

## **SLRD Area C OCP Amendment Application – Sunstone Ridge NCP FIRST OPEN HOUSE PROCEEDINGS**

**January 18, 2010**

**7:00 - 9:00pm**

**Pemberton Community Centre, Room ‘C’**

**SLRD Staff in Attendance: Director of Planning and Development Steven Olmstead; Planner Lisa Griffith**

**Sunstone Ridge Group Consultants: Agent, Andrew Beard, EABB Planning; Renée de St. Croix, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects + Urbanistes**

**Also in Attendance: Electoral Area C Director & Village of Pemberton Councilor Susie Gimse, Village of Pemberton Mayor Jordan Sturdy, Village of Pemberton Councilors Lisa Ames & Ted Craddock, Sunstone Ridge Group land-owners Brian Young & Art den Duyf and approximately 20 members of the public**

### **Public Comments / Q & A**

- **Regarding the proposed timing (to begin Phase 1 on the Ravens Crest lands), why not begin Phase 1 with the Biro/Sabre lands, which are already somewhat developed?**

*The agent for the application explained that this has to do with owner intent and financing. The developers are a consortium of three separate landowners, and the owners of the Ravens Crest lands (Young Developments Inc.) are motivated to begin developing their lands first to be considered with adjacent / proposed school and recreation sites.*

- **Can the applicants define what is meant by the concept ‘multi-family’? What type of densities are they proposing for Phase 1? Duplexes and townhouses tend to be more successful in Pemberton rather than apartments located over retail.**

*The agent responded that it is definitely not block apartments, but it will be ‘pretty intense’ in the very lower portion of the Ravens Crest hillside. The approach to the multi-family portion of the development is “modular” in the sense that there will be a range of building forms that relate in four-plex and eight-plex, etc. to provide diversity of product while conforming to terrain. The density will be confirmed through consultation with the community but it is proposed to be around 300 units on approximately 60 acres (or 5 units/ac.)*

- **Who does the SLRD envision will be living in this new neighbourhood? Is there a need given developments occurring inside the Village? What about jobs?**

*The development does include some employment generation, i.e. the independent school. Demographic studies conducted for the Regional Growth Strategy recommended*

*that the SLRD plan for an aging population, as well as some natural growth in Pemberton's population.*

*An important consideration is to balance infrastructure with terrain and the positive attributes (energy efficiencies, amenities) that would result as part of the development. The kind of energy efficiency measures being explored are geo-exchange and solar power generation. The applicants have hired Compass Resource Management Ltd., highly regarded energy consultants who developed the District Energy Plan for the City of Vancouver, to assist with the project.*

- **Would the current medical facilities be able to accommodate an aging population?**

*This is an appropriate question, for which we do not yet have an answer. It would also apply to the capacity of the education system, etc.*

- **What is the capacity of the Village of Pemberton's sewage plant? Are separate plants planned or needed?**

*Preliminary investigation shows the current sewage plant would need upgrading or a separate plant built. It is very early in the process to provide a definitive answer.*

- **Have the consultants looked at the environmental impact of the development on adjacent sites regarding habitat protection?**

*No, but they will.*

- **What is the thinking with respect to the recreational site proposed in Phase 1? What types of uses are proposed – ball fields, facility development, other?**

*One of the owners has offered to donate the quarry site to the applicable local government for use as recreation. The proponents are looking for public input on this aspect of the development. They acknowledge the community's desire and need for more recreational amenities – ball fields, ice rink, and swimming pool – and the lack of alternative flat locations and would like feedback from the public on the types of uses that might be included.*

- **What is the time-frame for Phase 1?**

*The time frame for Phase 1 is 5 to 10 years. The timeframe of the entire development to build-out is 30 years.*

- **How is driving 3 km (from Pemberton) to a recreation site sustainable? It is not a distance that is easily walkable with young children.**

*This is a good question, it depends on whose interests are being considered as well as what element of sustainability we are talking about. With regard to the Village of Pemberton, having facilities in the heart of downtown is ideal, but what if we begin to consider surrounding communities and future growth. It is reasonable to say that recreation in this location can reduce the community's overall environmental footprint by reducing car-trip to Whistler's Meadow Park facility. Also, there is the proponent's desire to contribute to the Friendship Trail- which will provide a direct bicycle/walking*

route to the site. The applicants assume that the land necessary to accommodate future recreation facilities is not available in the Village and are therefore endeavouring to do the best with what is available.

- **What is the timing of the recreational facility and the independent school? What comes first – the residential units or the facilities?**

A strategy will be developed taking into account financial situation and community expectations. The more assurances the community can provide that this is the type of development that Pemberton wants, the better the rest of the pieces can come together.

