

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT
ROBERTS CREEK (AREA D)
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
Monday, May 15, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting will be Held Online via ZOOM

CALL TO ORDER

AGENDA

1. Adoption of the Agenda

DELEGATIONS

MINUTES

2. Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
April 17, 2023 Meeting Cancelled Pages 1 - 3
3. Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29 & April 26, 2023 pp 4 - 9
4. Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28 & April 25, 2023 pp 10 - 14
5. Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29 & April 26, 2023 pp 15 - 20
6. West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28 & April 25, 2023 pp 21 - 26

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS

7. Re-Referral Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments pp 27 - 36

NEW BUSINESS

DIRECTORS REPORT

NEXT MEETING

ADJOURNMENT

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**ROBERTS CREEK (AREA D)
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

March 20, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ROBERTS CREEK (AREA D) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Mike Allegretti
	Members	Gerald Rainville Meghan Hennessy Erik Mjanes Bob Hogg
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area D Director (Non-Voting Board Liaison) SCRD, Manager, Planning & Dev. SCRD, Senior Planner Vicki Dobbyn	Kelly Backs Jonathan Jackson Julie Clark Recording Secretary
	Public	1
REGRETS/ABSENT		Chris Richmond

CALL TO ORDER 7:10 p.m.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Mike Allegretti was acclaimed as Chair.
Gerald Rainville was acclaimed as Vice Chair.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

The Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of June 20, 2022 were approved as circulated.

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of June 29, 2022
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of June 28, 2022
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of June 22, 2022
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of June 28 & November 22, 2022

REPORTS

Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

SCRD staff member Julie Clark made a presentation with slides to introduce the draft Board Policy, A policy is considered advisable at this time due to key issues and considerations: climate crisis, housing crisis, unlawful land infractions, development boom, and reconciliation. The SCRД has seven Official Community Plans (OCP) that are considered to be infrastructure at various stages of aging. The draft policy is designed to be an interim solution for reviewing OCP amendment applications before the current OCPs are renewed. The policy is meant to facilitate a transparent, holistic, and consistent review which will enhance negotiations for community benefits, while not being regulatory or prescriptive. Last reviews of the seven OCPs range from 1995 to 2018, with Roberts Creek’s OCP last reviewed in 2012. The SCRД is undertaking a three-and-a-half-year funded project for OCP renewal, and a development approvals project is also underway.

Key Points of Discussion:

- Policy is meant to be an SCRД-wide tool.
- There is no suggestion that the core set of values in the current OCP be ignored or replaced.
- The OCP renewal process could be considered as a half-life checkup.
- A Regional Growth report is due to come to the SCRД Board in the second quarter.
- The solution to affordable housing has to come from the Province.
- There will be funding for community engagement in the OCP renewal project.
- The policy is meant to create a framework to guide applications and provide guidelines for setting the bar.
- It is meant to be a living document that may be amended at any time and undergo review every 5-10 years.
- Feedback was generally positive and it seems the criteria outlined in the policy would stop certain applications from going forward.
- The preamble raises questions as how the policy will be applied and there is concern that the criteria would outweigh the values in the OCP.
- There is value in revisiting the OCP to engage the views of current residents.
- The Roberts Creek OCP works well in that there is room for different ideas but the community can always say no if they aren’t appropriate.
- The advantage of this policy is that it has a concrete set of boxes to tick that would save time on considering proposals that shouldn’t go forward. The policy is driven by staff to make the process more efficient.
- The policy doesn’t appear to have any conflict with the current OCP, and in fact strengthens and updates some issues.
- Feedback on the criteria included suggestions to address: drinking water, water conservation, storm water management, tree retention and wildfire suppression.
- Strengthen section 7c related to water supply and conservation.
Storm water management: When a proposal comes forward that would result in the building of roads or structures that could stop/alter the natural drainage of an area and cause water to be collected in such a manner that could possibly result in drastic increases in flow to existing water courses that this problem be considered in the final approval or disapproval of the proposal. In an undisturbed slope water percolates into the soil and slowly moves down slope. The direction of the movement of the water is

generally in response to gravity. The building of roads/structures across the slope with their accompanying drainage ditches then intercepts this natural flow and channels the flow into existing water channels, and then increasing their flows. A good example of this problem was seen last year near the eastern boundary of Roberts Creek during an atmospheric river event.

