

**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, September 3, 2024  
6:00 pm**

**PRESENT**            **Commissioners** Sharif Senbel (Chair), Scott Hanna, Ken King, Randy Knill, Sheena Macdonald, Archie Maclean, Bill McCreery, and Joanne Van Ginkel

**REGRETS**           **Commissioner** Javier Siu

**COUNCIL**           Mayor John Henderson (gallery) and Councillor Alton Toth (gallery)

**STAFF**              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 5:58 pm.

**3.     ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**Recommendation No. 1 – Agenda**

**Moved/Seconded**

That the agenda be amended to add item 6.2 (Minute Distribution - Verbal Discussion) and:

That the agenda be adopted as amended.

**CARRIED**

#### **4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

##### **4.1 Minutes of the August 20, 2024 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting**

#### **Recommendation No. 2 – Minutes of the August 20, 2024 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting**

#### **Moved/Seconded**

That the minutes of August 20, 2024 Advisory Planning Commission meeting adopted.

**CARRIED**

#### **5. INTRODUCTION TO AGENDA ITEMS**

The Senior Development Planner provided an overview of the proposal and noted that Aidan Shirley of CityState Consulting Group, and Rob Lee of Mara + Natha Architects, were in attendance. Mr. Shirley provided a presentation of the proposal.

#### **6. BUSINESS ITEMS AND REPORTS**

##### **6.1 Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

The commission discussed the following questions:

- The Development Permit (DP) application is only for a portion of the parcel:
  - The entire property was rezoned; however, the construction is taking place in phases due to financial feasibility.
  - A subdivision application for the property has been submitted.
  - If subdivision is approved, each phase will be treated as separate developments as they will be on separate parcels.
- The current address for the parcel is located on Shoal Way, but the current phase fronts Links Street?
  - Once the subdivision is complete, this parcel will front onto Links Street and be given a new address provided by the Sunshine Coast Regional District.
- Neighbouring playgrounds:
  - Kinnikinnick Elementary School is the closest playground.
  - There is another playground located on church property in the area as well; however, it is private.
- What data is there to indicate this is *workforce housing*?
  - In this case, the term is determined by unit size and price point.
  - There is no current data showing the proposal is considered *workforce housing*.
  - The developer is trying to create efficient, affordable housing to contrast the number of large, single detached homes.

- The applicant is not able to provide a timeline of construction and completion, but will consult the owner.
- Outdoor amenity space:
  - Development Permit Areas (DPA) outline basic guidelines, but do not impose requirements.
  - Additional park space is typically requested at the rezoning stage.
  - A community garden was requested for the site in its entirety, but is not required at this phase.
- The future phases of the site are not yet known.
  - If the subdivision application is completed, future phases will be on separate properties.
- The applicant is intending to retain trees, with the exception of a staging area. The owner would be able to provide a more in-depth answer.
- The current phase is proposed to be fee-simple strata. Future phases may include affordable housing contributions or cash in lieu in the form of Community Amenity Contributions.
- This phase is not proposed to include any accessible units, as they are all one unit type.
  - Future phases may include entry level units that could be adaptable for accessibility.
- The applicant believes air conditioning via heat pumps are proposed, but will confirm with the owner.
- Wiring for level two electric vehicle charging will be roughed in for each unit.
- Staff had initially requested a pedestrian pathway between Shoal Way and Links Street:
  - The pathway request was located on the remainder portion of the parcel.
  - There is currently one road dedication and one road reservation included in the subdivision proposal.
  - The developer believes the pathway should not be required because:
    - The north-west corner of the property contains a road right-of-way which will be an extension of Fairway Avenue and connects to the neighbouring property.
    - Once the neighbouring property is developed, this road continuation will connect to Links Street, providing vehicle connectivity between Shoal Way and Links Street.
    - The property to the east contains an existing pedestrian pathway between Shoal Way and Links Street.
    - They believe there is not enough room for a pathway in addition to the road construction and improvements needed in the north-west portion of the site.
  - Staff note further work is required on road dedication/construction as part of the subdivision application review.
- There is a proposed utility right of way on the east side of the site, to be provided at the time of subdivision.

