OCP Review
Land Use Notes part 2
Sept 28

Present:
Aigul
Peter Johnson
Richard Chesham
David Rogers
Ross Thompson
Phillipe Taillefer
Camino Cochrane
Richard Smith
Trudi Smith
Alysha Trinka-Taillefer
Katy Stewart
Joseph Fall
Kathy Rogers
Andrew Fall
Nadine Simpson
Marti Wendt
Shoshanah Waxman
Jordan Barton
Dave Olsen

Residential Land Use Objectives

Current Objectives

3.1 obj 1
To ensure that creation of land parcels (created) are capable of having sustainable living units on which there can be a variety of possible lifestyles.

All In favour, with grammatical tidy

3.1 intro
To maintain existing patterns of low density land use and sustainable, self-sufficient lifestyle.

Aigul: low density important

Marti: self-suff means having garden, firewood, water

Peter J: planners favour creation of higher density areas…in exchange for conservation of larger areas

Richard: possibility for pockets of higher density was discussed, would this dis-allow cluster housing? (No…doesn't preclude)

Ezra: encourage clustering, the current so-called low-density land use we have is higher impact with our residential growth in the same spread out way. Want to encourage our living pattern on the land to be more neighbourly, and lower impact

Kathy: replace low–density with low impact

Peter: how about both… low impact and low density .

Melinda: change "existing patterns… change to "encourage a pattern of low density" as a way to continue into future

Shoshanah: density increase wouldn't necessarily change the density island wide

Andrew: we don't want the island's overall density to change, can be though of on the parcel or island-wide scale

Phillipe: can OCP offer an incentive for clustering for new developments? is this an expression of a collective preference, and how would the planners work with this.

Alysha: question: how many houses are on the island? (500+, vs 420 residents)

Dave R: dwellings does not indicate the land use by people (ie. 8ppl in a house), density ought to refer to individuals

Nadine: we can't limit humans/house

Andrew: clarification: density to planners is number of houses, we need to be clear if we are referring to number of humans. Re Clustering: question… shall we enable or discourage?

Marti: own experience of clustering 4 houses on 120 ac, one area for gardening, each house is out of earshot.. beaurocracy discourages this because you lose home owners grants and old age

Ross: opening rental accommodation will increase density?

Andrew: objective of the OCP will guide policies – this is guidance to protect the 10ac min, give guidance for subdivision to make sure there are the proper elements (water, wood)

 Peter: current land use bylaw, if it allows a dwelling, it doesn't matter who

lives in it. You can only incentivise development.

Keep with revisions

3.1 obj 3
To support the establishment of low scale, low intensity home based enterprises.

Alysha: what is an example?
Richard Chesham: Short Term Vacation Rentals seem to fit into this
Peter: STVR is clearly not allowed, only B&B or long term rentals are allowed on residential land… home based business has no upper limits stated. Maybe we should discuss an upper limit.
Ezra: low scale, low intensity are vague, in the case of growth, there should be parameters where they should have to apply for commercial.. define low impact.
Andrew: define a threshold, may come to a point of irritating the neighbours, this obj doesn't say what we don't want (establishment of high intensity, high impact)
Phillipe: LUB has parameters/criteria – ie can the neighbours see, smell, hear, etc
Melinda: important to try to get across point of not disturbing neighbours, impacting ferry traffic, etc so that later on if something happens we can refer back to this
Ross: points covered
Dave R: encroaching on other people's property is definitely a line where it would not be considered low impact. Necessary to keep it contained
Alisha: say a home enterprise becomes successful: how do they get commercial (apply for zoning change through IT, goes to public hearing)
Peter: there are a few home occupation business' that include with them the equivalent of STVR, ie offering a workshop that provides accommodation
Aigul: what about a smell on main road from a home based business (not to be addressed here)
Ezra: generally keep, change wording to support home based enterprises that have minimal impact on freight and ferry etc
Melinda: hopeful that rewordings will be paid due attention by planners

and trustees

Richard: add "impact on neighbours"

Nadine: low impact must include environmental and resources from the land, not just about neighbours

Phillipe: neighbours, natural resources, and shared resources are part of rewrite

Andrew: clear generally that it refers to generally to environmental, services, etc

Peter: Policies is where the limits should be addressed

Keep with changes

3.1 obj 4

To support the establishment of affordable housing, special needs housing and providing the opportunity of (for) Island seniors to remain in the community

Aigul: seniors need to remember why they chose to live here

Ezra: what does this actually mean?

Peter: affordable housing is on the Trust council radar, it would be up to a community group to spearhead

Melinda: this is here so that when an idea comes forward, then the OCP give guidance to support them, catch-all statement for rezoning for one of these types of housings

Andrew: interpretation is that affordable housing is long-term rentals, this objective enables that

Dave R: "support" interpreted as community financing this project, rather use "encourage"

Ross: use "allow" versus "support" or encourage

Ezra: helping Aigul state her point: that we don't change the island in order to keep the seniors here

Nadine: change term to"age-in-place"

Phillipe: vote on support vs allow, vs encourage

Andrew: OCP as a whole will use a glossary and may make sense to streamline the terminology for the document as a whole

Support and encourage both preferred by group overall

Keep with minor changes

3.1 obj 5
To ensure residential development is self-sufficient in terms of freshwater and sewage disposal.