- Water supply: When plans for new subdivisions resulting in new lots are submitted, their impact on the existing water supply system(s) should be considered as one of the criteria for determining whether a proposal is allowed to go forward. It would appear that building permits cannot be withheld due to concerns about problems with water supply but we should be able to consider concerns about water supply in granting future subdivisions.
- It was acknowledged that the SCRDC cannot have tree retention regulations but this issue could be somewhat addressed with setback regulations.
- It was also acknowledged that tree retention and fire suppression may be competing issues.

Recommendation No. 1 *Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Roberts Creek (Area D) APC recommended that the draft policy as a tool for reviewing applications for OCP amendments be supported.

DIRECTORS REPORT

The Director's Report was received.

NEXT MEETING

Members agreed to continue to meet on the third Monday of the month. If there are referrals from the SCRDC the next meeting will be Monday April 17, 2023, at 7:00 p.m., by Zoom.

ADJOURNMENT 9.10 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**AREA A - EGMONT/PENDER HARBOUR
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

March 29, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA "A" ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Alan Skelley
	Members	Yovhan Burega Jane McOuat Dennis Burnham Tom Silvey Gordon Littlejohn Bob Fielding
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area A Director	Leonard Lee (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Electoral Area A Alternate Director	Christine Alexander
	DVP00084 Applicant	Ryan Miller (part)
	Recording Secretary	Genevieve Dixon
REGRETS:	Members	Sean McAllister Catherine McEachern

CALL TO ORDER 7:40 p.m.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Alan Skelley was acclaimed as Chair.
Election of Vice Chair deferred to next meeting.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented. The order of items was changed so that the DVP00084 application referral was the first item of discussion after the election.

MINUTES

Area A Minutes

The Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of June 29, 2022 were approved as circulated.

The following minutes were received for information:

- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of June 28, 2022
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of June 20, 2022
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of June 22, 2022
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of June 28 & November 22, 2022

REPORTS

Development Variance Permit DVP00084 (12820 Alexander Road)

Points of Discussion:

- Deck expansion started without a permit; development variance permit (DVP) required to finish the work on the deck.
- Neighbors were notified and show support from the neighbourhood.
- Staff recommend the variance be approved.
- Applicant noted this is a deck expansion to original deck.
- Applicant noted if a building permit was applied for a DVP would have been required due to the MoTI setbacks.
- Legally it is the property owner's responsibility.
- Supports the application.
- Doesn't look like a modest deck replacement, looks like a substantial structure.
- Mention of more DVP applications being referred to APC by SCR D Board and staff.
- Owner to pay double the permit fees for construction.
- Falls back on the owner and the contractor/engineers to take initiative on what's right and what's wrong on the property.

Recommendation No.1 *Development Variance Permit DVP00084 (12820 Alexander Road)*

The Area A APC recommended the Development Variance Permit DVP00084 be approved.

Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments

Points of Discussion:

- SCR D staff presentation was rushed didn't provide enough information.
- Could staff supply a summary of the presentation in writing to the APC.
- Housing shortages and changes to the rules make it hard for real estate developers.
- Housing and construction costs adds to the problem.
- Area A OCP was adopted in 2018. What wasn't adopted was portion of the bylaw.
- When will Zoning Bylaw 337 be updated in the work plan?

NEW BUSINESS

The Area A APC members want to send a heartfelt thank you to Peter Robson for his time spent as the Chair on the APC.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING April 26, 2023

ADJOURNMENT 8:37 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**AREA A - EGMONT/PENDER HARBOUR
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

April 26, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PENDER HARBOUR/EGMONT (AREA A) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD AT PENDER HARBOUR SECONDARY SCHOOL, 13639 SUNSHINE COAST HIGHWAY, MADEIRA PARK, BC

PRESENT:	Chair	Alan Skelley
	Members	Yovhan Burega Jane McOuat Dennis Burnham Gordon Littlejohn Catherine McEachern Bob Fielding
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area A Director	Leonard Lee (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Area A Alternate Director	Christine Alexander (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Kelly Kammerle
REGRETS:	Members	Sean McAllister Tom Silvey

CALL TO ORDER 7:00 p.m.

