

BOWEN ISLAND MUNICIPALITY

Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting held on Wednesday November 19, 2008 at 7:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers located at the Bowen Island Municipal Hall, 981 Artisan Lane, Bowen Island British Columbia

COMMISSION IN ATTENDANCE

Paul Tennant – Acting Chair
Frits de Vries
Gordon Ganong
Roger McGillivray

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Jason Smith – Community Planner
Michael Rosen – Planning Consultant

REGRETS

Jim Cox
Nerys Poole
James Tuer

Council Liaison

Mayor Turner

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mark Sager Cape Roger Curtis Planning Team
Julian Dunster, Cape Roger Curtis Planning Team
Gayle Ferguson – Minute Taker

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded
That the agenda for the November 19, 2008 Advisory Planning Commission be approved. CARRIED

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded
That the minutes of the October 22, 2008 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS**APC Membership**

Jason Smith, Community Planner noted that the Commission would be needing two new members to replace James Tuer and Nerys Poole. Nominations to be discussed at the next meeting.

Jason agreed to look into the Acting Chair's suggestion to have Council amend the bylaw, which gives the Planner the ability to veto a member on principle.

OLD BUSINESS

Cape Roger Curtis Referral

The Community Planner suggested that the Commission consider in their discussion the following On Table items:

1. Frits de Vries comments on the September 2008 Cape Roger Curtis Plan
2. The previous Commission's recommendations on the earlier round of referrals of Cape Roger Curtis Lands.

The Commission discussed the following issues:

1) **OCP Review:**

- a Suggestion that a review run parallel with the review of the September 2008 Neighborhood Plan and figure out which parts of OCP are in the way of the Plan. Identify and isolate issues of concern such as how to deal with transportation and density. If it looks like the project will be lost, then proceed with an OCP amendment and agree on a Phase One of the project;
- b The *Official Community Plan* (OCP) is a background document that will guide this process ;
- c Doing this review of the Plan now is almost part of an OCP review. No different in dealing with CRC now and 6 months from now. Development proposal has been in process for 2-3 years already and not comfortable with a review that would take up to two years;
- d No consensus among members present as to whether an OCP review should take place before, after or parallel to the review of the Cape Roger Curtis Neighborhood Plan;
- e OCP Density Map - Bowen Island has density zoning map which is a real mistake Need to revisit the correctness of the density map;

2) **Density**

- a) The Municipality needs a clear policy for calculating density. If one is creative in calculating density, then numbers in OCP don't need to be changed;
- b) With so many amenities doesn't need the large lots. The OCP should be written to encourage clustering densities;
- c) Density should be 17.5 units per acre. Multi Family should be at 12.5 not 23.5 units per acre unless Affordable Housing is included then 17.5 units per acre;

- 3) **Cape Roger Curtis Transportation Plan:**
 - a Needs to be updated It only dealt with Island transportation and not with Ferries coming from the other side with people coming onto the Island;
 - b Reducing ferry traffic for cars, also transportation going out to CRC,
 - c The phasing in and public transportation- At what point would it be viable for CRC? *Michael: Transportation plan has not been reviewed by external engineers but comments are available. The Mayor requested that the engineer comments be made available to the Commissions*
- 4) **Island wide impacts** - need clarity and suggest that the Municipality develop a transportation policy restricting car access on the Ferry. This would make Bowen Island more unique and desirable;
- 5) **Affordable Housing** - 3.24 acres or 4.5 acres is too modest relative to the total residential area of 238 acres Would rather see Affordable Housing spread throughout the neighbourhood, at least through the multi family area;
- 6) **Water supply** – query whether water supply is adequate if using approximately 30,000 litres a day especially when guest accommodation is added in. Suggestion to have a meeting in Tunstall Bay area to respond to concerns regarding long term domestic water supply capacity;
- 7) **Phasing the project** - different phasing options looked at to recover infrastructure costs. How to get value up front to defray these costs? Can this be done? If there was a way that the Municipality and the developer could agree on the phases of the land to be developed. Don't believe South Terrace should be in Phase One. *Jason: Mel Turner felt that a 6-8 month you would know whether money could be raised.*
- 8) **Islands Trust Policy** “sustain island character and healthy communities” has been implemented by the developers in the Plan;
- 9) **South Terrace** - reducing development in the south section for three years, does nothing. If more value was created and connected to the area fronting Pebbly Beach, then could take some of the development and make the South Terrace area smaller or no development;
- 10) **Build flexibility for future land use** - when small lots become more desirable *i.e. instead of “large lot/small*

lot” designation why not say “residential at a certain density”;

- 11) **Lot Sizes** - Housing diversity comes from a mix of housing types not by varying the lot sizes. There is no relationship between lot size and diversity. It is preferable to develop smaller neighborhoods with smaller lots and leave more land undeveloped;
- 12) **Inn** could also support senior housing development and would be a benefit. The size could perhaps best be determined by agreeing on a maximum total floor space;
- 13) **Live Work** is better in same zone as commercial. 15.5 units per acre, should be larger
- 14) **Retirement campus** is it for profit? It is unclear in the Plan;
- 15) **Park and Development** - general agreement that the balance between park and development is a fair one.

Mayor Turner provided the following comments for the Commission’s consideration

- ◇ Density is the crux issue and has to be addressed clearly by Council’s premier advising group;
- ◇ Amenities being offered – need clarity as to what is being offered as an amenity and what is being offered because it is needed to pay for the amount of park land;
- ◇ Clarification required on priorities. Financial Plan is the driver;
- ◇ Suggestion that the Commission focus on the issue of priorities and if possible, rank the priorities for Council and from proponents side prioritize items.

Members of the Planning Team made the following comments:

- ❖ The present proposal is a response to Council’s request for the 50% park dedication;
- ❖ There is a very real risk of losing the park and any other amenities if discussions cease;
- ❖ Size of park and financial viability - Land economist hired by the Municipality had indicated that the OCP density does not work with the amount of park land being requested. Take some of the park land out and it might;
- ❖ Density - the size of the park is principal driver of density. The only think that generates a guaranteed return is some form of housing;
- ❖ Other amenities – Affordable Housing, seniors

housing and live/work are not profit generating. If these were not important it would change things.

Frits agreed to provide different scenarios for calculating density equivalencies for the next meeting and members agreed to identify those issues where there is agreement.

Next Meeting November 26, 2008

The Community Planner noted the agenda for the November 26, 2008 meeting would include the following:

1. Crowns Land report for comment
2. Housekeeping issues
3. Continued discussion of Cape Roger Curtis Neighbourhood Plan

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

DRAFT