



DATE: October 8, 2019
TIME: 7 pm

MINUTES of the Electoral Area E – Cowichan Station/Koksilah/Sahtlam Advisory Planning Commission held on the above noted date and time at: CVRD Offices, Conference Room 2, 175 Ingram Street, Duncan, BC.

Chair Hilary Nixon called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. The position of Secretary is vacant, Hilary Nixon will be Acting Secretary for this meeting.

PRESENT:

Chairperson/Acting Secretary: Hilary Nixon
Vice-Chairperson: Susan Kaufmann
Members: Celina Gold, Marianna Terauds, Parker Jefferson, Sarah Davies-Long

ALSO PRESENT:

Director: Alison Nicholson (arrived after meeting began)
CVRD Planner: Christina Hovey
Applicant: Rick Young sent regrets
Guests: Luke & Karen Gardner (owners, 4335 Sunrise Rd.)

ABSENT: David Coulson, Karen Humber, Teresa Emery

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: The agenda was approved and seconded as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES: It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the Electoral Area E – Cowichan Station/Koksilah/Sahtlam Advisory Planning Commission of July 9, 2019 be accepted as corrected to remove listing of Sarah Davies-Long twice under members present.

MOTION CARRIED.

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

The Chair introduced the APC members and reviewed the purpose and process of APC.

1. Application: DVP19E02 (4335 SUNRISE RD.)
Owner – Luke Gardner presented the proposal for the over-sized accessory building.

Plan is to build a showroom for collection of cars, and a boat. Wants everything

contained under a single roof. No plans for any car repair work – only display purposes. No commercial activity. No plans to remove additional trees. No plans for plumbing to the structure. Architect and owner both open to on-site stormwater management improvements – CVRD planning department has put in a request for a stormwater management plan. Does do some vehicle parting on the property, but states that activity would not take place in this building.

Discussion:

- Question about the height of the bays – side elevation looks to be 12'6" – applicant stated that the building is high to accommodate a vehicle lift
- Site is about half covered with a wetland – only about 1 hectare usable space
 - Current regulation allows 30% coverage which includes the wetland area of the property where no development could take place;
 - Members see benefits to not having multiple 100 sq. meter buildings – accessory building by-law needs to be revised
- Many neighbouring properties have multiple buildings, including some that have been non-permitted buildings
- Location for the building seems screened from the road by trees
- Question about future home-based business – concern expressed that since this oversized accessory building is explicitly for automotive purposes, the zoning bylaw for home based auto repair is relevant for the discussion, particularly with regard to potential future uses of the building. Current zoning bylaws have restricted space allocation for auto repair – far smaller than the proposed building.
- Question about whether the bylaws could be changed to better address accessory buildings and whether limitations could be placed to reduce future building on the site
- Much of the site is restricted for development due to existing wetland, yet 30% lot coverage is calculated based on the whole property size – a better approach would be to revise bylaws to take into account the "usable" parcel size for lot coverage
- Concern about stormwater runoff – area is known to have water pooling
- Question about habitat conservation zone around Wake Lake (proposed Wake Lake Protection Zone) – currently no regulation in place, but CVRD could share recommended practices to minimize impact during construction. However, this does not address likely permanent habitat loss, especially for the Western Toad.
- Accessory buildings need to scale appropriately for the parcel size; property buildings should be clustered together to reduce impact on the site
- APC members felt that when an oversized accessory building is approved, some limitations on future accessory buildings should be put in place
- Concern among APC members regarding the proposed size – 297 sq. meters is simply too large; could the building be scaled down and still allow for the planned purposes. APC members specifically commented that the plans for the building strongly resemble a commercial building; one member commented that a two door building would fit with the scale of residential building design more appropriately.
- The APC has recently reviewed two applications for oversized accessory buildings, which were discussed in the context of deliberations on this application.

MOTION:

It was moved and seconded that the application be approved with the following set of recommendations:

MOTION APPROVED: 4 to 2 (dissenters felt that the size of the building was too large)

- Any planned exterior lighting follows best practices for fully shielded/dark sky protection and habitat protection
- Best management practices for stormwater management are implemented
- Construction activity follows best practices for habitat protection related to Western Toads
- Encourage no additional tree removal as part of the construction process
- Encourage planned landscape to use native species

- In addition, several members of the APC could not support the proposed building size (297 sq. meters) and strongly recommended that a smaller accessory building be approved instead. An accessory building that is three times the permitted size is simply out of scale with the residential setting. However, there was majority recognition that a single, larger building is preferable to multiple smaller buildings.

- Further, in consideration of future applications for accessory buildings greater than 100 sq meters, the Area E APC strongly recommends that the CVRD review the current accessory building regulations to consider zoning, lot coverage (including addressing the issue of developable area as opposed to parcel size), parcel size, and clustering.

2. REPORTS

- Director Alison Nicholson
 - HOCP
 - CVRD has officially referred the HOCP to the Area APC
 - APC members are asked to review and provide comments on Version 3.0 prior to the November 12 meeting
 - Development Permit Area Guidelines distributed for APC review
 - Local Area Plan needs to be reviewed
 - Zoning Bylaws need to be updated and Director Nicholson asked APC to consider providing feedback on key bylaws for Area E that need revisions

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: November 12, 2019

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 9:02 pm.



Chair/Acting Secretary