



---

**Hornby Island Local Trust Committee  
Minutes of a Special Business Meeting  
Community Information Meeting  
Regarding  
Hornby Island Official Community Plan Review**

---

**Date of Meeting:** Sunday, October 27, 2013

**Location:** Hornby Island Community Hall  
Central Road, Hornby Island, BC

**Members Present:** David Graham, Chair  
Alex Allen, Local Trustee  
Tony Law, Local Trustee

**Staff Present:** Rob Milne, Island Planner  
Vicky Bockman, Recorder

**Media and Others Present:** Approximately twelve (12) members of the public

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Graham called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He welcomed the public and introduced himself, Local Trustees, Planner and Recorder.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**By general consent** the agenda was approved.

**3. OPENING REMARKS**

Chair Graham explained that the purpose of this special meeting was to solicit comments and to answer questions on proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). He introduced Planner Milne for presentation of the particulars of the draft revisions.

**4. PRESENTATIONS**

**4.1 Rob Milne, Islands Trust Hornby Island Planner**

Planner Milne explained that the presentation would examine four policy areas in the targeted review of the OCP, focusing on Housing and Economic

## ADOPTED

Opportunities issues. He advised that the revisions in the Land Use Bylaw will be presented at a future meeting. He pointed out the location of various materials on hand for the public, as well as a questionnaire that can be completed to provide comments for consideration in the process. He stated that after the presentation there would be an Open House to provide an informal setting for discussion.

He summarized the timeline of the targeted review project up to this point, and noted that next steps would include review and consolidation of community comments into the draft OCP and referral of the draft to the Advisory Planning Commission. He reviewed the possible time frame for readings and submission to:

- Executive Committee;
- Public meetings;
- Minister of Community, Sport and Culture ; and
- Consideration by the Local Trust Committee of final adoption of both the OCP and LUB.

He provided an overview of the key changes in the draft OCP:

- Housing – a new section 6.3.5 includes new provisions for secondary suites on larger lots in an effort to provide rental opportunities, and the use of detached units to provide non-permanent affordable rental accommodation permitted through a Temporary Use Permit. He explained that the use of Temporary Use Permits would allow the community to test drive uses without expensive rezonings being required.
- Subdivision of rural residential lots – revised policy 6.3.3.1 would enable residents to subdivide their rural residential lot with two dwellings into two lots with a dwelling on each lot. He noted that this would retain the existing density of dwellings.
- Expansion of commercial zoning – a revised policy 6.5.1.3 sets the criteria to be considered for the possible limited expansion of commercial zoning to allow for small scale retail and personal service use.
- Community Trades and Services Areas – includes new language in a renamed and revised section, 6.2 Community Service Use, with new policies to encourage community based tenants and businesses. He noted that there are questions for community consideration in order to provide direction:
  - Do you support including the Community Services Use area in a Development Permit area to protect groundwater; and
  - Do you support eliminating the requirement that any uses in the Community Services Use area be based upon a non-profit organization? He advised that the OCP cannot legally regulate the user, although it could be left in the document to indicate the intent.

Planner Milne encouraged feedback from the community, not only at this meeting but also by contacting him or Trustees afterwards to request clarity

or provide comments, and confirmed that email is an acceptable form of correspondence.

**5. QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION**

Tim Biggins asked if the document being discussed today would become a bylaw once it has completed the process that has been outlined.

Planner Milne responded that the OCP is a schedule to the bylaw that becomes law once the bylaw is adopted.

Jan Bevan noted that the draft language in the Community Service Use section refers to “non-profit society” and asked if it could include an informal group or if it would need to be a registered non-profit.

Planner Milne responded that a non-profit society would be registered, operating under the *Society Act*.

Trustee Law provided background on the revisions to the Community Services Use section, noting that in the 1990s there were uses in small lot areas that were not appropriate as home occupations. In response, an area was considered for that use, however, there were ground water concerns, leading to the current consideration of inclusion of the Community Services Use area in a Development Permit area to protect groundwater.

He explained that consideration is being given to restricting use to non-profit organizations with the intent that if the land is owned and managed by a non-profit they may choose to allocate sites to other non-profits, making the area available for small businesses rather than being co-opted by one business. He noted that the Local Trust Committee has since been advised that regulations can specify the use, however, not the user and remarked that community comments would be appreciated on whether to retain the language that restricts users to non-profit organizations.

