

**DISTRICT OF SEHELDT
MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Community Meeting Room
1st Floor, 5797 Cowrie St., Sechelt
and
Via Zoom Online Meeting Platform
Tuesday, May 6, 2025
6:00 pm**

PRESENT **Commissioners** Scott Hanna, Neal Mackie, Archie Maclean, Bill McCreery, Vickie Morris, Jason Packer, Sharif Senbel, Angie Sita, Jesse Stuparyk and Joanne Van Ginkel (Chair)

REGRETS **Commissioner** Javier Siu

COUNCIL Mayor John Henderson and Councillor Alton Toth (gallery)

STAFF Director of Planning and Development A. Allen, Development Planning Manager I. Holl, Senior Development Planner T. Baker and Recording Secretary, M. Sugars

1. LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

2. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) Meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Recommendation No. 1 – Agenda

Moved/Seconded

That the agenda be adopted.

CARRIED

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the April 1, 2025 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

Recommendation No. 2 – Minutes of the April 1, 2025 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

Moved/Seconded

That the minutes of April 1, 2025 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

CARRIED

5. INTRODUCTION TO AGENDA ITEMS

The Senior Development Planner provided a verbal summary of the proposal, and noted that Aidan Shirley of Citystate Consulting Group, was in attendance to provide a presentation.

Mr. Shirley made a presentation and noted the applicant’s architect, Rob Lee, was also in attendance virtually to answer any questions.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS AND REPORTS

6.1 Zoning Bylaw Amendment for 23 Townhouse Units located at Lot B Baillie Road

Commissioners noted the following questions and comments:

- The landscaping plan proposes a large number of conifers, which conflict with FireSmart guidelines.
- Regarding the proposed location of the children’s play area:
 - The shadow analyses provided show that no sunlight reaches the play area between September 21 and March 21, and minimally for the rest of the year.
 - Site elevations provided reveal that the location downslope and up against the facade of Building 2 creates a situation where cold air will pool in the proposed play area.
 - Some members feel these factors make the current proposed location unsupportable.
 - A possible relocation area may be where the visitor parking is currently proposed or another suitable area to enhance sunlight access and minimize pooling of cold air.
- Drip irrigation is currently proposed for the site. If rainwater collection were to be considered, options for onsite water collection would need to be explored.
- It is suggested to consult with fire safety experts, as conifers pose a fire hazard. Alternative options should be considered.

- The planting plan appears crowded due to the proximity of buildings, leaving little room for both.
- This proposal will return to the APC at the development permit stage.
- There is concern that people may walk through the plantings to reach their units from the parking stalls. It is suggested to add pavers between parking spaces to protect the landscaping.
- Some members noted their appreciation of the efforts to separate the vehicles from the buildings.
- Some members commended the applicant for incorporating rain gardens, pervious paving, and native species.

Rob Lee, the architect for the application, spoke briefly about the architectural plans and form and character.

Commissioners further noted:

- Some members expressed their support for the density and provision of missing middle housing.
- Some members felt the application was supportable, while others felt it required significant revision prior to support.
- The application is requesting a relaxation of parking stall requirements. The proposal exceeds the parking stall requirements under the property's current zoning of R2, but does not meet the requirements of the proposed rezoning to R5.
- Staff clarified that parking requirements were amended in the District's Zoning Bylaw as per the Province's Small-scale Multi Unit Housing (SSMUH) legislation for other residential zones, but not R5.
- The property is close to transit.
- There are approximately 24 bus departures per day between the two bus routes that serve the area.
- The property shape is better suited to a strata development rather than traditional subdivision.
- Subdividing is less cost-effective both financially and in terms of timelines than a building strata.
- The proposed large unit sizes, seemingly geared towards families, may create a high number of occupants on the site.
- Most families, especially those with children, have more than one vehicle.
- Including two-bedroom units may attract a variety of demographics.
- Some members feel that rooftop patios, and small balconies, will not be used.
- Larger patio spaces on lower or ground levels may be beneficial.
- In terms of units per hectare, the proposed density is not excessive.
- All of the proposed units include several steps into the space, which causes access concerns.
- Only one accessible visitor parking stall is proposed.

- The applicant responded that additional accessible parking could be explored.
- Commission members enquired about the assignment of parking stalls:
 - The applicant explained that parking allocations are not typically finalized at this stage, however he assumed at least one stall would be assigned to each unit.
- Commission members enquired about electric vehicle (EV) charging:
 - The applicant explained that if the parking stalls are strata owned, they can explore the inclusion of EV charging stations.

Regarding the proposed large unit types, the applicant explained that surface parking is a significant factor. Since square footage of the building is not allotted for parking, living spaces could be larger, naturally making the units bigger. The developer feels with larger living spaces, additional bedrooms were logical. He also noted that their firm is involved with another development in Sechelt in which phase one of the project is exclusively two-bedroom units. He stated that while they aim to provide a variety of unit types in Sechelt, they are unable to provide all items in every project.

The following was further noted:

- Feedback from the public information meeting, held about two weeks ago, included concerns about density, building height, parking, and speed control.
 - The applicant noted that District engineering and planning staff were consulted about speed control, which will be implemented if data warrants it.
 - Mr. Shirley further noted that within the parameters of the current zoning, the allowable building height is larger than the proposed project under the R5 zone, if successful.
- Currently, street parking is proposed, however staff confirmed that approximately five parking stalls may be located on the street.
- If the property is not rezoned, subdivision equaling five lots could potentially occur, with up to four units per lot, and 20 units total allowed under the current zoning. The current proposal requests 23 units.
- The development is proposed to be built according to BC Building Code Step Three.
- Some members feel this development is appropriate for the housing needs of Sechelt.
- Some members feel families will scale down the number of vehicles, while other disagree.
- Some members requested clarification on the differences between subdivision and rezoning.
- Some members feel the proposed density is too great, while others feel it is necessary.
- Some members feel the site is too small to incorporate all of the proposed items.
- There is skepticism about the marketability of the units.
- The proposed development may be costly to construct, making the units unaffordable.
- Some members feel the proposed setbacks are too small.
- Some members feel the proposed balconies are too narrow.
- There may be a large number of children living in the development and some members feel the proposed play areas and outdoor space is inadequate.
- Some members feel the interior layouts could be improved.