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Sean McAllister was acclaimed as Vice Chair

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

Area A Minutes

The Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023 were approved as circulated.

The following minutes were received for information:

- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023

REPORTS

Re-Referral Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

The Area A APC discussed the staff report regarding Re-Referral Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments with the following comments:

- Has the potential to discourage developers as it is too detailed.
- More general terms are needed and should be opened for new ideas from developers.
- Written well but is not practical for all OCP's.

Recommendation No.1 *Re-Referral Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area A APC does not support the Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments as presented for the following reasons:

- A “one size fits all Areas policy” does not seem appropriate for the rural areas, in particular Area A, because we have no public transit and over 50% of homes are recreational or “second” homes where affordable housing (or any increased density) may not be compatible with large minimum area subdivision requirements.
- In an effort to assist with housing and climate change issues, the proposed policy is creating an additional level of compliance, beyond those identified in the OCP. This could deter development initiatives.
- It is hard to discern what “best planning practices” are or where they have come from. They go well beyond the community vision and objectives set out in the Area A OCP, which were developed after extensive community consultation and legally adopted through the public hearing and by-law adoption process. Many of the policies venture into social engineering policies beyond the jurisdictional authority of regional Districts.
- Many terms used in the draft policy have no specific meaning: For example:
 - 2 (e) What are “complete community and low-carbon land use attributes?”
 - 5 (a) “Climate Risk Assessment?”
 - 6 (a) an “equity lens?”
 - How do you define an “equity-deserving group?”
 - “Affordable Housing?”
- The criteria needs to be specific, measurable and relevant to the specific land location. If this cannot be achieved, it is rather meaningless. Broader wording (closer to that in the DVP amendment policy) would be more relevant.
- The criteria should be prioritized. Which considerations are critical? Which are preferred, but not essential? Are any safe to ignore because they have no relevance? Which are merely desired?
- Suggest adding “compatible with existing nearby community character, land use and density” as a criteria.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING May 31, 2023

ADJOURNMENT 8:55 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 28, 2023**

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Kelsey Oxley
	Members	Barbara Bolding (Recorder) Len Combes (in part) Kim Dougherty Matt Garmon Alda Grames Nicole Huska Eleanor Lenz Suzette Stevenson
ALSO PRESENT:	Director, Electoral Area B	Justine Gabias (Non-Voting Board Liaison)

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 p.m.

In preparation for discussion of the Referral per the agenda, SCRD staff made a brief presentation to Area B and Area F APC members. Area F members joined this part of the Zoom meeting. Johnathan Jackson (Manager) and Julie Clark (Senior Planner) SCRD Planning and Development Division spoke jointly. A question/answer session followed the presentation, and the presentation was concluded at 7:40 pm.

AGENDA: The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

Area B APC Minutes

The Area D APC minutes of June 28, 2022 were approved as circulated.

REPORTS

Referral for feedback: Board Policy—Official Community Plan Amendments

The APC discussed the staff report regarding assessment of requests for OCP amendments.

The following concerns/points/issues were noted:

- Recognition of the need for interim and updated guidance for assessing OCP amendment requests.

- This APC needs additional time for a more fulsome discussion of this very important draft. The very limited time within which to discuss the document and provide feedback at this meeting is not sufficient.

The time constraints arose from the:

- Planning Division’s request for presentation time.
 - Need to conduct member introductions before proceeding to discussion of the referral, due to the length of time since our last meeting (June 22) and the changes in Commission membership.
 - Need to conduct elections for the positions of Chair and Vice Chair.
- In the time that we did have available, the following points were raised:
 - Has the potential to introduce another layer of requirements, open to misinterpretation.
 - Review criteria need clarification; improved definitions e.g. “Affordable” housing is not defined. Affordable housing is not necessarily “attainable”.
 - Too many categories and criteria will cause confusion.
 - Ensure final criteria are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound.
 - Test criteria before distribution to confirm that criteria can be applied and results are useful.
 - Some criteria repetitive, duplicated in various categories.
 - Need some kind of criteria weighting system. (Nice to have, must have, Show-Stoppers).
 - How to ensure conditions imposed when granting an amendment are maintained over time, change of ownership etc.

