

Gabriola Island Local Trust Committee Public Hearing Record

REGARDING PROPOSED BYLAW NO. 293 (Housing Options Review Project)

Date: March 1, 2018 Time: 11:00 am

Location: Gabriola Arts & Heritage Centre

476 South Road, Gabriola Island, BC

Members Present: Laura Busheikin, Chair

Melanie Mamoser, Local Trustee Heather O'Sullivan, Local Trustee

Staff Present: Ann Kjerulf, Regional Planning Manager

Sonja Zupanec, Island Planner Jaimie Dubyna, Planner 1 Lisa Millard, Recorder

Others Present: There were approximately fourteen members of the public and one

member of the media in attendance.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Busheikin called the Public Hearing to order at 11:19 am.

Chair Busheikin read a formal statement explaining the Public Hearing regarding the Proposed Bylaw No. 293. She stated that all persons who believe their interest is affected by the bylaw would be given the opportunity to express their concerns and that further submissions cannot be received by the Local Trust Committee after the close of the Public Hearing.

Planner Zupanec reviewed the Public Hearing Notice, summarized proposed Bylaw No. 293, and stated that all related information, and public comments, was available for members of the public to view in the Public Hearing binders.

2. PROPOSED BYLAW NO. 293

Gabriola Island Local Trust Committee Bylaw No. 293 cited as "Gabriola Island Land Use Bylaw No. 177, 1999, Amendment No. 1, 2017".

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Nancy Heatherington-Peirce made the following points:

- She requested that in reference to secondary suites located on properties within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) trustees should consider reinstating the option of allowing a secondary suite over an outbuilding so there is a choice between providing a manufactured home or suite over an outbuilding.
- She noted that the purpose of the Housing Options Review Project is to provide a wider range of housing options and based on that purpose the allowance of a secondary suite built over an out building provides further options for non-farming renters.
- She indicated that the enforcement challenges of ensuring that farm status is maintained in order for said secondary suite to remain in use are no different than existing enforcement challenges in reference to manufactured home use.
- She noted that the benefits of allowing the suite outweigh the potential enforcement challenges.

Kees Langereis made the following points:

- He disagrees with adding clause B.1.2.3.b in section 2.1 and believes this is a potential error.
- In section 2.6 he does not agree with including the language that all dwelling units are for residential purposes except when a Temporary Use Permit (TUP) is in place as this is an information note and not a rule. The Official Community Plan (OCP) TUP provides use for this therefore this clause is a duplication.
- In section B.6.6.2 he believes it should say only one secondary suite or a maximum of one suite
- In section B.6.6.6 it states an accessory building includes a cottage and feels this language is ambiguous.
- There is need for an additional statement noting that a detached secondary suite can be a maximum size of 868 square feet.
- He notes that the ALR regulation talks about immediate family only and not farm worker housing and he assumes the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) has seen this and has expressed no concern and he questions why.
- Within the agricultural zone there is reference to a secondary suite as a detached building
 and if the agricultural zone is always located within the ALR this language is not needed as it
 implies that an agricultural zone in not within the ALR.
- He does not agree with removing the word 'means' at the beginning of each definition.
- He believes the language in section B.1.2.3.b will generate a lot of illegal suites regardless of enforcement allowances and that illegal suites will occur in an increased manner.

Erik Johnson made the following points:

- He stated that he likes the document but believes that any ambiguity, as noted by Kees Langereis, needs to be removed.
- He has property located within the ALR and that ALR regulations supersede things that the LTC can do and he requests that the LTC use the ALCs template.
- He is concerned about increasing density and believes that this bylaw does not sound like a
 density increase.
- He appreciates the issues with enforcement however illegal suites are already an issue.

Public Hearing Record Received for Information By Local Trust Committee

He appreciates the work that has been done by the LTC.

Rosheen Holland made the following points:

- As a farmer she proposed that amendments regarding a suite above an existing building option on land within the ALR not be removed.
- She would like this to remain as an option to alleviate the problems of farm families who are trying to make ALR regulations work for them while operating as a working farm.
- A manufactured home is a high expense and it is more conservative for a farmer to use an existing building and this option has less impact on resources.
- The choice to have this option remain is important as it increases ecological and sustainable ways for farmers to have options.

Graham Bradley made the following points:

- He would like to propose that the option for an additional suite above accessory buildings remain.
- He noted that it is important for farm labourers to have accommodation year-round versus seasonal accommodation.
- Manufactured homes are not always ideal.
- The option of having rental income as a passive income source is valuable to farmers.

Chair Busheikin asked the public for any other comments or submissions. The Chair asked again for any further comments or submissions. The Chair asked a third and final time for submissions. Hearing none, Chair Busheikin closed the meeting.

4. ADJOURNMENT

By general consent the Public Hearing was adjourned at 11:45 am.

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A FAIR AND ACCURATE SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTI	NG THE MEETING F	IELD:	
	_		
Lisa Millard, Recorder			