



DISTRICT OF HIGHLANDS

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting held on September 20, 2011
Caleb Pike House, 1589 Millstream Road at 7:05 p.m.

PRESENT: Eleanor Rayner, Chair
Colleen Robertson, Vice Chair
Mara Dhillon
Honora Johannesen
Rick Lester
Allan Roger
Fred York

To Council
November 7, 2011

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Karel Roessingh, Council Liaison
Laura Beckett, Planner, Secretary to APC (*Arrived at 7:30PM*)
Two Members of the Public

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOVED BY: MARA DHILLON
SECONDED: FRED YORK

THAT the agenda be approved.

CARRIED

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

MOVED BY: COLLEEN ROBERTSON
SECONDED: HONORA JOHANNESSEN

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission minutes dated March 16, 2011 be adopted.

CARRIED

3. NEW BUSINESS

- 1) Council Referral – July 18, 2011
RE: REZONING APPLICATION – RZ-02-10 & OCP-03-10
LOT C, SECTION 30 AND 74, ROWNTREE AND GOWLLAND ROADS

The APC discussed the application. The applicant reviewed various points of the proposal, including how the amendments responded to Council's and staff's direction from August 2010. The following points were discussed:

- Amenity of trail
 - What are beginning and end locations;
 - How does it connect (*via Gowlland Tod*);
 - Potential for stairs;
 - Who would maintain trail;
 - Who would build (*NB: Developer indicated this is one of their proposed amenities*);

- What specifications;
- Route;
- Pedestrian, equestrian uses;
- Is this an adequate amenity to provide the land for a trail?
- Is this an important link?
- Generally this is considered to be a continuation of the two other Highlands Estates developments/phases
- Emergency access through two of the lots, connecting most of property
- Addressing affordable housing is addressed by proposing duplex lots and potential for suites (ex. rental units above garages) on single-family lots; massing and design of duplexes is intended to match design of rest of development
- What if each of the duplexes adds a secondary suite? What is the impact on the aquifer?
- Septic systems' functioning on duplex lots
- Location not appropriate for duplex; no bus service or other type of service typically available for "affordable housing"
- Not the place for "affordable housing"

MOVED BY: ALLAN ROGER
SECONDED: MARA DHILLON

That affordable housing not be considered in the context of this application due to location.

CARRIED

MOVED BY: RICK LESTER
SECONDED: COLLEEN ROBERTSON

That Council should define policy on types of affordable housing before recommending that applicants consider this in an application.

CARRIED

Applicant acknowledged that secondary suites and duplexes were not critical to their requirements for the project.

Further discussion points included:

- Reasonable location
- Logical extension of Highlands Estates
- Concern of additional burden on aquifer
- Want groundwater assessment specific to South Highlands (all properties, not just subject property)
- Maximum of 10 lots for this proposal is preferred
- Applicant explained that the 13-lot scenario makes the donation of land possible
- Benefit – Regional trail and parkland, plus building of trail
- Disincentive – number of homes
- Re: Amenity – prefer to see a dollar amount per door. Prefer \$10,000 per door, right now, to build community centre (\$130,000 total) instead of applicant paying for trail building

- Discussion regarding would the trail cost more or less than \$130,000. There was some thought that it might be more, but it was too hard to venture a guess. For that terrain, comment was made that it is more expensive to build a trail than a road.
- Acknowledged that, if successful, this application would result in Rowntree Road being brought up to standard (through subdivision requirements)
- Lots are small, but worth the trade-off for land donation/dedication.
- There was some general agreement that the members were OK with the 13-lot scenario, providing there were no suites or duplexes.

MOVED BY: COLLEEN ROBERTSON
SECONDED: ALLAN ROGER

Recommendation: With removal of suites and duplexes, proposed density is acceptable.

CARRIED

Discussion: Preference to have amenity money for community hall because:

- It is a regional connector, therefore it is expected that more regional people will use the trail than Highlanders
- More of a community benefit to have money for a community hall building
- Perhaps the region or the province or the federal government can build the trail since the land is being provided
- There are other things that the District of Highlands needs money for other than a community centre/hall.

MOVED BY: COLLEEN ROBERTSON
SECONDED: ALLAN ROGER

APC recommends accepting dedication of land, and in lieu of building a trail that there is a per door cash amenity to be dedicated to the community.

CARRIED

ABSTAINED: RICK LESTER
OPPOSED: ALLAN ROGER

4. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY: COLLEEN ROBERTSON

THAT the meeting adjourn at 9:15 p.m.

CARRIED

Eleanor Rayner, Chair

Laura Beckett, APC Secretary