Ezra: gives planners the notion we want regulation around this…. We don't want to encourage well-drilling (include "surface fresh water")
Joseph: sustainable inserted after "of"
Peter: water sustainability act, health
Joseph: many levels of gov't will have their own says, we should say here what we want
Dave R: in order to subdivide their property they had to take a percolation test
Peter: is this in regards to the subdivision rules – should it say "each subdivided parcel?"
Ezra: it's not the subdivision principle, it should be residential development, could be stronger: (to encourage rules and regulations to enforce)
Andrew: we want guidance even if it's non-enforceable
Alysha: does this ensure not runoff to neighbours
Andrew: self-sufficient sewage would mean not polluting
Dave Olsen: add self-contained to sewage

Keep with changes

__Proposed Objectives -__

1) **To support alternative housing arrangements, such as co-op housing or cluster housing, in a way that retains rural values.**

Ezra: back door to density transfer, don't support
Trudi: echo Ezra, it's a way of creating high density areas, opposed
Richard Chesham: it's inappropriate to remove because there are very few people here to vote on this, it's obviously important to someone
Joseph: attempt to avoid 1ac lots, one house on every 10 ac is not desirable,

there are co-op and cluster housing examples that work well and retain rural values (glossary will define rural values). This would not supersede other goals and density rules, maybe we don't need an objective to create

Richard Smith: fears large tract with a little waterfront having a large number of developments in a little area. Chances are that they will get subdivided in the long run.

Dave: agree with Ezra, and support cooperative, cluster housing arrangements would have a different mindset, set of values which would overwhelm us. There is always a constant pressure to develop, if there is a large number of new people they could overwhelm the status quo. Don't see any harm in supporting the concept of cooperative housing, but a problem with clustering.

Peter: covenants can protect the large tracts of preserved land if cluster is an option, they can be monitored.

Phillipe: I can't see why take the risk, don't want to risk more development. Fear unforeseen consequences

Andrew: this came from a community meeting, there are scenarios where this could be good or bad, could we get one with out the other. An outcome from this process is that we have a list of items with contention and it will be written up and included in further clarification. If it's not included, it will still be included

Nadine: don't like wording – want to maintain the status quo

Ezra: we have these things already: add ensures that existing density doesn't change

Peter: hard to imagine a place in Canada that has such a diversity of housing

Trudi: what does co-op housing mean (it's an ownership structure)

Richard Smith: terms rural values and co-op/cluster clash, they're high density anacronisms, what are the values that the density serves. Fear urbanization.

Katie: hearing fear: thinking of who may have proposed this. They are probably living less impactful. Not looking to create Granville island

Dave R: indiv. Who put this forward may have low impact in mind, but this may make provisions for platform for someone to create something inappropriate for our community. The potential of destroying cultures

Shoshanah: speak as one of those who wants to live low-impact communal

Aigul: shoshanah's intentions are supported by other objectives, this obj could become a back door for the wrong intentions,

Alisha: if it can happen, that's great, but it should not be a gateway for a new mean of

Peter: cooperative housing can be any type of housing, it's an ownership structure, not a style of building

Ezra: in a way that maintains the existing low density,

Joseph: interpreting terms in the city context, not necc. If you imagine a 160 ac with 150 covenant and 16 houses on 10 ac, as your preference, then let's keep this

Richard Smith: likely to create more saleable houses if they can be clustered on best part of large tract

½ for adding with changes and ½ for leaving it out

2) **To support long-term rental housing**

Peter: can do this as long as it doesn't change density

Trudi: we say we want rental housing but we have cabins that we can't rent

Nadine: if you don't piss a neighbour off, then you can rent your cabin

Ezra: bring in a empty home tax… just saying support long term rental housing can't do anything. What does it mean? Could we get recognition on our taxes for providing rental housing

Andrew: we have a rental housing crises on this island, it can be hard to find reasonable housing. This would do nothing until there were an application pertaining to is. This is in response to the STVR discussion. It relates to rental stock that is available, are there proposals that help or hinder this objective.

Phillipe: clarify only one residence/10ac

Peter: 10ac limit to density, is the main way of retaining our rural nature

Nadine: I don't know why this is here, there are places for people to rent.

Shoshanah: can't rent a cabin, but can rent your cabin with TUP for STVR

Alysha: clarifying the logic: so can rent a cabin out STVR with TUP, not long term… is the build out density 1240 houses (yes)

Peter: clarify that the assumption STVR should use less resources because they are not permanent

Andrew: 10ac min is preserved in LUB

Joseph: very strong understanding that community prefers to keep 10ac minimum (not renting guest cabin, that doubles density). This statement is in support of creating any way of freeing up housing.

Melinda: long term rental crisis is world-wide, include this in the previous slide (added to affordable and special ability obj. previously).

Trudi: density is 1 household/10ac, co-op housing would increase density by having multiple households in one household, there is a difference between human and building density. Why do we say long-term housing? As soon as you start renting a house on a month to month, you cannot move back in without a few months notice and paying the renter several months rent. I don't get why we can't offer a smaller building (ie. Cabin) to rent long term.

Richard Smith: does this apply to a room? Promote the ability to have a rental room (no secondary suite with a kitchen allowed).

Dave Olsen: Magic Mountain co-op is an example – by devaluing the land, they have made long term affordable housing

Aigul: older people with large acreage can build cabins for caretakers in exchange for work.

Andrew: each objective stands alone, none supersedes another. This says we want to find ways to increase long term housing rentals. It could be rolled into the previous list of housing options

Agreed Roll it into the former objective

Have we missed any Residential objectives ?

Ezra: have we addressed energy efficiency and wood consumption?

Richard Smith: we may want to say we don't want street lights?