- Slab on grade construction with front patios were suggested.
- The roofline is believed to be inefficient for snow and maintenance.
- There was support for the façades below the roofline.
- Adjoining buildings are not shown, lacking context.
- All neighbouring buildings should be shown on site plans and street views to provide context and scale as the houses are close to the property lines.
- This is the first proposal of this scale in the neighbourhood, and challenges are expected.
- Neighbouring properties will likely be in shadow if the project is constructed as currently proposed.
- Setbacks or stepped buildings were suggested.
- Context of adjacent buildings and 3D street view renderings should be shown.
- There is a retaining wall on the south side.
- The topography is not clear.
- Garbage and recycling enclosures are anticipated but not shown, with common bins expected near Baillie Road.
- Variation in car sizes should be shown in all parking areas.
- Some members echoed feelings that both the number and size of the units should be reduced, and they do not feel the current proposal is supportable.
- Further accessibility measures were suggested.
- Varied unit types were suggested.
- The sawtooth roof pattern adds height, which may be a concern.
 - Over height ceilings could be considered if this roof shape is pursued.
- Privacy and eyes on the street should be balanced, considering the location of play areas and daylight.
- Balconies may be used as storage areas if they are not functional.
- The reduction in parking is supported by some due to proximity to transit, however, measures should be taken to maximize the experience for cyclists, including secure or covered bike parking for e-bikes, cars, and trailers.
- Some members would appreciate further sustainability initiatives, while others feel added measures may contribute to the unaffordability of the units.
- Some members noted that increased sustainability at the construction stage creates units which are cheaper to operate and maintain long-term, reiterating that innovation is encouraged.
- Some members feel that families may be deterred by the lack of parking.

Recommendation No. 3 – Zoning Bylaw Amendment for 23 Townhouse Units located at Lot B Baillie Road

Moved/Seconded

That the APC recommends to Council that the parking variance be supported, with the following considerations:

- Vehicle size distribution within the site;
- Stall assignment for individual units; and
- EV charging provisions.

CARRIED

Recommendation No. 4 – Zoning Bylaw Amendment for 23 Townhouse Units located at Lot B Baillie Road

Moved/Seconded

That the APC recommends to Council that the applicant consider the following design changes, and/or additions:

- On grade patios;
- Improved accessibility;
- Protected bicycle parking;
- Pavers from parking stalls to units in between vegetation strips;
- Garbage enclosure;
- Playground location;
- Alternatives to the Saw-tooth roof pattern;
- Increased balcony size;
- Possible reduction in height;
- Further exploration of parking layout; and
- Additional information on aspects of sustainability.

CARRIED

Recommendation No. 5 – Zoning Bylaw Amendment for 23 Townhouse Units located at Lot B Baillie Road

Moved/Seconded

The APC recommends that the applicant revisit the site massing and building scale in the context of adjacent buildings and neighbourhood; and

Upon return to the APC, provide the following:

- site plan that includes adjacent buildings;
- site section that includes adjacent buildings; and
- 3D rendering that includes neighbourhood context.

CARRIED

The Chair called a brief break at 7:39 pm

The meeting resumed at 7:42 pm

6.2 Development Permit for 5504 Trail Avenue

The Development Planning Manager provided an overview of the proposal and noted that the applicant's representative, Drew Ambercrombie of Mallen Gowing Berzins Architecture, is available virtually. Mr. Abercrombie stated the applicants goal to maintain the same perimeter and massing of the current building.

Commissioners noted the following questions and comments:

- Some members applauded the relocation of the entrance, and the overall good urban design.
- The architect is not aware of any plans to close the south-east vehicle access.
- The applicant is seeking additional loading connections, and is therefore proposed.
- While the additional loading area may increase congestion, those deliveries are currently taking place with trucks using regular parking stalls.
- In person retailers are competing with online retailers.
- Some members feel that the internal layout changes may be problematic.
- It was suggested that the internal layout be revised to remove the dead end.
 - Staff clarified that the internal layout changes are not within the scope or regulations of this application.
- The signage present in the rendering appears large.
 - Staff clarified that the signage shown in the renderings is governed by the Sign Bylaw, and is not within the scope or regulations of this application.
- Patrons who park at the mall may be visiting neighbouring establishments.
- Further measures to protect patrons from the elements when accessing stores from the exterior could be considered.
- The proposed façade modifications are an improvement from the current state.
- The proposed streetscape improvements are notable.
- Concerns were reiterated regarding the size of the loading dock.
- The loading dock should be large enough to accommodate the largest delivery truck.
- The property owner should ensure the garbage disposal area is screened off and does not invite others to dump garbage or other items there.
- The owner is most in-tune with the needs of the tenants and property.

Recommendation No. 6 – Development Permit for 5504 Trail Avenue

Moved/Seconded

That the APC recommends to Council that the development permit for 5504 Trail Avenue be approved.

CARRIED

7. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Planning Commission meeting of May 6, 2025 was adjourned at 8:06 pm.

Certified Correct:

Joanne Van Ginkel, Chair

Kerianne Poulsen, Corporate Officer