
From: Carola Bun [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 7:47 AM
To: Council <Council@sechelt.ca>
Subject: Item 8.1: Small Lots in the Village Infill Area

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution opening links or attachments.

Dear Mayor and Council,

Earlier this year, my husband and I were forced to move from our rental apartment into his parents' home, with our 10-month old son in-tow. Coupled with the ongoing affordability crisis, when the pandemic hit, our household income was significantly reduced leaving us devastated, like so many others impacted by Covid and limited housing options. Full disclosure, Gaetan and Zoe are my parents and I work as a planner with CityState Consulting.

My family's goal is to own a home, while having stability, peace of mind and flexibility. And ideally, we would like to have a patch of garden in a small, manageable yard. With land values escalating over the past three years, we are told university grads will have to save for *decades* to have enough money for a down payment.

Just prior to Covid, we were prequalified by our bank in a range that offered very limited product on the market. Now, banks are far more cautious, it's harder to qualify and CMHC subsidies have been reduced. This means home ownership in Sechelt is still out of reach for growing families like ours.

Charming, smaller lots present the opportunity for boomers to age in place, often with their adult kids or an aging parent next door. And for young professionals like us, it maybe the only chance to have a nest egg we can call our own.

Please support item 8.1 on this evening's council agenda. Small lots can cut land values in half and make home ownership more affordable and obtainable.

Thank you for your consideration in bringing affordable options to Sechelt!

Respectfully,
Carola

From: [Bill Quarry](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application 3360-2020-05
Date: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 8:26:22 AM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

We reside in the older area of Sechelt and are concerned about the rezoning application! The property has been rezoned back to residential and a lane or carriage house could be constructed! The house has not been resided in for 30 some years! Why is the applicant using the address for his business City State and does not live there? Why did the applicant personally renovate the building for the past 10 months during Covid restrictions while living off Coast? Why did the applicant have trees removed from the property before the rezoning application? Why is the applicant not content to build a lane house rather than subdivide the property? If this lot is subdivided it will set a huge precedent for future small lots being subdivided in Sechelt ! Yes we need more density for living in central Sechelt and lane houses would be great ! To retain the character of an older home, lane houses would enhance the property rather than subdividing and building a new house. If a new house is built on the subdivided property it is not a great location for a home next to a Fire Hall ! We reside on the Corner of Trail Ave.& Dolphin Street and are very aware of how busy and noisy it is with all traffic including the Fire Hall ! We are in favour of a lane house being built but are opposed to the lot being subdivided ! Please respond to us that this email was received. Thank You !
.....Bill & Mary Quarry

From: [Judy Sim](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Rezoning application 5547 trail avenue
Date: Friday, January 29, 2021 1:29:27 PM

I am the owner /resident at [REDACTED] mermaid. I am against this small lot subdivision. The owner can build a house for family as they have stated, under the lot's current state. Thank you. Ron Sim.

Sent from my iPad

BY EMAIL – planning@sechelt.ca / council@sechelt.ca

February 5, 2021

District of Sechelt
2nd Floor, 5797 Cowrie St
Sechelt, B.C. V0N 3A0

Attention: Planning Department

Re: Development Application Referral # 3360-2020-5 - CityState Consulting

The applicant forwarded this plan to us asking for our views on his application and our Board of Directors considered this matter at a recent meeting.

Workforce housing is the most pressing issue faced by our members and, indeed, most if not all businesses, community organizations and governments on the Coast.

Accordingly, we fully support initiatives that address, even slightly, this dire and urgent shortage. We therefore support the application which delivers both a direct albeit small improvement to the current shortage of housing and, hopefully, some encouragement to other property owners and developers that such creative applications are welcomed by the District.

In this respect, we also ask that you ensure that any and all of your processes and procedures are expedited so as to ensure both the approval and construction of these types of applications proceed without delay.

In conclusion, and as the Proactive Voice of Business for much of the Sunshine Coast, The Chamber supports this application.

On a related matter, we note that the Referral dated October 1st was not referred to us. As our members are directly impacted by housing applications, we ask that you ensure future projects are forwarded to us directly.

Sincerely
SECHELT & DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

ED PEDNAUD
Executive Director

Sechelt & District Chamber of Commerce

Phone: +1 604 885-0662

PO Box 360, Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0

www.SecheltChamber.bc.ca

exec@SecheltChamber.bc.ca

From: [Jan Major](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: File No: 3360-2020-05 (CityState)
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 11:05:15 AM

To: The District of Sechelt Planning and Development

Re: Public Hearing on Tuesday, February 16, 2021

I own the property across the street from 5547 Trail Avenue - [REDACTED] Street - and I have the following questions and comment:

Does the District of Sechelt Council plan on amending the official community plan to allow all lots downtown to be subdivided into parcels as small as 350 square meters?

