



# Minutes

Electoral Area 'C' Advisory Planning Commission

Meeting of: *Tuesday, June 21, 2016*

Community Centre, Oliver BC

---

**Present:**

Members: Bill Michael | Sara Bunge | Jessica Murphy

Absent: Rick Knodel | David Janzen | Ed Machial

Staff: Director, Electoral Area 'C', Terry Schafer | Chris Garrish, RDOS Planner

Recording Secretary: absent

Delegates: Bill Ross

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:08 p.m.

### ADOPTION OF AGENDA

#### MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the Agenda be adopted.

**CARRIED**

## 2. DELEGATIONS

- 2.1 Souto, Antonia for Development Variance Permit Application Agent: Ross, Bill C05754.005 / C2016-058-DVP

## 3. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Bylaw No. C01138.000/C2016-021-ZONE

Delegate *Bill Ross* present

Discussion: Discussion around some infilling of oxbow by applicant.

#### MOTION

It was Moved and Seconded that the APC recommends to the RDOS Board that the proposed development variance be approved.

**CARRIED**

## **4. REFERRALS**

### **4.1 C2016.059-CROWN - Integrated Land Management Bureau Referral Application; Crown Land Referral – Trails and Recreation Facilities Tenure**

There was incomplete information presented in the referral documents to the APC by FLNRO Ministry staff on this matter and they had not provided answers to the RDOS planning staff request for additional information prior to this meeting. The APC responded to the limited information they had received for the meeting.

Discussion: APC members raised a number of concerns regarding this application for motorized recreation track on Oliver Mountain:

- Potential noise impacts to neighbours and beyond
- Impacts to species at risk including Lewis Woodpecker and Antelope-brush
- Motorized vehicles will not stay within designated area due to lack of fencing
- It needs to be shown how this use would be compliant with the Okanagan Shuswap LRMP direction on uses of this particular Crown Land which we understand was to be reserved for a protected area
- No provisions for monitoring usage
- Motorized and non-motorized users groups sharing same area is not compatible
- APC would like to see defined guidelines or protocol for motorized use, that could be used as assessment tool (i.e. staying within designated area, noise restrictions, use of spark arrestors and the concerns noted here) to determine whether used should continue after 5 year trial
- After 5 years the tenure should expire automatically and a new application be made for this use on these lands. It should not be an automatic renewal. Review of any new application will be made conditional upon the compliance of the motorized users with the terms of the use guidelines in the previous period.
- If guidelines/protocols are not followed, prior to end of 5 year trial, motorized use of the recreation area should be removed and the tenure cancelled for the motorized use of these lands.

## **5. Other**

### **5.1 X2016.057-ZONE Review of Zoning Bylaw Regulations – Modular and Mobile Homes**

A discussion was held about the definitions of modular and mobile homes and the social stigma which appears to be held for variations of these types of home construction. Members felt modular homes were equal to a single family dwelling. Mobile homes give people on low incomes (i.e. seniors, youth, young farmers, etc.) an opportunity to have their own home.

A member of the public questioned why a registered double wide mobile home could not be moved to another property. She stated that the current RDOS definitions of a mobile home capture these types of structure which, in essence, are modular homes when established on a property yet exclude them on certain sized zonings.

In the absence of clear recommendations for the Area 'C' APC to address, the members present chose to address the summary conditions which were presented in the information package. These indicate where the two types of manufactured homes might be initially be accepted within the various zoning categories.

Generally, the members felt that on the larger size properties that either type of manufactured home would be acceptable. The smaller sized properties in the zonings of SH and RS will need to be further addressed to provide a process for allowing mobile homes under certain conditions, possibly parcel size. Additional work will be needed to provide for the conditions under which they might be acceptable to provide for administrative fairness.

The APC's response follows the questions regarding the proposed changes to the Electoral Area Zoning Bylaws:

*.1 should modular homes be permitted as a form of "single detached dwelling" in all zones;* YES

*.2 should modular homes be permitted as an allowable form of "accessory dwelling" in all zones;* YES

*.3 should mobile homes be permitted as an allowable form of principal dwelling unit in the RA, LH and AG zones;* YES

*.4 should mobile homes be permitted as an allowable form of "accessory dwelling" in the RA, LH and AG zones;* YES and

*.5 should consistent building width requirement for principal dwelling units be introduced in SH and RS Zones?* APC is in favour of consistent building width requirements, so that all areas in the RDOS are consistent. However, as stated above, additional consideration should be given regarding allowing manufactured/mobile homes on other zoning with smaller parcel sizes like SH and RS.

**CARRIED**

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

### **6.1 MOTION**

It was Moved and Seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 8:42 pm.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Bill Michael

Advisory Planning Commission Chair

Sara Bunge

Advisory Planning Commission Secretary / minute taker