From: Peter Grove

Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 1:08 PM

To: Elizabeth FitzZaland

Cc: SSIInfo

Subject: Re: Secondary Dwelling Bylaw 528

Thank you Elizabeth, for your thoughtful input (as always). I am copying staff to ensure that your ideas are captured. I am hopeful that this matter can move ahead at least to the point where it is discussed formally with the community. There will be plenty of time for input!

Best

P

Peter Grove Tel: 250-537-1117 Cell:604-341-6710

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 14, 2022, at 1:01 PM, Elizabeth FitzZaland <<u>elizabeth@greencitybuilders.ca</u>> wrote:

Hi Peter,

I hope this email finds you well.

I am reaching out in regards to Bylaw 528 and tomorrow's LTC. I'm happy to see the draft included in the agenda package and think the overall intent and direction is quite good. I do have some specific concerns that I want to raise with you:

1. Myself and many others in the community were very pleased with your direction to staff last year when you asked that detached accessory dwellings be included in the updated suites/accessory dwelling unit bylaw (Thank you!). This is consistent with best practices across BC and North American — especially in smaller, more rural communities where properties tend to be larger and full height basements less common. By setting a maximum ADU size, it really shouldn't matter whether the secondary unit is within the footprint of the existing house, over a garage or in another building — the impact is the same. This shouldn't trigger an OCP ammendment if other conditions are set to ensure the "incremental" intentions of the OCP (which, given the 10 year+ lag on this, shouldn't be a problem). I've ran this past other professional planners who all agreed. I don't agree with the staff interpretation here and hope the Trustees will

take the more progressive interpretation that is available in the OCP language to enable more legal ADUs to be realized sooner.

I am concerned the OCP amendment path will be a long one that extends well beyond next election.

- 2. There is no longer a need to include the 40% building ratio as this has been removed from the BC Building Code and isn't a productive metric for suites. If anything, it can encourage larger principal dwellings. Setting the maximum unit size for suites/ADUs is the better practice.
- 3. I don't see why secondary suites/ADUs shouldn't be allowed in RW, RU and RI **if potable a water supply is available** plus the other criteria described in the draft bylaw are met. DPAs, waterbody setbacks and other environmental protections should be sufficient for protecting water quality and environmental features on those properties. Property owners in these zones should be equally allowed to realize ADUs to house family members or long-term tenants if they meet the other requirements in their zones. Conversely, there will be properties in the Rural zone and other residential zones where ADUs may not be appropriate because of water supply, DPAs, etc. It should be about the criteria and other land use tools that are already layered over these properties not a blanket statement in Bylaw 528.

I really appreciate your thoughtfulness and leadership on this, Peter. Working class folks and housing advocates have been so encouraged by your support of the recommendations coming from the Housing Action Task Force. While none of the individual actions will solve our housing crisis outright, the combined implementation of the recommendations will start to provide much needed relief — it's a glimmer of hope that our community can actually make smart changes that are timely and appropriately scaled to our community.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss any of this in more detail.

Warmly, Elizabeth

Elizabeth FitzZaland MCIP, RPP Salt Spring Solutions 250.538.7027 www.saltspringsolutions.com

This email was sent from the unceded territories of Hul'qumi'num and SENĆOŦEN speaking peoples, including the Quw'utsun First Nation and Tsawout First Nation.