

OCP Forum #5 : Land Use

Sat August 31<sup>st</sup> 2pm-5pm @ community hall

We would like to acknowledge we are on unceded Coast Salish territory.

Our goal today is to review Official Community Plan (OCP) objectives related to Land Use

We will go through the current objectives in the existing OCP, as well as new proposed objectives suggested by members of the community.

For each objective we would like to see a show of hands to indicate your support.

These objectives should articulate our broadly shared values and interests and will be used to inform the policies that guide and limit our local governments.

Current objectives can be  
kept as is (default),  
kept with minor or major wording changes OR  
removed

Proposed objectives can be  
added as is  
added with minor or major wording changes OR  
not added (default)

17 objectives to review: General objectives, Commercial and Industrial, Hazardous Conditions, Residential

Speaker's list will prioritize folks who haven't yet spoken

Short break 1/2 way through

Email sign up list to receive notes

Refreshments & Donations

Please express your views on the objective (speaking through the chair)

Please speak LOUDLY and clearly

The feedback we collect today will go to a Land Use Sub-committee group who will use it to word a revised set of objectives.

Limited time commitment! Not onerous! (maybe only a couple of meetings, the work could also be done online via email)

Please indicate on the email sign up list if you might be interested.

# General Land Use Objectives

## Current Objectives -

### 3.1 obj 2

To ensure low density subdivision and land use is maintained

Ross: add "at existing levels"

Hillary: clarify what low density is... current build out limit is 1230 houses

Phillip: is the 10 acre rule the only limiting density factor (general discussion that yes, essentially)

Shelley: note of caution, not to arbitrarily do things to ppl that affect their land value (eg removing the guest cottage ability), taking away something people already have will create pushback

Colin James: proposal: only allow subdividing in half, (ie, 40 acres could only subdivide to 20ac), keeping 10ac minimum

Willy: colin's objective doesn't change density rules – 40 ac still could have 4 houses

Jessica S – does the build-out factor include the limits on building on ALR? (yes)

Ezra: add "in keeping with our 10 acre minimum", some indication of historical limits

Richard B – encourage clustering, sharing vehicles and gardens..

Peter: IT doesn't govern subdivision, must apply to ministry of transportation and infrastructure, who refers it to trust.... No public input process is required

Carson: a reply to colin's idea: unsubdivided land allows for more affordable housing and people to therefor afford living on island

Sue wheeler: no prohibition or any limit on cluster housing other than 10 acre minimum, same with co-ops

Melinda: reason to maintain low density: maintain amount of natural area we live within

Andrew: more precise OCP the better for ensuring we are guiding government effectively in the realm of subdivisions

Dave Rogers: land use should be connected to how many people the land can support. This objective needs some definition of low density and connection to the ability of the land to support the population

Barry: does ALR sections of acreage affect number of houses on a parcel? (answer No, unless you are subdividing)

Joseph: some kind of rationale as to why we want this. Eg sustainable, provide firewood, waste, water etc.

Dolf: mechanism to reduce levels of high density, in alignment with belief in lower density...

Valeria: colin's suggestion re restricting subdivision – worth looking into

**Sue: is wording going to stay? It's not a sentence (rewording necc)**

**General agreement with modifications**

### **3.1 obj 6**

**To ensure appropriate access to parcels is provided, taking into account topography, and existing trails and roads.**

**Andrew: clarification: subdivision must always ensure road access**

**Willy: Road access should be limited by other features (water, old trees, etc) not just "topography"**

**Joseph: criteria should include wildlife, water courses, old growth trees etc**

**Ezra: irrelevant to try to tell dept of highways about road standards, is not likely to influence**

**Trudi: strength comes from "appropriate", "taking into account", "existing". Does this objective exclude subdivisions with water access only? (no, says Andrew)**

**Ross: not appropriate to alter ground water**

**General approval with modifications**

### **3.2 intro**

**To maintain an acceptable scale and rural nature of development, important considerations for development include rural character and scale, low site coverage, adequate setbacks, and the provision of off-street parking.**

Jessica: instead of rural – "wild" character

Willy: throw it out

Ezra: meaningless and counter productive to have setbacks

Marti – off street parking is offensive (use "road"- we have no streets)

Sue Wheeler – rural came about as a term to address human homestead habits, as opposed to wilderness

Shelley; value in the concept of vision to describe kind of lifestyle

Nadine: maybe better for vision statement

Peter: value – setbacks can be easily varied by applying for variance

Generally considered more of a vision statement

**Proposed Objectives -**

1) **To support housing density transfer that benefits housing, environmental and community stewardship objectives.**

Trudi: worry that density transfer might not actually meet environmental/community objectives

Willy: totally against it, seeing what happened on Saltspring – density units were put into downtown area, condos

Ezra: not supporting

Sirrett: not supporting

Nadine: example: sell ability to build

Andrew: without this objective anyone can still apply to rezone for anything they want and a public hearing process is required. Another scenario is that if someone can “buy” densities, there is no public hearing. There is a restriction placed on the title of the land giving up density.

