

## SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

### HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 23, 2024

---

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

---

|                      |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| <b>PRESENT:</b>      | Chair  | Nicole Huska   |
|                      | Members  | Len Coombes<br>Bob Baziuk<br>Kim Dougherty<br>Suzette Stevenson<br>Alda Grames<br>Barbara Bolding (recorder) |
| <b>ALSO PRESENT:</b> | Manager, SCRD Planning and Dev.<br>SCRD Planner II<br>DVP00099 Applicant | Jonathan Jackson<br>Nick Copes<br>Eric Pettit  |
| <b>DELEGATION:</b>   | Birch Way Representative   | Konstantin Vassev  |
| <b>PUBLIC:</b>       |  | 5  |
| <b>ABSENT:</b>       | Members  | Ellie Lenz<br>Kelsey Oxley<br>Justine Gabias (Director, Area B)  |

---

**CALL TO ORDER** 7:16 p.m.

**AGENDA** The agenda was adopted as presented.

#### MINUTES

##### Halfmoon Bay (Area B) Minutes

The Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC minutes of June 25, 2024 were approved as presented.

##### Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of 26 June, 2024
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of 26 June, 2024
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of 25 June, 2024

## REPORTS

### Development Variance Permit DVP00099 (7531 Cove Beach Road) – Electoral Area B

A detailed discussion of issues related to this application occurred. The participation of SCRD staff members was very helpful to our further understanding of many of the circumstances related to it.

The development permit request was considered in 2 parts as outlined in the Staff Report Recommendation.

Regarding Section 5.16.1 (a) to reduce the setback for a structure adjacent to the natural boundary of the ocean from 15 m to 7.5 m, the APC was divided on this request. No members opposed the 7.5 m set back as it has already been approved. However, while a majority of members supported the request for approval of a “structure” (i.e. a pool) in this space, at least 3 members opposed construction of the same.

#### **Reasons:**

Reasons to support a “structure” (i.e. pool) in this space included:

- Construction of a plaza in this space is already approved
- Pool is preferable to a heat reflecting plaza
- Question comes down to a “waterscape” vs. a hardscape

Concerns of those opposed to construction of a pool included:

- If the pool is to be part of a heat sink for summer cooling, the possibility of warm water being released into the ocean needs to be assessed by the appropriate agency.
- Pool will increase parcel coverage beyond that which is allowed by current zoning.
- During the design and permit approval process, the owners and architect became aware of the specific bylaws requirements re: definitions of “structures” and of allowable square footage in this zone, and yet seem to have chosen a plan that would lead to overbuilding.
- Pool and fence (per artist’s drawings available on the architect’s website) is not in keeping with the OCP guidelines

Regarding Section 7.9.3 to vary the maximum parcel coverage for a parcel over 3500 m<sup>2</sup> in the RU1 Zone from 15% to 20.5%:

The Halfmoon Bay APC was about evenly divided on this request. We could not reach agreement and so could not make a recommendation.

#### **Reasons:**

Those in support of the request to increase the maximum parcel coverage considered the unique situation described in this application. Key points included:

- SCRD bylaw anomalies that apparently allow up to 35% parcel coverage on smaller parcels
- Application to reduce lot size will increase staff time and SCRD costs. Approval now may create time and cost savings.

- The large eaves of the house do not cover living space, and in fact protect it from summer heating. They provide beneficial cooling effects, which are becoming essential during our increasingly hot summers.

Those opposed to the increase were concerned with the following:

- The increase to the maximum parcel coverage contradicts the previous (310) and the current (722) bylaws applicable to the current zoning of this property. Increased parcel coverage also contradicts OCP principles.
- During the planning and approval process, other designed options were possible but apparently not pursued. The overall site plan was known, but not included with the original permit application. If it had been, adjustments could have been made at the time.
- Both the old and new bylaws (known to any applicant) include overhangs/eaves in area coverage calculations. This may differ other jurisdictions, but it's this region's standard. The calculation method has been, and will continue to be applied to all other permit applicants on the Coast. We need to apply the bylaws consistently.

#### Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 722.11 for Subdivision of 8000 Birch Way

Discussion touched on water supply, highway/roadway access, and the potential for subdivision of the new lots and covenants, Once again, the presence of SCRD staff was helpful.

#### **Recommendation No. 1**      *Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 722.11 for Subdivision of 8000 Birch Way*

The Halfmoon Bay APC supports the application for rezoning of 8000 Birch way as outlined in the staff report attached to our meeting agenda.

#### **Reasons:**

- It conforms to the criteria for consideration of a 1 hectare parcel size described in the staff report. Once subdivided, it will still be similar to properties in the neighbourhood.

**NEXT MEETING**      September 17, 2024 by Zoom

**ADJOURNMENT**      9:45 p.m.