

COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT

Notes of the Public Hearing held on Monday June 12, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at the Lower Level of the Cedar Heights Community Centre, 2316 Lakeview Drive, Blind Bay, BC, regarding proposed Bylaw No. 725-8 and Bylaw No. 701-87.

PRESENT: Chair Paul Demenok – Electoral Area C Director
Dan Passmore – Senior Planner, Development Services
22 members of the public including the applicants

Chair Demenok called the Public Hearing to order at 6:00 pm. Following introductions, the Chair advised that all persons who believe that their interest in property may be affected shall be given the opportunity to be heard or to present written submissions pertaining to the proposed Electoral Area 'C' Official Community Plan Amendment (Shuswap Lake Estates) Bylaw No. 725-8 and South Shuswap Zoning Amendment (Shuswap Lake Estates) Bylaw No. 701-87.

The Planner explained the requirements of Section 470 of the Local Government Act and noted that the Public Hearing Report will be submitted to the Board for consideration at its July 20, 2017 meeting. The Planner explained the notification requirements set out in the Local Government Act and noted the Public Hearing was placed in the Shuswap Market News on May 26 and June 2, 2017.

The Planner provided background information regarding this application and reviewed the purpose of the bylaws.

The Chair opened the floor for comments.

Nancy Hoyles, 2714 Golf Course Drive, asked whether any response had been given to referrals to First Nations.

The Planner advised that no responses from First Nations had been received by the CSRD.

Krista Friesen, 2545 Golf Course Drive Drive, on behalf of the applicant outlined some specifics regarding the proposed development. She noted that the site densities were originally permitted through a rezoning approved in 2013, which were not recognized in the subsequent adoption of the OCP bylaw. She advised that major difference from the zoning approved in 2013 was that this application would permit the seniors complex anywhere on the property, but that the site development was more likely to be townhomes, duplexes or single family dwellings. She stated that parkland requirements were fulfilled in 1996 when a portion of land totaling 5% of the total development parcel was dedicated as parkland by Loftus Lake just off Balmoral Road, and therefore parkland would not be required for this development. In spite of this the developer is looking at providing walking trail access through the rear of this property down to Loftus Lake. She noted that vehicle access to the development site could not be from Sunnyvale Place, and that Golf Course Drive had been originally developed to collector standards and admitted that traffic along Golf Course Drive is a concern of the

developer, however, the current collector status of the road reflects the current zoned densities that will be serviced. She advised that development densities of nearby townhome developments were 6.5 and 6.6 units per ha and that the density within Autumn Ridge would be 5.6 units per ha and that the MD designation allows up to 10 units per ha. The lot sizes in the Autumn Ridge development would be 475 m². She noted that for parking each home in Autumn Ridge would have a double garage, and have driveway apron parking for an additional 2 vehicles. Finally, she advised that Shuswap Lake Estates had initiated a community survey and held an open house on December 8, 2016. The results of the public input process led the developer to design Autumn Ridge to reflect market desires and that 78% of respondents were positive about the development. She indicated that the open house resulted in 21 interested buyers in the project.

Larry Stephenson, 2706 Golf Course Drive, advised that he has been following the course of this development closely and that by and large it has resulted in a pleasing aesthetic appeal. He stated that his principal area of concern was with respect to Golf Course Drive as a collector road. He noted that it is in fact a residential road. Other servicing issues have been taken care of, notably the water and sewer servicing, but traffic impacts increasing due to development do not seem to be. The problem is with a rural standard road servicing urban scale development patterns. He advised that Golf Course Drive was not designed for pedestrians and that no parking is permitted on the road, with a 24' wide paved width. He noted that the next phase of development has not been discussed and if it results in a higher density seniors facility, too much additional loading on Golf Course Drive will result. Again he stressed that the overall development quality is good, but that it is lacking in certain details, notable a second collector road linking the development to Balmoral Road.

Nancy Hoyles, 2714 Golf Course Drive, advised that she had a number of concerns regarding the development proposal the application. She stated that the development will have a significant impact on the residents in the area through the increased density. She noted that the Autumn Ridge site would allow 37 units, with a population increase of 2 people per unit, for 74 people. This would translate into 2 cars per residence and would overall increase traffic on Golf Course Drive from Cedar Drive to Balmoral Road. She advised that the current posted speed limit on Golf Course Drive is 50 kmph, and that this is regularly exceeded by all. This makes for a dangerous situation as there is no refuge available for pedestrians on Golf Course Drive. Compounding this was the regular use of the road to drive golf carts on. She stated that the main entrance to the Autumn Ridge development was adjacent to Lots 14, 15, and 16, across Golf Course Drive and was immediately opposite her driveway. She perceives that some realtors would not take a listing of such a lot on a "tee", significantly reducing the value of her property. She noted that the development property is currently used by residents for recreational purposes and that it was a great place to walk dogs. This current use will be displaced through development and she wondered where people would go as an alternative. She stated that the parkland dedicated for this development is not useful and that the developer needs to establish walking trails throughout the entire development. She noted that this density, if approved would place additional loading on service infrastructure which may drive up levies for existing lots. She asked why this development needs to proceed when Fox Glen has 14 unsold lots, and the Highlands has 56. She advised that aging in place is a worthwhile goal, but that the marketing seems to be targeting out of area customers. Lastly she stated that when she was purchasing her home, she asked the developer about future plans for this site and was

told that the seniors facility would be on the west side and that she would not have purchased if she was aware of the entrance being immediately opposite the property she was considering. She finished by advising that she will now have to relocate at a financial loss to her.

