

Hyde Creek Land Use Planning & Development Questionnaire – May, 2018

Question		Yes Responses	No Responses	Left Blank	% Yes	% No	Responses Per Question	Additional Comments
1	Would you prefer that Hyde Creek be maintained as more of a rural type of community?	175	3	4	96%	2%	178	No additional comments.
2	A) At present, the Hyde Creek Zoning Bylaw/allows residential lots of a minimum of 2 acres in area if they are serviced by a communal sewer system and an on-site water well, or by a communal sewer system and communal water system. Do you think that the minimum lot size should be reduced to below 2 acres?	28	154	0	15%	85%	182	No additional comments.
	B) The minimum area of residential lots serviced by a communal sewer system and an on site water well, or by a communal sewer system and communal water system should be decreased to:	1 acre - 19; No smaller than 1 acre when supported by communal sewer and water - 1; 1.5 to 2 acres - 2; No Response - 157						No additional comments.
3	In a zoning bylaw, it is possible to allow lots of a smaller area than the prescribed minimum lot area where the average lot area associated with the development equals the minimum lot area requirement. This is called density averaging and is done in developments where it makes sense to cluster the lots and preserve an area(s) for park or environmental purposes. Do you think that density averaging should be allowed in Hyde Creek?	45	122	15	25%	67%	167	As long as the smallest lot is not less than 1 acre - 4; In certain situations, consult with neighbours - 1;
4	At present, most of the residential zones permit each lot to have one <i>single-family dwelling</i> and one <i>guesthouse</i> which is not allowed to be rented. Does the idea of allowing <i>guesthouses</i> to be rented, or the possibility of permitting additional rental dwelling units such as secondary suites on a residential lot, support your vision of a rural residential lifestyle for Hyde Creek?	112	66	4	62%	36%	178	Affordable housing is at a critically low level and we have to ensure we continue to provide housing for everyone, young & old. Restricting rentals is detrimental - 2; Yes, but strictly limit to only one rental arrangement (guesthouse or suite) - 1; There appears to be all sorts of renting on properties as we speak, no one seems concerned - 2; Question has too many possibilities, we would support rental of guesthouse only -1.
5	Presently, a <i>guesthouse</i> with a maximum floor area of 400 square feet is permitted in most residential zoning categories. <i>Guesthouses</i> are not permitted to be rented and are intended for occasional use by family and friends. Do you think that <i>guesthouses</i> should continue to be permitted?	170	12	0	93%	7%	182	No additional comments.
6	A) Do you think the maximum floor area of 400 square feet for <i>guesthouses</i> should be increased?	113	68	1	62%	37%	181	Guesthouses should be permitted as rentals also - 1; No, they are abused now and there's little way of policing and can lead to price escalation and speculation. Will lead to even larger dwellings – 2.
	B) The maximum floor area of guesthouses should be increased to (square feet):	Less than 600 - 9; 600 - 31; 800 - 27; 1,000 - 20; Greater than 1,000 – 8; Other – 11; No Response – 76						
7	<i>Guesthouses</i> are intended for occasional use by family and friends and are not currently permitted to be used for short term vacation rentals or rented on a longer-term basis as residential dwellings. Would you prefer that they be allowed to be rented?							Limit only to one rental per 2-acre lot.
	Yes, for short term vacation rentals only	7	-	-	4%	-	179	
	Yes, as a typical, longer term type residential tenancy only	7	-	-	4%	-		
	Yes, for all rental types	103	-	-	59%	-		
	No	-	62	-	-	36%		
No response	3							
8	<i>Secondary suites</i> are not permitted in Hyde Creek. Do you think a separate self-contained <i>secondary suite</i> dwelling with its own entrance to the outside, kitchen, bathroom and living areas should be allowed to be located within a <i>single-family dwelling</i> ?	131	47	4	72%	26%	178	May not be permitted but it is happening anyways - 1; Yes, as once we are aged our family may move in to help us - 1; Yes, but should only be one rental suite or a guesthouse; Size is definitely a factor – 1.

9	If <i>secondary suites</i> are permitted, do you think they should be allowed to be rented?						No additional comments.	