Recommendation No. 1 *Board Policy—Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommended that the Board Policy—Official Community Plan Amendments be supported subject to the following conditions:

- The APC has sufficient time to identify and discuss its concerns more thoroughly in order to provide meaningful feedback. This means that whether or not there are Planning Division agenda items for the APC meeting next month,
 - a full two-hour meeting be held,
 - that the meeting be devoted to discussion of this referral, and that
 - feedback arising from discussion be received for consideration by the Planning Division.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

- Nicole Huska accepted the nomination and was acclaimed Chair of Area B APC
- Matt Garmon accepted the nomination and was acclaimed Vice-Chair of Area B APC

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 at 7 PM via Zoom

ADJOURNMENT: 8:35 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 25, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE HALFMOON BAY (AREA B) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Nicole Huska
	Members	Len Coombes Ellie Lenz Matt Garmon Suzette Stevenson (part) Barbara Bolding (Recorder)
	Director, Electoral Area B	Justine Gabias (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
ABSENT:	Members	Kim Dougherty Alda Grames Kelsey Oxley

CALL TO ORDER 7:03 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented

MINUTES

Halfmoon Bay (Area B) Minutes

The Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC minutes of March 28, 2023 were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023

REPORTS

Re-Referral of Board Policy—Official Community Plan Amendments

The APC continued discussion the Staff Report and draft policy that began at the meeting of March 28, 2023.

The following broad concerns/points/issues were noted:

- Many terms lack definitions and/or descriptions of baselines e.g. affordable housing, climate change, environment. Without an understanding of accepted definitions and relevant baselines, it is impossible to move forward and to assess progress or benefit.
- While the documents refer to the need for “innovation” multiple times, it is not clear how innovation would and should be addressed. E.g. How would an innovative proposal that conflicts with the area OCP be dealt with?
- The staff report explicitly states that the policy “...is not a yardstick, prescription or requirement.”, but the format as presented makes it very difficult for any reader to view it as anything other than some type of checklist of requirements.
- The document does not address the cumulative impact of a proposed OCP amendment
- Last sentence of -first paragraph of the Intent should clearly state that the OCP remains an evaluation criterion.
- The document needs to be reorganized/reordered for a more logical flow and to help clarify priorities. Grammar, use of jargon and repetition need to be tightened up. However, there is not much point in providing specific comments at the moment because presumably the document will evolve through a number of iterations. It is frustrating and disappointing to have been told that the only opportunity for APCs to comment is at this very early stage. There are community members who have knowledge and skills to provide helpful editorial comment that would likely be of benefit to the document.

Additional points were noted:

- 4C—Protecting or enhancing farmland is not applicable as most ALR land is forested and not farmable.
- 4F—can’t force landowner to maintain a wildlife corridor.
- 5—Climate/Climate Resilience. Need to quantify (or at least define).
- 5B—Resilient design as a requirement will be a barrier to housing creation.
- 6—Need baseline data to ensure Community Health and Equity is achieved.
- 6—Lead this section with e) Childcare and i) Affordability (and define affordability).
- Additional costs to developer/development. Does the SCR D Board and Planning Department. acknowledge more costs to the developer equals higher cost of housing on the coast?
- How many of these “criteria” does a development have to meet?

Recommendation No.1 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that more fulsome definitions of terms used in the policy document be incorporated into the document or be cross-referenced with terms that currently exist in other SCR D documents.

Recommendation No.2 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that staff explain how “innovative criteria” will be considered and incorporated into a review of an amendment application.

Recommendation No.3 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that:

- a) “Considerations” replace “Criteria” as the second, level 1 heading in the draft policy
- b) The bullets under the level 2 headings 1-10 be changed to a narrative that clearly indicates the items are examples for proponents to consider.

Recommendation No.4 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that **Cumulative Impact** be added to the policy as an additional “Consideration”, and that cumulative impact take into account effects on the:

- Immediate area
- Neighbourhood
- Electoral area
- Other Electoral areas/entire lower Sunshine Coast

Recommendation No.5 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that the wording of the last sentence of the 1st paragraph be changed to “...evaluated against the OCP and the criteria below.”