- An underground water system is proposed to provide irrigation.
  - The size of the tank was determined by the applicant's engineer.
  - The applicant can obtain the rationale for the size of the tank and how long the tank will be able to provide irrigation.
- The commission may benefit from seeing physical samples of exterior features, as digital renderings may be inaccurate.
- A design review panel may be beneficial for Sechelt.
- The owner is exploring construction options regarding pre-fabrication.

Additional comments included:

- This type and size of housing is needed.
- There is some concern there is no place for children to play, or green space.
- The landscape design feels utilitarian, but understandable.
- The interior space could be reworked to eliminate one of the two proposed staircases.
- There are concerns regarding the road construction and the potential lack of drainage,
- The 'stepping' of the windows appears uneven, and would be more visually appealing if they were lined up.
- The unit entrances being located at the back seems unclear for visitors.
- Concerns were voiced regarding the lack of windows and the size of the proposed ones.
- No recreation vehicle parking is proposed.
- There is no turnaround proposed for the roads for firetrucks.
- More trees could be included on the site, although they may be excluded for fire prevention.
- The main entrance steps appear narrow.
- The entrance is located on the opposite side of the parking spots.
- Some members felt the shape of the units could be more efficient.
- Some members felt the interior layouts of the units could be revisited to improve views and efficiency.

The applicant's architect clarified the following:

- The slope of the road is dictated by the civil engineer, which is why the units are stepped.
- There is a continuous trough located between the roof pitches to provide drainage.
- The road length meets code requirements for firetrucks to back in and out without a turn around.
- Most residents will use their individual entrances, not the front main entrance.
- The applicant can review the interior staircases.
- The applicant will review the interior floor plans to improve views.

Commission members additionally noted their feelings that:

- The current proposal does not leave much room for the remainder of the site.
- A previous proposal for the site worked more effectively with the topography.
- The current proposal appears to work against the topography of the site.
- Basement suites are not provided.
  - The applicant noted that neighbouring residents expressed concerns regarding the massing of the building, and changes were made to present a smaller façade.
- the accessibility of the pathways are too steep.
- The slope could be leveled off in some areas.
- A terraced design may be more appropriate.

**Recommendation No. 3 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

- The APC recommends the applicant revisit the site plan, and consider including a dedicated amenity space on the north-west side of the property in accordance with Development Permit Area 7.

**CARRIED**

**Recommendation No. 4 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

- The APC recommends the architect revisit the north and south elevations to provide a more orderly composition.

**DEFEATED**

Staff clarified that DPA guidelines do not regulate interior layouts or design.

**Recommendation No. 5 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

That the APC recommends the architect revisit the interior layout to increase efficiency, room orientation to appropriate views, and interior access to the suites.

**CARRIED**

**Recommendation No. 6 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

The APC recommends that the proponent revisit the size and locations of windows to allow the most amount of light into the units.

**CARRIED**

**Recommendation No. 7 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

The APC recommends that the roof be redesigned to provide straightforward, maintenance free drainage.

**CARRIED**

**Recommendation No. 8 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

The APC recommends the applicant provide a minimum 12-foot-deep rear private outdoor space for each unit.

**DEFEATED**

**Recommendation No. 9 – Development Permit for 5981 Shoal Way**

**Moved/Seconded**

The APC recommends the Development Permit Application be brought back to APC with the recommended revisions incorporated before Council consideration.

**CARRIED**

## **6.2 Minute Distribution - Verbal Discussion**

The following was noted regarding distribution of previous meeting minutes:

- Some members would like to see the minutes within one week of the meeting taking place.
- The current process is to send meeting minutes to the Chair prior to inclusion on the agenda for the following meeting.
- The Terms of Reference for the APC may outline how minutes are to be reviewed and distributed.
- All members could be courtesy copied when the minutes are provided to the Chair for review.
- Any comments the members may have regarding the minutes should be directed to the Chair, and compiled for singular response to staff in order to streamline comments.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Planning Commission meeting of September 3, 2024 was adjourned at 7:36pm.

Certified Correct:

---

Sharif Senbel, Chair

---

Kerianne Poulsen, Corporate Officer