	Yes, for short term vacation rentals only	4	-	-	2%	-		179
	Yes, as a typical, longer term type residential tenancy only	9	-	-	5%	-		
	Yes, for all rental types	108	-	-	62%	-		
	No	-	58		-	33%		
No response	3							
10	A) If <i>secondary suites</i> are permitted, do you think they should be limited in size (for example, a maximum of 25% of the floor area of the <i>single-family dwelling</i> it is located within, or 800 square feet, whichever is less)?						Yes they should be limited in size, but strongly object to any – 2;	
	102	73	7	56%	40%	175		
	B) The maximum floor area of a secondary suite should be:							
	Percentage based: 25% or less - 3; 30% to 50% - 9 Square footage based: 400 to 500 - 9, 600 to 800 - 13, 900 to 1000 - 8; 25% or 800 sq. ft. - 5;							
11	If both <i>guesthouses</i> and <i>secondary suites</i> are permitted in residential zones, do you think each lot should be limited to one <i>guesthouse</i> or one <i>secondary suite</i> , but not both?						Yes, this is a better idea - 1; No, allow both if wanted - 1; Only if serviced by a communal sewer system – 1; Each lot can have both one guesthouse and/or secondary suite - 1; Both if there is an adequate community sewer system - 1; Maximum one guesthouse and one secondary suite - 1;	
12	A) At present, there is no limitation on the number of <i>accessory buildings and structures</i> that are permitted on a lot. Do you think there should be a limitation on the number of <i>accessory buildings and structures</i> that are permitted on a lot?						No additional comments.	
	44	132	6	24%	73%	176		
	B) The maximum number of <i>accessory buildings and structures</i> should be:							
	A practical number depending how it is used (e.g. less if just residential, more if farm use) - 1; Needs to be determined - 1; Is a shed an accessory building? - 1; In relation to the size of the property - 1; Really depends on the structure and impact on the land - 1, Four to eight - 1; Based on a percentage of the lot size - 1; Two buildings - 3; Three to five buildings – 3; Six to seven - 3; No more than four as this gives a home barn guesthouse and shop - 1; Three per acre; Woodshed, greenhouse, garden shed, garage - 1; Three - shop greenhouse and woodshed - 1; Saying no because there is no clear definition of structure size;							
13	A) At present, there is no limitation on the size of <i>accessory buildings and structures</i> . Do you think there should be a limitation on the size (footprint) of <i>accessory buildings and structures</i> (e.g. garages, workshops, storage buildings, etc.) that are permitted on a lot?						Depends on the size of the property/ determined as a percentage of the land - 1; Small - 1; Not bigger than the residence - 1; As big as you want though not more than one story high - 1; total area of all accessory buildings not to exceed 10% of lot - 1; Within reason - 1; Total footprint of all structures and buildings should not exceed one third of the lot size - 1; Total square footage of all - 1; Needs to be determined – 1;	
	57	123	2	31%	68%	180		
	B) If yes, the maximum footprint of an <i>accessory building</i> should be:							
	Based on square footage: 250 - 1; 600 - 1; 800 - 1; 1,000 - 4; 1,500 - 2; 1,600 - 1, 2,000- 2; 2,500, 3,000 - 3; 4000 - 1; No Response - 146							
14	At present, there is no limitation on the area of a lot that can be covered by <i>buildings and structures</i> . Do you think that there should be a limitation on the amount of area of a lot that can be covered by <i>buildings and structures</i> (e.g. 30%, 40%, etc.)?						Use other communities as guideline - 1; 20% - 1; 30% - 1; 33% - 1; 35% - 1; 50% maximum covered by buildings and structures - 1; Percentage ratio seems fairest way to go - 1; Not more than 10% (For a one acre building, a lot coverage of 30% would be a massive building) – 1;	
15	Do you think the road connection between Jekyll Road and Jekyll Road East should be constructed? It may be possible to lobby the Ministry of Transportation to undertake or assist with construction if there is substantive support for this.						I am not affected by this question, lot owners in that area should have the last word on this issue - 1; We would vocally oppose this - 1. We bought our properties partly because of the appeal of living on a dead-end street - 1; Connecting the road serves no purpose other than providing existing owners with "lane access", expense of construction is not value added - 1; Should have been done at the subdivision phase, absolutely necessary - 1; Evacuation route absolutely necessary - 1; We should have a bridge over the creek to connect both sides of the Hyde Creek - 1. Children could bicycle to town without getting hit by logging trucks - 1.	