Recommendation No.6 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area B APC recommends that a revised draft of this policy be referred to all APCs for a 2nd review.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

The Director’s report was received.

NEXT MEETING Tuesday, May 23, 2023 via Zoom

ADJOURNMENT 8:30 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**AREA E – ELPHINSTONE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

March 29, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA E ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Mary Degan
	Members	Rod Moorcroft Nara Brenchley Arne Hermann Laura Macdonald Clinton McDougall Anthony Pare Michael Sanderson
ALSO PRESENT:	Director, Electoral Area E	Donna McMahon (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Subdivision Applicant (SD0000102)	Sam Maedel
	Subdivision Applicant/Owner (SD0000102)	Cory Dew
	Recording Secretary	Vicki Dobbyn

CALL TO ORDER 7:30 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Mary Degan was acclaimed as Chair and Michael Sanderson was acclaimed as Vice Chair.

MINUTES

Area E Minutes

The Area E APC minutes of June 22, 2022 were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information: ^{SEP}

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of June 29, 2022
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of June 28, 2022
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of June 20, 2022
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of June 28 and November 22, 2022 ^{SEP}

DELEGATIONS

Cory Dew (Owner) and Sam Maedel (applicant) presented to the APC regarding Subdivision SD0000102 (Lot Y Grandview Road).

REPORTS

Subdivision SD0000102 (Lot Y Grandview Road)

The application was forwarded to the APC for information only as no SCRD Board consideration or approvals are required for subdivision approvals. Subdivision approvals are considered by the Approving Officer at the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI). The APC discussed the jurisdictional complexities regarding stormwater management in general and noted the following concerns and questions with respect to the subdivision approval process:

- How can neighbourhood concerns regarding road design, road grades, and stormwater management be communicated most effectively to the decision-maker(s)?
- What are the requirements for public notification and consultation, and how they could be improved?
- The APC requests more information on the park dedication decision-making process and parkland acquisition process. Is there an SCRD plan or policy with respect to parkland acquisition?
- Where can information on subdivision approval decisions be found?
- Are the subdivision referral letters from SCRD staff to MoTI publicly available and/or can copies of the referral letters be forwarded to the APC?
- In the context of the work of the APC in advising the Regional District on complex planning matters, what resources or educational material can the SCRD provide to support capacity building for APCs?
- Does the Regional District have authority to create a tree preservation bylaw?

Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

Due to time constraints, this item was referred to the next Area E APC meeting. It was suggested that there be a second meeting with all the APC's and staff present.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING May 24, 2023, 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT 9:24 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

AREA E – ELPHINSTONE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 26, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ELPHINSTONE (AREA E) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD AT FRANK WEST HALL, 1224 CHASTER ROAD, ELPHINSTONE, BC

PRESENT:	Chair	Mary Degan
	Members	Rod Moorcroft Nara Brenchley Arne Hermann Clinton McDougall Anthony Paré Michael Sanderson Laura Macdonald (by zoom)
ALSO PRESENT:	Electoral Area E Director	Donna McMahon (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Alternate Director	Ashley St. Clair (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Vicki Dobbyn

CALL TO ORDER 7:04 p.m.

AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

MINUTES

Area E Minutes

The Area E APC minutes of March 29, 2023 were approved as circulated.

It was noted the minutes were amended to align with SCRD's corporate minute standard and did not entirely reflect the concerns expressed at the meeting. There is a training planned for APC Chairs and Recording Secretaries where we should get clarity on the content and format of minutes. Director McMahon has asked for flow charts to explain Planning processes. Questions that arose from this discussion included:

- Is there a protocol for giving input to MOTI?
- Why doesn't planning staff attend APC meetings? It is probably an issue of capacity.
- Has there been consideration of the SCRD becoming a municipality? This is a complex

issue with many cost implications.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023

REPORTS

Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

This draft policy was referred to the APC for feedback. Feedback included the following key points of discussion regarding OCPs and how they are revised:

