of development that is adjacent to a SPEA by setting simplified and consistent regulatory expectations. Moreover, the buffer provides protection to the natural features, functions, and conditions in the SPEA; a critical green infrastructure asset that strengthens the region's resilience to climate change impacts.

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 337, Section 515:

- Current: There is no SPEA buffer in Bylaw 337 at this time.
- Proposed Add: Notwithstanding any other provision of this bylaw, and for the purpose of protecting the long-term integrity and health of Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEA), no buildings, structures, hardscaping, or any part thereof shall be constructed, reconstructed, moved, located or extended within 5 metres of an established SPEA boundary.

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 722, Section 5.16:

- Current: There is no SPEA buffer in Bylaw 722 at this time.

- Proposed Add: No buildings, structures, hardscaping, or any part thereof shall be constructed, reconstructed, moved, located or extended within 5 metres of an established Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEA) boundary.

Local government precedent for more robust SPEA protection:

- City of Abbotsford Streamside Protection Bylaw 1465-2005
- City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw 3000

Proposed Amendment 3: Setback from Waterbodies and Watercourses

Staff propose amendments to Bylaw 337, Section 515(1)(a), Section 515(1)(d), and Section 515(1)(e). The proposed amendments are consistent with Zoning Bylaw 722, Section 5.16 setbacks for waterbodies and watercourses. The amendment would promote clear and consistent setback regulations from waterbodies and watercourses across SCRD Electoral Areas. Further, the proposed amendment would strengthen property protection from flooding and facilitate environmental protection, public enjoyment of natural coastline, and reconciliation. These regulations would align with provincial guidelines and best practices and enhance SCRD's approach to building climate resilience and mitigating risk from climate change. This regulatory consistency and enhanced alignment with provincial guidelines and best practices is also envisioned to further enhance SCRD's ability to streamline development approvals.

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 337, Section 515(1)(a):

- Current: 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean
- Proposed Replacement: 15 m of the natural boundary of the ocean

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 337, Section 515(1)(d):

- Current: 7.5 m of the natural boundary of a swamp or pond;
- Proposed Replacement: 17 m of the natural boundary of a swamp or pond;

Proposed amendment to Bylaw 337, Section 515(1)(e):

- Current: 30 metres of the natural boundary of Brittain River, Smanit Creek, Skawaka River, Deserted River, Vancouver River, Seshal Creek, Hunaechin Creek, Stakawus Creek, Potato Creek, Loquilts Creek, Tsuadhdi Creek, Osgood Creek; or 15 metres of the natural boundary of all other watercourses.
- Proposed Replacement: 30 metres of the natural boundary of Brittain River, Smanit Creek, Skawaka River, Deserted River, Vancouver River, Seshal Creek, Hunaechin Creek, Stakawus Creek, Potato Creek, Loquilts Creek, Tsuadhdi Creek, Osgood Creek; or 17 metres of the natural boundary of all other watercourses.

Precedent for the proposed amendment:

- SCRD Zoning Bylaw 722
- District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw 580
- South Cowichan Zoning Bylaw 3520
- Comox Valley Zoning Bylaw 520

Options

Option 1 Proceed with First Reading for all proposed amendments (staff recommendation)

The proposed amendments provide measures to immediately address organization risk and strengthen community climate resilience, while also facilitating streamlining of development approvals by setting clear and consistent regulations across the regional district's electoral areas. By setting clear and consistent regulations it is additionally hoped that the proposed amendments will lessen the demand on staff for bylaw enforcement and remedial planning applications. Accordingly, staff believe these amendments should be implemented as soon as possible during this early stage of PEP2.

Option 2 Proceed with First Reading for one or more of the proposed amendments

Any proposed amendments that do not move to First Reading now will be revisited during future Official Community Plan renewal work associated with PEP2.

Option 3 Make no changes at this time

Continue development review and approvals based on the current zoning bylaws.

Organizational and Intergovernmental Implications

The proposed amendments to Bylaw 337 and 722 seek alignment with Provincial regulations and guidelines.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report, though it is noted that the proposed amendments seek to create regulatory clarity and simplicity aimed at improving development approval efficiency and lessening demands on bylaw enforcement and planning staff.

Timeline for next steps or estimated completion date

If the Board gives the proposed bylaws First Reading, staff propose to engage with the Advisory Planning Commissions (APCs) and conduct public engagement via Let's Talk throughout Q3, 2023. Following APC and public engagement, consideration of Second Reading would be brought forward in a future staff report. This report would also contain recommendations on whether a public hearing should be held or if consideration should be given to waiving the public hearing, per Section 464(2) of the *Local Government Act*. Third Reading, and Bylaw Adoption are targeted for Q4, 2023.

Communications Strategy

A communications plan is in development.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This initiative/proposal can be seen as supporting Strategic Focus Area 4: Climate Change and Resilience in the Board's 2019 – 2023 Strategic Plan.

CONCLUSION

Housekeeping amendments are proposed for Zoning Bylaw 337 and 722. The proposed amendments provide measures to strengthen protection of ecologically sensitive areas including watercourses, and shorelines within SCRD. The proposed amendments provide measures to immediately address organization risk and strengthen community climate resilience, while also facilitating streamlining of development approvals by setting clear and consistent regulations across the regional district's electoral areas that are aligned with Provincial best practices. By setting clear and consistent regulations it is additionally hoped that the proposed amendments will lessen the demand on staff for bylaw enforcement and remedial planning applications. These amendments are therefore recommended to advance in this early stage of PEP2 work. Staff recommend proceeding with First Reading for the proposed amendments.