- **How do we deal with the CN Rail tracks?**

Carefully, comprehensively and creatively. Buffering, eventual de-commissioning of the rail-line may lead to an opportunity for Rails to trails type of transition. Crossing & moving along the tracks will be an important consideration in planning the development. CN Rail is invited to participate on the Technical Working Group. We will look for other example of developments, i.e., Porteau Cove, to see how they dealt with the proximity of the train tracks to a dense residential neighbourhood.

- **What is the status of the ALR portion of the application: Recreation centre need ALC's approval first?**

The Independent School Site has been approved with conditions by the Agricultural Land Commission for a non-farm use in the ALR. The recreation site would also need ALC approval for a non-farm use in the ALR. No application has been submitted for the Rec site at this point.

- **What portion of DL 211 has the ALC considered? Is it not the entire parcel?**

The ALC has only considered a non-farm use in the ALR for the 39 acres rock bluff site proposed for the independent school, not the remainder of D.L. 211. All the land remains in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).

- **Is there a separate application – OCP Amendment and Rezoning - for the Rec site?**

The proposed rec site is included in the OCP amendment for the NCP. There is no separate rezoning application as of yet. It would, however, require a 'non-farm use in the ALR' application first.

- **What is the agricultural potential of the quarry site?**

This would be determined as part of an application to the Agricultural Land Commission.

- **How would the trail experience of the area be maintained?**

Start by consulting with the PVTA & the SLRD Open Spaces Coordinator to prioritize the trails. Some trails will be lost, others may be re-routed and others will be saved by integrating them within the development (i.e., like they did in Stonebridge, RMOW). The SLRD policy is to ensure a no net-loss of trails.

- **When would the public hearing be? How many public hearings would be held?**

*The proposed timeline is for the Fall, if possible. The public hearings for all relevant bylaws could occur on the same night.*

- **There will be an increase in the number of visitors to Mosquito Lake; could you consider including a pond in the development? It gets very hot in that area in the summer.**

*Will take that into consideration.*

- **Why is the SLRD so concerned with trails on land that is privately owned? The trails were not constructed with any permissions or public funds, were they? Is that not trespass?**

*There is a legacy of trail use in this area, and land owner consent is a key principle in SLRD trails planning. The issue of trespassing is met with different responses from different landowners – where landowners have objected the SLRD has removed those trails from its policies or plans.. No formal rights have been given to use these particular trails. However, in conjunction with a development application, it is appropriate for the regional district to consider the matter of formalizing the status of informal or unauthorized trails. The Lil'wat Nation has and Ravens Crest will work with the PVTa re: liability insurance.*

- **How much longer can trails be used before development occurs?**

*Approximately 5 years? Only two trails will be impacted in the near future (Phase 1).*

- **The timeline for approvals seems aggressive. There appears to be some urgency to this development getting approved. What is the rush?**

*SLRD responds to the developer; the SLRD is not driving the proposal. The Developer sets the agenda to a degree by submitting its application. The SLRD responds with a process to consider all applications such as this in a timely and efficient manner.*

*Previous applications for this site were 'shelved' by the SLRD because the timing was inappropriate. Earlier applications for Ravens Crest were postponed in the past to allow the Benchlands development to proceed.*

- **The land is still in the SLRD, and yet the services would come from the Village of Pemberton? What is the timing for transition?**

*The lands in question are already part of a boundary expansion by the Village of Pemberton.*

**How does a resident of Pemberton comment on development in Area C?**

- *Lobby/talk to your Elected Official, attend public houses like this one, fill out comment sheets and get involved with the Boundary extension application process. The views of all residents of the area are welcome!*
- **Is there a way to accomplish the development without using Village of Pemberton services?**

*It could but that is not the plan. As noted before, a boundary expansion application is in process and this area is included in the application. Technically, that answer will be determined through an Engineering analysis. We are currently planning the development for the transition to municipal status.*

- **For clarity, can you reiterate the timing of the different approvals that are necessary?**
- *NCP – OCP Amendment Bylaw – approximately 1 year*
- *NCP Hillside Rezoning – has now been submitted, will be processed concurrently with OCP Amendment – timing 1 year or more.*
- *Independent School Site- ALC approval already granted, separate OCP & Rezoning application have been submitted, it will be processed concurrently with NCP and hillside rezoning*
- *Rec. Site – Part of current OCP Amendment application; would require separate application for non-farm use & possibly, depending on what was included, rezoning*
- *Servicing plans need to be approved before the implementation of zoning*
- *Phased Development Agreement needs to be approved*
- *Amenities Agreement needs to be approved*
- *Development Permits would need to be approved and issued*
- *Building Permits*
- **What about water? There are issues with water at Reid Road.**  
*This development could lead to improvements for all residents in the area.*
- **What happens to the promised amenities if the owners go bankrupt?**  
*The SLRD will ask for as much as possible ‘up-front’. After the public hearing, essentially the next step would be to ‘paper the deal’ with covenants and agreements.*
- **Speaking of which, whatever happened to the cash amenity that was promised as part of the Wedgewood (Green River Estates) subdivision?**  
*It is coming.*