Does the District risk setting a precedent in allowing these tiny lots to go ahead?

Perhaps the District should look at amending the OCP as a first step and allow lots in this area, close to downtown, to be rezoned multi-family before cutting them up into tiny single family parcels?"

Thanks and regards,
Janice Major

From: Dianne McLauchlan [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Council
Subject: 5547 Trail Avenue (CityState) Rezoning 3360-2020 05

As a professional planner I live in the village area and would like to build a laneway house. However, this applicant's project poses a dangerous precedent that could ruin the fabric and the quality of life here and subject to us to rampant land speculation and needless redevelopment. Blanket lot splitting through the village should not be encouraged or permitted.

We are undergoing a District wide zoning bylaw review, Trail Avenue was just upgraded, and we have severe water shortage problems in the summer. We need to stop building so many single family homes because they are not affordable or sustainable. Keep the village as the walkable, quiet, affordable, diverse area it is supposed to be as per the OCP.

Say no to this application and no to a R-2A minimum lot of 350 m2. Instead work with owners in the OCP village infill area to accommodate existing homes, reduce costs, etc. to put in appropriate small laneway homes - 90 m2 maximum. Probably use CD zoning.

Thank you.

Dianne McLauchlan
[REDACTED] Street

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Joan Payne](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: RE: Dec 8, 2020 Public Hearing
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 11:54:51 AM

This is a comment on rezoning of 5547 Trail Ave. I think that the current zoning of starfish lane for lane housing is a better way to get affordable housing into the core area. I don't think City State has a very good plan for dividing the property. Joan Payne, Payne [REDACTED] St. Sechelt.

From: [Warren Allan](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: RE: Dec 8, 2020 Public Hearing
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 3:22:15 PM

Warning! This message was sent from outside your organization and we are unable to verify the sender.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Comments,

I write as a concerned resident having some knowledge of municipal government practices, policies and general land use issues. I don't actively follow the affairs of our local government much anymore however, having been a 3 term municipal councillor including a year as Deputy Mayor, having chaired numerous committees during my terms and having sat as a community member on the Advisory Planning Commission prior, I offer the following comments.

"The District of Sechelt has received a rezoning application for 5547 Trail Avenue. CityState Consulting has applied to reduce the minimum parcel size from 700 m2 to 350 m2 in the Residential Village Infill Zone 2A (R-2A) Zone to facilitate a two-lot subdivision. **The intent is to retain the existing single family home and construct a new home on the proposed lot fronting Starfish Lane.** This application is consistent with the District of Sechelt Official Community Plan."

Firstly, I don't understand why a single application for a variance of a single property would result in such a significant proposed revision of the R-2A zone to request "micro lots" be a permitted use in the development of our community at this time. If the applicant wishes to apply for a (minor) variance to the present R-2A permitted uses allowed for the subject property, so be it, request that it be made properly as a minor variance (set-backs, as an example) or as a Comprehensive Development application for the subject property. The rationale for requesting such a significant zoning amendment to the R-2A zoning uses for a single property escapes me, as it would be more appropriate or, as the applicant indicated "... apply for rezoning to Comprehensive Development (CD zone)."

As the applicant further noted "... A CD zone is site-specific and would not help anyone else in the same predicament in the future. We propose that a simple text amendment of the R-2A zone would be the best way to achieve our goal and, at the same time, allow subdivision of existing Village Infill Area properties once rezoned." The operative wording "simply" grossly understates the impacts and potential complexity of such a request. Is this a "simple" request by the applicant or an attempt to redefine to purposes and intent of our R-2A zoning. So, one must wonder, why is this redefining of the permitted use of the existing zoning, which goes far beyond the apparent purpose of the application, being proposed by an applicant?

Secondly, with respect to CD zoning, yes, it's not perfect, however did you know that Sechelt already has some 30 CD zones, so it is not precedent setting, that have dealt with single applications to define and limit the use, form and character of numerous properties throughout Sechelt.

What should be a fairly straight forward (minor) variance application for a single property appears to

be an effort by the applicant to justify a completely new zone. Is this the responsibility of the average citizen? Or is it the responsibility of local government to engage broadly with affected residents to discuss the benefits of such proposed redefinitions and the implications of such an application. In these times, not by posting notice, or having Zoom meetings which by its very nature limits input to perhaps a few dozen residents at best, is fair to the process.