Sue McCrae, 2549 Golf Course Drive, talked about the needs of the area, and that Shuswap Lake Estates was the only development with full servicing, offering options for following new trends for development. She noted that people do want to age in place and provided census figures indicating the aging population in the area. She stated that this property had been slated for higher densities for some time. She advised that development trends indicate that walking trails are necessary in the area and that planning should be reflective of future needs. Of these needs she advised that the lack of seniors housing and some form of local health care provision were important and that the existence of water and sewer infrastructure is essential to support this need.

Jordie Wiens, 2541 Golf View Place, noted that since he had purchased in the area 3 people had moved out because there was currently no alternative to downscale. He stated that Golf Course Drive is a good road, but that walking trails in the area are needed. He advised that he is currently working for the Barkers to log the Balmoral corner property and to construct walking trails on that property. He finished by noting that because of the servicing, more options for a variety of lots and development was possible.

Craig Russenholt, #21 – 2550 Golf Course Drive, advised that the type of housing proposed in this development has been needed in this area for a long time, and that there is currently no alternative available for those residents who may wish to downsize. He stated that it was not his intention to continue living in a large home forever and that the community needs the type of options available in this development proposal to help people to stay in the area.

Doug Cathio, 2733 Sunnydale Drive, noted that the development plan for Autumn Ridge showed that proposed Lots 1 and 2 would front onto the new internal strata road and not onto Sunnydale Drive, and that this would take away from the continuity on Sunnydale Drive by facing in rather than onto the street front. He noted that the presence of the rear of homes on Sunnydale Drive would not result in pleasing aesthetics. He inquired about whether there would be some form of screening between the new Autumn Ridge and the existing homes off Sunnydale Drive. He also questioned whether some form of community center in the area would eliminate a perceived need for additional green space. He finished by asking if there was not some park dedication requirement in place.

Terry Barker, 1805 Archibald Road, responded by stating that a park had been dedicated near Loftus Lake and Balmoral Road, and that a buffer of 15.0 m around Loftus Lake had been reserved by covenant as green space. As a result the autumn ridge development is not required to have park. He advised that some form of fencing would be installed between autumn ridge and the neighbouring properties on Sunnydale Drive. He finished by stating that no community center was planned.

Doug Cathio, 2733 Sunnydale Drive, responded by asking about why the community center was not planned.

Terry Barker, 1805 Archibald Road, responded by stating that a lot of amenities were considered for the overall development, but that people did not want to pay for them, so they would not be installed.

Doug Cathio, 2733 Sunnydale Drive, responded by advising that Lot 2 should not have been included in the autumn ridge development proposal.

Chair Demenok interceded to remind the public that the Public Hearing was to hear input rather than to debate the merits of the application.

Jane Stephenson, 2706 Golf Course Drive, advised that she felt that there was a need for services for seniors in the area, and that seniors already there had a need to be able to access services. She stated that smaller homes on small lots does not change the needs that seniors have for services. She noted that the community seemed to have a disregard for the speed limit posted on Golf Course Drive, and that this created a safety issue. She stated that a recent issue of the resident newsletter remarked about the clearing of the large property at the Balmoral corner. She questioned if this was done to make the property ready for development and if so, what would that development be.

Terry Barker, 1805 Archibald Road, responded by speculating that it might be for a town center, maybe, but that he had no current plans for the site. He advised that walking trails throughout this area currently being constructed would only be temporary in nature.

Chair Demenok noted that the land was currently in the ALR.

Karen Brown, 2730 Sunnydale Drive, indicated that she saw the need for more diverse housing choices in the area and that she had no issues with the proposed development. She remarked that she did however have concerns with Golf Course Drive. She stated that she does not trust in the Provincial Government to maintain the road. She advised that she walks in the area and wondered about the trail indicated in the back of the development proposal and where it went. She noted that the development proposal was a welcome addition but that she agreed with comments made by Doug Cathio earlier that Sunnydale Drive should be finished property as an act of good faith.

Jennie Anderson, 2628 Golf View Crescent, stated that a sidewalk was needed along Golf Course Drive and that the road was not kept up properly.

Karen Brown, 2730 Sunnydale Drive, noted that the proposal provided the developer with some fluidity for the placement of a seniors center, and that placement of such a facility closer to Golf Course Drive would be a cause for concern for her aesthetically.

Terry Barker, 1805 Archibald Road, responded by stating that the property had previously been zoned for a seniors center, but that he was doubtful it would happen. But if it does, he wanted greater flexibility on where it would be located.

Karen Brown, 2730 Sunnydale Drive, reiterated that the Seniors Center could potentially go anywhere.

Neil Sandikoff, unknown, inquired about retail use as part of the proposal.

Chair Demenok advised that home business would be a permitted secondary use in the zone.

Nancy Hoyles, 2714 Gold Course Drive, redirected by indicating that she thought Neil Sandikoff's question was in regard to the term Village Centre.

The Planner advised that the OCP had designated a Village Center and Secondary Settlement Area Development Permit area for form and character of development, in areas where development densities and preexisting commercial development had occurred. In reality, Blind Bay is a secondary settlement area, and the Village Centre is actually for downtown Sorrento.

Larry Stephenson, 2706 Golf Course Drive, noted that this rezoning amendment application represented what was originally meant to occur on this property, but that roads are taken for granted in the planning process. He stated that currently nobody has a say on road issues and that this needs to be taken into account. Roads must address the future needs of the area.

Hearing no further representations or questions about proposed Bylaw No. 725-8 and Bylaw No. 701-87 the Chair called three times for further submissions before declaring the public hearing closed at 6:55 p.m.

CERTIFIED as being a fair and accurate report of the public hearing.

Original Signed by

Director Paul Demenok
Public Hearing Chair



Dan Passmore
Senior Planner