Bruce: what if it gets out of our hands, and no comments are allowed... don't know why we would even consider it.

Shoshanah: support the ability to create more affordable housing possibilities

Phillipe: against automatic allowing

Joseph: many parcels will not be developed because there is so much land unviable to build upon, still could create a way to support affordable housing

Carson: in this scenario, would a 10 acre parcel with 2 house sites be subdividable into 5 ac lots (no 10 ac min is not on table)

Barry: useful mechanism, rules could be written into it, but who would be monitoring or evaluating?

Suzanne: how many people is enough/too much? Unintended consequences are the bane of our existence... could try to figure out checks and balances that could make this work to create affordable housing... must consider certain factors (waste, water, firewood, etc) we could also say where this sort of thing is allowed

Colin: fully opposed to this as an objective

Valeria: denman island used density transfer well, introducing a different way of living on the land

Hillary: clarify what all the objective, could set parameters ex required covenant

Dave Rogers: remove support, replace with reject... if there is a mechanism to allow indiv. their interpretation without community input, could really screw things up.

Richard Chesham – this has the potential to do good things – need to name the checks and balances.

Andrew: example from the highlands ocp review: density transfer done in a way with public input through rezoning. Words were added to the ocp to indicate the community is considering this through rezoning process.

Richard Baur: san juan island rent skyrocketed as Californians moved there, Friday harbour created affordable housing units for local help

Trudi: likes Andrews comment: net benefit to community

Joseph: Hillary's comment is on it: housing density transfer might be a good way to achieve other objectives (env, housing, etc) – open to housing density transfers where creating net community benefit

Ezra: with density transfer the only benefit would be environmental protection, won't make affordable housing, more likely to be exploited by developers

Colin: not opposing this, just its wording, agrees with Joseph in his previous comment

Shelley: could we park this somewhere as a tool? Not as an objective as worded, concept may have a use sometime in an amenable way

Barry Parks: comes down to the mechanism ; who is adjudicating, principles could be put in place that rule decision making, evaluate the benefit to the community.

Noel: density transfer needs community input... its basically going through rezoning pathway.

In with wording changes: 8pple

Not in: 30ppl

MORE TO DISCUSS

## **2) To limit the negative impacts of tourism.**

Richard C: objects to this, tourism can be useful tool for community, helps people make a living, don't want to live in a retirement community

Phillipe: in support

Gail: take out the negative, hasn't experienced long term benefits to tourism (i.e vacation rentals taking up housing), b and bs should be zoned commercial

Shelley: not sure understand this wording, we don't have infrastructure for tourism, define it more clearly. Point: Visitors vs "tourists"? intention behind this obj is to keep integrity intact, protect this place

Hillary: committee opted to reword this and present it a second time, tourism at last forum, impacts are the issues (ferries, short term vacation rentals)

Ezra: It doesn't have any impact, take it out or make it meaningful

Trudi: what are the negative impacts of tourism? Public access isn't obvious so tourists stray onto private land; want tourism to be unobtrusive. Define the negative impacts

Kathy: last forum had ppl bring up lots of negative impacts of tourism – shooting, full ferries, stvr's

Sirett: air bnb should be commercial, creating housing problems

Willy: to limit the impact of tourism, make rules about air bnb, not through objectives

Joseph: its important to have an objective to ensure zoning follows, legitimate goal to say community wants tourism to have a positive impact

Shelley: say what we want

Colin: state the positive goal, net benefits, limits on resources, behaviour

Phillipe: good to list what we don't want also

Dolf – language sets up a pattern of culture that makes him uncomfortable

8 in support to add it as is

put it in rewritten – strong majority

### **3) To ensure adequate public access to beaches.**

#### **(to guide ministry of transportation)**

Suzanne: what does adequate mean?

Hillary; address adequate – most access is ridiculous, subdivisions should have to give access to beaches, not necessarily roads

Sho: include “subdivisions must provide”

Ezra: change ensure to encourage, define adequate

Willy: wheelchair, or walk-able access

Trudi, to encourage and support public access to beaches

Peter: adding foreshore, not just beaches

Dolf: lets mean it

Bruce: don't always want just easy access, for example a set of stairs might provide access to something great

General support to add

#### **Have we missed any General objectives?**

Ezra: most significant non human thing is forest cover, first objective should be to preserve health of islands forests.