Dianne Chouke asked if an industrial business has ever expressed interest in doing business there.

Trustee Law commented that there has been interest from time to time from various parties, however, there has not been an application put forth.

Tim Biggins proposed that a model might be considered where the land set aside for commercial use would be managed by a non-profit while the people working there would be for profit.

Jan Bevan asked for a comment on the results of the Denman Island Forum on Suites and Cottages held in August.

Planner Milne provided a summary of the outcome of that meeting, noting that secondary suites and detached secondary units on larger parcels were seen as the best ways to creating housing without an onerous process. He indicated that

## ADOPTED

discussion was ongoing regarding the density cap that exists on Denman Island, the need for certain specific conditions and the possible use of tools to assure attainable housing.

Jan Bevan commented that this draft is proposing that on Hornby Island detached secondary units be permitted through TUPs only for specific purposes, not as a part of the general pool.

Planner Milne clarified that this draft proposes that secondary suites may be permitted as rental housing under certain conditions while the detached units are proposed to provide non-permanent housing for a relative or care-giver or non-permanent affordable rental accommodation through a TUP.

Dianne Chouke asked if other islands are making detached units a permitted use without considering their status as temporary or requiring TUPs.

Planner Milne responded that islands are moving forward using different solutions and that in some cases TUPs are being considered. He commented that the use of TUPs would allow the community to assess the impacts or success of the approach without the rezoning process.

Dianne Chouke commented that she supports the use of TUPs as a tool to ensure that secondary units are allowed for affordable rentals. She observed that there is a lack of affordable housing and raised the question of how to make people confident enough to be willing to invest in building with the possibility of the unit not being permitted after six years. She commented that the TUP approach would allow the opportunity for illegal units to become legal.

Planner Milne remarked that affordable housing would be defined in the LUB and noted that the implementation of affordable housing can vary among islands.

Trustee Law noted that of the options available, he considers that the TUP offers the best balance between accountability and accessibility.

Jan Bevan noted that the possible timeline for completion of this OCP review might be compromised by the late engagement of some in the community who have not been following the process and she asked how that might be mitigated.

Planner Milne commented that the Public Hearing is technically the opportunity for viewpoints to be expressed.

Chris Weixelbaumer expressed concern that the definition of affordable housing includes a reference to 30 percent of the median gross income of families or individuals on Hornby Island, noting that is a difficult measurement on Hornby Island where waterfront property owners inflate that number. He indicated he would rather consider a percentage of median income of the working population of Hornby.

Planner Milne acknowledged that the definition of affordable housing is difficult and noted that the approach to affordable housing can be different for each island. He commented that, as an example, Denman Island is considering the use of the term "attainable housing" that would not be bound by the definition of affordable housing,

however, demonstrates the concept of affordability. He added that this might be a useful topic for community conversation.

Dianne Chouke asked if the applications for TUPs for the detached units would ask what the rent would be.

Planner Milne responded that the benchmark of 30 percent of median income is common in the process, however, noted that this could be a question for community discussion.

Tim Biggins commented on his understanding that when housing is over 30 percent of medium income it is classified as homelessness or at risk of homelessness.

Planner Milne remarked that most islands are experiencing similar housing issues and want to create inventory, although he acknowledged that attaching income percentages to the approach makes that difficult.

With no other questions forthcoming, Chair Graham directed attention to the hand-out materials and maps for viewing and the Open House segment began, to allow an opportunity for review of the material and discussion.

**6. CLOSING REMARKS**

Trustee Law commented that in addition to those key revisions discussed today, there are other changes in the draft OCP. He suggested that those changes are not as significant, however, recommended the entire OCP be reviewed and encouraged comments be provided to assist the Trustees in their evidence-based decisions. He added that even if comments on issues other than those in the current targeted review are offered they will be noted and considered for a future review.

Chair Graham remarked that Trustees are looking forward to consideration of comments received on this draft of the OCP and thanked everyone for attending and participating today.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Graham adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

---

**David Graham, Chair**

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

---

**Vicky Bockman, Recorder**