Lastly, laneway housing should continue to be encouraged and supported with efforts by the municipality (perhaps request a report from planning on practices in other municipalities?) that actively promote the development of laneway housing. Maybe offer to waive some of the initial application fees or some such costs, a small price to pay for the ensuing future taxation benefits, for maybe the next year or so? That would easily be a more appropriate way to retain the character of the neighbourhood

Zoning already permits a principal residence and laneway housing. Allow laneway housing as bare land stratas. The smaller dwelling would obviously be more attractive and financially within reach of younger buyers or seniors. So, I ask, on what basis was there to propose such a broad approach to what should be the development of a single property by a single property owner? Has there been any long-term studies of the implications of significantly re-writing the permitted uses of the present zoning? Municipal sewage capacity? Water use? To name a few. Has there been any broad public consultation about the impacts of redefining the permitted uses? What density benefits have been requested by the District or offered by the applicant?

Attempting to propose substantial changes to the existing zoning for a single applicant during this pandemic is also "simply" bad practice and policy, there are no pressing reasons that I'm aware of to re-write our OCP or present zonings at this time. It would be more appropriate to wait until broader public input is possible to be gathered from the community if this is the will of council and the community that elected them.

Bad idea ... Request the applicant comply with laneway housing, as presently permitted or with minor variance if necessary, or re-apply for a CD zoning for the subject property only to accommodate this specific application to be able to define/limit the permitted use, lot size of the subject property and form and character of the proposed improvements of the subject property.

To redefine/rewrite the permitted uses of the entire R-2A zoning to accommodate a single application makes no sense.

Kind regards and stay safe,

Warren Allan
[REDACTED] Sunshine Coast Hwy,
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A2
T: [REDACTED]

From: [Jim Lafferty](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [Darla](#); [Judy Hoeppe](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application 3360 2020 05
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 4:37:58 PM

The Sechelt Village Residents Association does not approve of this project. The lot is zoned for a lane house and that would be an appropriate use. The north part of that lot is a meter higher than Trail Ave. so any house just 5 meters in would seem very tall. Allowing minimum lot size to be lowered by one half is a big step and should be carefully considered.

Respectfully,
Jim Lafferty
Sechelt Village Residents Association

From: Brian McFadyen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 7:35 PM
To: Council <Council@sechelt.ca>
Subject: City State Rezoning Application for 5547 Trail Ave

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Attention : District of Sechelt Council

I do not support this rezoning application at this time. Allowing for the creation of micro lots in the downtown Sechelt core on an ad hoc basis could cause unforeseen circumstances in the future. I do support the building of lane housing as zoning permits.

If the applicants wish to build a lane house for a family member they should proceed as current zoning allows. In time as some lane housing is developed and seems to be a good option for higher density in practice then I would suggest micro lots could be considered for the next stage for infill development. At that time this proposal could be revisited.

Brian McFadyen
[REDACTED] Street
Sechelt BC

From: [Margaret Gory](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Rezoning App 3360-2020-05 (CityState)
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 10:56:11 AM

Warning! This message was sent from outside your organization and we are unable to verify the sender.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

To all concerned:

My concerns about rezoning application 3360-2020-05 (CityState) are regards to parking and utilities:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->**Parking:** You just have to watch upper Mermaid St. a few days to notice the crowding of cars parked along it. Even though some properties have parking off the lanes, there are still multiple vehicles parked on the street. If I know a contractor is coming, I move my vehicle onto the street as soon as I notice a spot open in front of my place. The contractor can then use my driveway rather than my paying them to walk up and down the block to get to their truck. If there are two houses per now-existing lot area, surely matters will be worse?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->**Utilities:** Will garbage/recycling still be picked up only in the lane or do we increase costs to accommodate street collection too? Street pickup could be problematic-See #1 above. Lane-only collection requires the front resident to cross another's property in order to put out their bins.

While I accept that the above may not be an issue in this particular case, what happens later when one lot is sold to a non-relative? Will the owner of the back small lot still allow the other access to the lane if there's no street collection service? What happens with parking when the under-house garage is converted to more living space (as so often happens) or the children grow and have their own vehicles?

I request council keep these comments in mind when amending the bylaw before setting a precedence that may later haunt us.

Thank you.

Margaret Gory
[REDACTED] St.



Virus-free. www.avg.com