16	Do you think the road connection between Jekyll Road and Ravenhill Road should be constructed? It may be possible to lobby the Ministry of Transportation to undertake or assist with construction if there is substantive support for this.	88	79	15	48%	43%	167	I am not affected by this question, lot owners in that area should have the last word on this issue - 1; Community safety concern - 1; Serves no purpose - 1; We should have a bridge over the creek to connect both sides of the Hyde Creek. Children could bicycle to town without getting hit by logging trucks.
17	Would you like to see more recreational uses associated with the community hall / ballpark property at 1105 Hyde Creek Road?	108	38	36	59%	21%	146	No additional comments.
	I would like to see the following recreational uses established on this property:	Playground improvements; Sports facilities / games (e.g. tennis, basket ball, soccer, hockey, mountain biking, hockey, gym etc.); Dog/horse agility/shows; Event rentals (e.g. weddings, craft fairs, dances, concerts, farmers market); Community events / other outdoor games (e.g. horseshoes, bocce ball, pickle ball); music festivals; Hyde Creek Days, Christmas / Easter / Halloween parties;						No opinion or recommendation.
18	The Hyde Creek Official Community Plan includes policies that promote home-based agriculture. Presently, <i>home agriculture</i> is a permitted use in residential zones and largely allows the growing and sale of crops or produce, as well as the keeping and rearing of animals on a property for the personal use of the occupant of the property only. Do you think <i>home agriculture</i> should be expanded to allow the growing, rearing and keeping of crops, produce and animals (including poultry and fowl), as well as the selling of crops, produce and animals that are grown / reared on the property?	117	57	8	64%	31%	174	Most of us already do sell our excess - 1; Each case to be considered privately with consultation between individuals and neighbouring properties - 1; organic crops and produce only - 1; Is that not what rural lifestyle entails? - 1; Food security, I would buy local produce all year if I could - 1; Provides healthy food options - 1; I am concerned about an increase in noise, smell, chemical use if expansion is permitted - 1; Five acre minimum for the expanded version - 1; Concern with quantity and how it affects our water/wells -1; Not sure/unsure - 1; Pig farms would be intrusive and so would certain crop covers with high odour factor - 1; As long as rearing of animals doesn't run the risk of impacting well water, only small animals - 1.
19	Do you think that <i>home agriculture</i> should also allow the manufacturing of products that are derived from the growing, rearing and keeping of crops, produce and animals (including poultry and fowl), and the sale of such products?	118	57	7	65%	31%	175	Yes, providing there are no airborne or waterborne discharges - 1; Yes, but obviously all provincial and federal laws apply - 1; Yea, all business need "added value" to be sustainable - why handcuff innovation? - 1; Each case to be considered privately with consultation between individuals and neighbouring properties - 1.
20	If the scope of <i>home agriculture</i> uses were to be expanded for residential zones, do you think they should be restricted in terms of their size and scale (for example, only so much of a property could be used for <i>home agriculture</i> purposes, or so many animals of various types would be permitted based on area of the lot)?	150	24	8	82%	13%	174	Yes, crops and produce - 1, Animals - 2; Is this not covered by provincial wide rules (i.e. 1 acre of pasture per horse etc.)? - 1; Yes, 50% of one horse per acre - 1; Limitation of animals kept (no fixed number but needs to ensure that the manure and run off does not enter the ocean) – 1; No limitation on property use - 1; Should be as per type of business, not some blanket statement - 1; Do NOT include pot growers - 1; Each case to be considered privately with consultation between individuals and neighbouring properties - 1.
21	In residential zones, do you think that the growing and processing of cannabis for commercial purposes should be permitted? Under the proposed new system, this would require at the very least that a permit or other approval be obtained from the federal government.	45	132	5	25%	73%	177	This should be in a commercial or industrial area, move to Twin Peaks - 1; Absolutely not - commercial purposes for growing and processing cannabis need to be strictly in commercial zones and not to be mixed with residential zones, breathing and smell harmful to lungs, like pig farming it smells, can't stand the odor and would not want it next door, just as I wouldn't want 100+ chickens next door - 6; All business needs "added value" to be sustainable - why handcuff innovation - 1.