- OCPs are usually updated every five to ten years, with the process for each update taking about two years.
- What is the specific process for updating the OCPs? The *Local Government Act* is the starting point, but there are details not covered in the Act.
- The APC would like to see a “roadmap” of how OCPs are reviewed that would include an itemized checklist including how community consultation is achieved and how members for a consulting committee are chosen.
- What is the role of the Elphinstone Community Association in OCP review or other planning matters?
- It was noted that the District of Sechelt has one OCP but there are sections for the different neighbourhoods. It was suggested that in the SCR D OCP updating process one consolidated OCP be developed for sections that are the same in all areas, thereby eliminating the need to duplicate certain sections. OCP sections that are unique for each rural area could be added.
- A unified OCP was just completed in the Cowichan Valley Regional District and this may be a model for the SCR D.
- It is suggested that all APCs get together for discussion.

Following are key points of discussion on the draft policy:

- There was positive support for the draft policy as it indicated a direction to harmonize some sections of OCPs.
- Accessible active transportation promotes sustainable, resilient, and affordable transportation options which have positive environmental impacts. Therefore, the policy needs more emphasis on accessibility for active transportation, that is, non-car transportation that includes cycling and pedestrians.
- There is also a need for connectivity for active transportation, linking neighbourhoods, and providing access to commercial and community locations.
- There is lot of subjective language (for example, “significant” and “appropriate”) so it would be clearer if some metrics were added.
- There should be a requirement for developers to meet the higher levels of the BC Energy Step Code, and include consideration for the carbon emissions under the new provincial Zero Carbon Step Code.

- How will SCRD prioritize the 13 criteria? Which is most important? Is it in the order presented in the draft? Section 4 Environmental Enhancement should be a priority.
- The APC members would like SCRD staff to bring this draft policy to a meeting and give examples of how they would apply it. This would be done by going through an actual application and weighing and assessing the application against the criteria.
- It was noted that there are lots of good ideas in the draft policy.
- Will developers get this policy ahead of time to facilitate getting better applications?
- APC members are grateful for the opportunity the draft policy creates for a more positive development direction and hope these criteria are reflected in the updated OCPs.
- The APC would like to see the final version of the draft policy. It will show up in the agenda for the Electoral Area Services agenda.
- As structured the proposed OCP Amendment Framework is too open to varying interpretation by an applicant preparing an amendment and the municipality reviewing the submission. The framework includes a long list of criteria covering a wide range of planning, quasi planning, and non-planning matters. Greater clarity is required on how it should be interpreted and reviewed. Are the criteria to be interpreted/reviewed subjectively, quantitatively, or both? Will some/all of the criteria be weighted, ranked, scored out of 10, etc. or will some be a simple yes/no response, etc.? A framework that provides consistency in interpretation, preparation and review of an application is essential to successful use by both the municipality and industry when considering an amendment to the senior municipal planning document.

Recommendation No. 1 *Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area E APC recommended that feedback on the draft policy wording be considered as follows (in italics):

1. Location

d) Proposed development eliminates direct vehicular driveway access to the Sunshine Coast Highway and seeks to limit or reduce direct vehicular driveway access to other arterial roads *Add “and seeks to redirect vehicular access to a secondary feeder road”*

Add f) create transportation corridors and trail networks so people can freely and safely move using active transportation.

2. Land Use Compatibility and Density

f) If located at or near a rural-municipal edge, proposal responds to adjacent municipal land use planning *Add “that includes consideration for multi-modal transportation options”*

4. Environmental Enhancement

Add g) “The application includes best management practices (BMPs) for Integrated storm management, and also use BMPs for environmental management, road construction (grades), tree preservation, and ensuring stable slopes. Technical information related to these matters should also be included with the application for SCRD review and provided to the APC for its review of the application.

5. Climate Resilience & Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

5. a) iv. *Delete “opportunity”*

8. Affordable Housing

8. a) ii. *Add “and creates higher density near transportation hubs.”*

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING – WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2023, 7:00 PM BY ZOOM.