## **Commercial and Industrial Land Use Objectives**

### **Current Objectives**

#### **3.2, obj 2**

**To ensure home enterprises are in harmony with rural residential neighbourhoods.**

Richard Chesam: is there a glossary of terms to define rural – (yes, we (steering committee) will work on it)

Trudi: what does “in harmony” mean?

Nadine: example of a non-harmonious enterprise across the street from her  
Peter: our land use bylaw is special in allowing “home enterprise”, not specific, allowed across the board, must maintain residential appearance to lot, specifies hours, can lead to conflicts

Nadine: traffic, noise pollution

Willy: home enterprise might change nature of neighbourhood

Andrew: essence is to limit the negative impacts and encouraging the positive

Gail: her neighbourhood has propane and sawmills

Ezra; important to encourage home enterprise, slippery slope as business grows, need to ensure ppl can make a living, but doesn't have negative impact on neighbours and community

Peter: formal thing to do is to lodge a complaint with the bylaw enforcement of IT or talk to the neighbour

General support

### **3.2 obj 4**

**To ensure appropriate industry and commercial ventures are permitted that are respectful of the citizens of Lasqueti Island.**

Willy: remove

Ezra: put there to encourage sawmills and shipyards, and have opportunity to address concerns. Put to allow industrial activities.

Peter: rezoning is required for new ...

Sirrett: once the zoning granted, neighbours can't change it if they are bothered

Trudi: do we have any bylaws that restrict noise

Kathy Rogers: we have objectives that address noise,

Nadine: public can have comment during zoning process, but not after

Peter: don't know if we have a noise bylaw,

Andrew: this is partly about rezoning, allowing respectful

Dolf: what about respectful to land, water, etc – (yes, listed in other area of ocp)

Bruce: add policy about noise and light, etc

General support

### **Proposed Objectives -**

- 1) To consider short-term vacation rentals as commercial activities, and as distinct from long-term rentals.**

Andrew: this would mean they would need to have commercial zoning

Peter: any residence can be rented monthly or more, not less than a month, C1 is zoning to allow short-term vacation rental

Richard Chesam: should allow ppl to make extra money, changing zoning will make it onerous

Trudi: what is benefit to community to rezone commercial (answered: taxation paid to district goes towards us)

Hillary: is this a policy? It will become a more serious business if requires rezoning

Shelley: tourism has infrastructure costs, do we want to single out one type of business to require rezoning

Ezra: speaks to long term affordable housing, long term affordable housing is a more important goal

Andrew: lub has c3 zone for short term vacation rentals, this is about creating an objective to match this land use bylaw. Enforcement is by complaint if the activity contravenes zoning.

Gail: my property is C1, makes no diff on taxes

Marti: Making life good for people living here. Distinguish between full-time/long term vs short term.

Nadine: salt spring example (IT taking action against unauthorized air bnb with several complaints against it)

Peter: land density issue – house and guest house, guest house can't be rented out, apply for rezoning (tourist accom) if want to rent out guest house,

Nikki: mortgage and insurance would increase with rezoning

Noel: is it a b&b if it's a separate building but you make meals? (No)

Kathy R: absentee owners are a problem,

Dave Rogers: absentee owners/landlords are a problem, short term can be a problem, commercial venture should be put to community to be approved

Trudi: it's already not allowed to ask someone to leave: after 10 month, at the end of lease it automatically converts to month to month, don't need to make another rule, it already exists. ppl make a living being caretakers for absentee landlords. Have a local license requirement, \$ goes to LCA or something.

Suzanne: seems muddy: what do we want, figure that out

Gail: clarify that air bnb is a platform for advertising, not a "thing"

Willy: vote, we already have the rule, lets make an objective

General support

3 opposed



*Have we missed any Commercial and Industrial objectives?*

## **Hazardous Conditions Land Use Objectives**

*Current Objective*

*3.5 obj 1*

To allow reasonable development in areas not subject to hazardous conditions

Andrew: this must be in OCP, floodplanes, estuaries, steep slopes, etc

Suzanne: need glossary,

Sirrett: what is “reasonable” development

Joseph: reasonable is confusing issue. Limit development in areas subject to hazardous conditions

Peter: designate areas of hazardous conditions. Owner assumes risk. Object to “limit” development...

PHillipe ; subcommittee rewrite to meet criteria

Eugeni: this is gov guaranteeing they aren't liable

Trudi: flip it

General support: to limit devel....