ATTACHMENT

Appendix A – Amendment Zoning Bylaw No. 722.9

Appendix B – Amendment Zoning Bylaw No. 722.9

Reviewed by:			
Manager	X – J. Jackson	Finance	
A/GM	X – R. Shay	Legislative	
CAO	X – D. McKinley	Risk Management	X – V. Cropp

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

BYLAW NO. 337.123

A bylaw to amend the *Sunshine Coast Regional District Zoning Bylaw No. 337, 1990*

The Board of Directors of the Sunshine Coast Regional District, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

PART A – CITATION

1. This bylaw may be cited as *Sunshine Coast Regional District Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 337.123, 2023*.

PART B – AMENDMENT

2. *Sunshine Coast Regional District Zoning Bylaw No. 337, 1990* is hereby amended as follows:

Insert the following immediately following Section 402(3):

402(4) excluding the following areas from the calculation of minimum parcel area

- (i) area to be used for community sewer field and equipment;
- (ii) area to be dedicated for public open space, park or returned to the Province, except as permitted by the *Strata Property Act*;
- (iii) area to be dedicated as a highway;
- (iv) area of land covered by flowing or standing water, including, without limitation, a lake, pond, river, creek, spring, ravine, or wetland, whether or not usually containing water; or
- (v) area of land that contains a Stream Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), as established under the *Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations*.

Replace Section 404(b) with the following:

404(b) covered by flowing or standing water, including, without limitation, a lake, pond, river, creek, spring, ravine, or wetland, whether or not usually containing water; or

Insert the following, immediately following Section 404(b):

404(c) that contains a Stream Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), as established under the *Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations*.

Insert the following immediately following Section 515(3):

515(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this bylaw, and for the purpose of protecting the long-term integrity and health of Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEA), no

buildings, structures, hardscaping, or any part thereof shall be constructed, reconstructed, moved, located or extended within 5 metres of an established SPEA boundary.

Insert the following definition in Section 201 immediately following “grade, average natural”:

“hardscaping” means any human-made element made from inanimate materials like gravel, brick, wood, pavers, stone, concrete, asphalt, or similar material. Examples of hardscaping include landscaped elements (e.g., patio, deck, stone wall, pavers, etc.), retaining walls, roads/parking lots, campground pads, and fill placement.

Replace Section 515(1)(a) with the following:

515(1)(a) 15 m of the natural boundary of the ocean

Replace Section 515(1)(d) with the following:

515(1)(d) 17 m of the natural boundary of a swamp or pond;

Replace Section 515(1)(e) with the following:

515(1)(e) 30 metres of the natural boundary of Brittain River, Smanit Creek, Skawaka River, Deserted River, Vancouver River, Seshal Creek, Hunaechin Creek, Stakawus Creek, Potato Creek, Loquilts Creek, Tsuadhdi Creek, Osgood Creek; or 17 metres of the natural boundary of all other watercourses.

PART C – ADOPTION

READ A FIRST TIME this	####	DAY OF,	YEAR
READ A SECOND TIME this	####	DAYOF,	YEAR
PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE <i>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT</i> this	####	DAY OF,	YEAR
READ A THIRD TIME this	####	DAY OF,	YEAR
ADOPTED this	####	DAY OF,	YEAR

Corporate Officer

Chair

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

BYLAW NO. 722.9

A bylaw to amend the *Sunshine Coast Regional District Zoning Bylaw No. 722, 2019*

The Board of Directors of the Sunshine Coast Regional District, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

PART A – CITATION

1. This bylaw may be cited as *Sunshine Coast Regional District Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 722.9, 2023*.

PART B – AMENDMENT

2. *Sunshine Coast Regional District Zoning Bylaw No. 722, 2019* is hereby amended as follows:

Insert the following immediately following Section 4.3.1(c):

- d) Area of land covered by flowing or standing water, including, without limitation, a lake, pond, river, creek, spring, ravine, or wetland, whether or not usually containing water;
- e) Area of land that contains a Stream Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), as established under the Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations.

Insert the following immediately following Section 5.16.2:

5.16.3 No buildings, structures, hardscaping, or any part thereof shall be constructed, reconstructed, moved, located or extended within 5 metres of an established Streamside Protection and Enhancement Areas (SPEA) boundary.

Insert the following definition in Part 12 immediately following “green roof”:

hardscaping: means any human-made element made from inanimate materials like gravel, brick, wood, pavers, stone, concrete, asphalt, or similar material. Examples of hardscaping include landscaped elements (e.g., patio, deck, stone wall, pavers, etc.), retaining walls, roads/parking lots, campground pads, and fill placement.

PART C – ADOPTION

READ A FIRST TIME this ##### DAY OF, YEAR

READ A SECOND TIME this ##### DAYOF, YEAR

PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE *LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT* this

DAY OF,

YEAR

READ A THIRD TIME this

DAY OF,

YEAR

ADOPTED this

DAY OF,

YEAR

Corporate Officer

Chair