22	A) The Hyde Creek Official Community Plan includes policies that promote home-based business and the Hyde Creek Zoning Bylaw permits <i>home commerce</i> as an accessory commercial use in the residential zones. While <i>home commerce</i> comes with certain limitations, which include things like the number of employees that are allowed, there are no other limitations related to the physical size of a <i>home commerce</i> use. Do you think that the size of a <i>home commerce</i> use should be limited (for example, the area of a property or number of buildings that may be used)?	118	56	8	65%	31%	174	Depends on zoning and property size - 1; Greenhouse vs. chicken farm, can not make some broad decision - 1; No industrial type businesses - 1; Types of commerce - 1; Not loud or disruptive - 1; should not negatively impact - 1; Not to detract from the overall intent of the community plan - 1; Crops / livestock / animals etc. to be screened from the road - 1; Not to be included in housing rentals - 1; Needs to be specific to types of business - 1; Not large scale home business / would like the area to remain residential within a reasonable limit - 1; Should be addressed by a set of bylaws - 1; Review on a case by case basis with each case to be considered privately with consultation between individuals and neighbouring properties - 1.
	B) A <i>home commerce</i> use should be limited in size as follows:	By percentage of lot: 20 to 33% - 8; 40 to 50% - 10; 60 to 75% - 3; By square footage of buildings: 600 - 2; 1,000 - 3; 1,500 - 1; 3,000 - 1; By number of buildings/size/height - 1; By # of employees/use - 1;						
23	At present, the construction and siting of buildings and structures in Hyde Creek requires that a Site Permit be applied for and obtained. The Site Permit process is designed to ensure that building and structures comply with the regulations of the Hyde Creek Zoning Bylaw only. To ensure that buildings and structures also comply with the British Columbia Building, Fire and Plumbing Codes, do you think that the Site Permit requirement should be replaced by a Building Permit process that would involve such things as onsite inspections as part of the construction process?	70	104	8	38%	57%	174	With proper bylaw enforcement -1.
24	Where a lot is to be serviced by an onsite septic disposal system, construction of the proposed system must be monitored by a Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioner (ROWP) who files the appropriate paperwork with the Vancouver Island Health Authority (Island Health) upon completion of its installation. For situations involving the expansion or addition of buildings which will utilize an existing onsite septic disposal system, do you think it is important to ensure that confirmation is provided by a ROWP in advance of construction or siting of any expanded or new building, to ensure the onsite septic disposal system will be able to properly accommodate the development?	145	32	5	80%	18%	177	Only if the structure is to be inhabited. A shop with a toilet and wash basin, but no additional inhabitants would not alter the septic's ability to handle - 1; Yes as it is a health risk - 1.
25	For those properties that are serviced by the Hyde Creek Sanitary Sewer System, should every residential dwelling (including <i>guesthouses</i> and <i>secondary suites</i> if they are permitted) be subject to payment of a sewer connection fee (where a separate connection to the Hyde Creek Sanitary Sewer System is required) and an annual utility fee to help cover operating costs associated with the Hyde Creek Sanitary Sewer System?	121	47	14	66%	26%	168	That's a money grab, 1 connection fee per lot, if more money is needed it should be a utility fee - 1; Yes to connection fee, unsure on annual fees for other residences on the property - 1; Yes for only properties connected to it and their secondary dwellings / suites - 1; Should be dependant on # of inputs into system, not # of dwellings, e.g. large mansion with five bathrooms vs. small house with one bathroom - 1; If a separate sewer connection is required, I can understand the need to pay for the connection and annual utility fee - if another connection is not required the should not be a fee or an annual utility fee - 1.
26	Are you in favour of the Regional District of Mount Waddington establishing a mandatory curbside collection service whereby garbage is picked up biweekly (every other week) and recyclable materials are picked up each opposite week (e.g. garbage this week, recyclables the next week, then garbage again the week after, then recyclables the next week, and so on and so on)? The estimated cost of this service would be approximately \$101 per year per dwelling.	74	102	6	41%	56%	174	We recycle the majority of our recyclables ourselves. The garbage that can be regularly put out for weekly pick up is kept and trucked to 7-Mile as needed so I'd be paying for a service I don't require! - 1; I can do it myself a lot cheaper, not all recyclables can go into the blue box - 1; Only for properties with dwelling units - 1; Yes, have fibre optics yet no curbside recycling, weird - 1; Will be responsible for getting our own recyclables to 7-Mile. Too much is not picked up curbside. Want garbage every week -1.
27	Do you have any other comments you would like to share: Available in separate summary document titled "Other Comments – 2018 Hyde Creek Land Use Planning & Development Questionnaire".							