ADJOURNMENT 9:24 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**AREA F – WEST HOWE SOUND
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

March 28, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WEST HOWE SOUND (AREA F) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair	Susan Fitchell
	Members	Tom Fitzgerald Kevin Healy Miyuki Shinkai Katie Thomas Dave Haboosheh
ALSO PRESENT:	Director, Electoral Area F	Kate-Louise Stamford (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary Public	Diane Corbett 1
REGRETS:	Members	Anita Smith
ABSENT:	Members	Jonathan McMorran Ryan Matthews

CALL TO ORDER 7:50 p.m.

AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as presented. The order of items was changed so that the ALC application referral was the first item of discussion after the election.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Susan Fitchell was elected Chair of West Howe Sound (Area F) Advisory Planning Commission.

Tom Fitzgerald was elected Vice Chair of West Howe Sound (Area F) Advisory Planning Commission.

REPORTS

[Agricultural Land Commission Application 66833 \(SCRD ALR00023\) \(2005 Port Mellon Highway\)](#)

The APC discussed the staff report regarding Agricultural Land Commission Application 66833 (SCRD ALR00023) for 2005 Port Mellon Highway, requesting removal or amendment of the

farm home plate covenant.

The applicant provided background information and a synopsis of the application. Points included:

- Recent updates to ALC legislation permits two residences.
- Plan to develop cidery and community supported vegetable farm garden operation.
- Restriction of the home plate covenant regarding location of worker accommodation.
- Potential for farm worker residence above cidery.
- Rules already exist around number and size of dwellings on agricultural land.

Points raised by the APC included:

- Meet the intent of the ALC to protect farmland and do not ignore what the land is telling you to do. Understand the owners' needs and do not give up protection of the property.
- It is a great idea having a farming community in that area, a very rich land in terms of producing fresh product, and providing workers housing and creating a labour opportunity for younger people. Like proposal. Recommend removal of covenant.
- There are already restrictions in place, such as zoning. If you want to build your house, and you have an area for a second residence over the cidery, good to remove covenant.
- Great idea. Option 1 (removal of covenant) seems the best option.
- If the covenant had not been put on at subdivision, the new ALC rules would allow you to put the dwellings wherever you want.
- In favour of promoting all farming initiatives on the coast; would like to further support the applicant to remove the home plate covenant on their parcel.

Recommendation No. 1 *Agricultural Land Commission Application 66833 (SCRD ALR00023) (2005 Port Mellon Highway)*

The West Howe Sound APC recommended that removal of the home plate covenant be supported for following reasons:

- to promote small scale agricultural endeavours on the coast and be less restrictive to ensure success for those agricultural endeavours; and
- the APC feels there are adequate regulations in place through the Agricultural Land Commission, zoning, and the Official Community Plan to restrict the quantity and size of building; and
- the location of the buildings is likely better determined by the applicant.

MINUTES

West Howe Sound (Area F) Minutes

The West Howe Sound (Area F) APC minutes of November 22, 2022 were received.

REPORTS

Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments

The APC discussed the staff report regarding Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments. The following points were noted:

- It is important to have the local reflection from APC members about what is important to

them.

- Need more time; need to see it more than once, given it is a tool that is supposed to be helping us.
- That ½ acre lot requirement decision has created a high cost to buyers, subdivision, the cost of roads.
- Like idea of having a framework. This isn't an exhaustive list. Have points for each subsection. There must be important parts of each of the criteria that should be addressed.
- Great to have the framework, which is very current. Issue: active transportation and transit. Would like to keep this as a hot topic in our area; Port Mellon has no services. The more development is happening in Port Mellon area, things need to change.
- Note regarding community amenity contribution: there is a hard cost for developers. Having huge hoops to jump through has really affected the coast; it will be a downloaded cost to the buyer.
- Have noticed that parkland isn't dedicated. When looking through the criteria, I wonder if that is missing.
- How do we want trails to connect? Does an amenity fit?
- Haven't seen details of Bylaw 722 and am not aware of four or five other documents. Would like to have a closer look at it. Would like to hear other minutes of APCs.
- Like way it is laid out. It is written in language that a regular person can understand, which is very helpful. It is important that it be laid out for staff to economize on staff time.
- We are only a small subset of West Howe Sound. There is a lot of important information in this document; it would be great to get a crowd source opinion. How could we get the opinion of more people? What mechanisms could we leverage?

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING Tuesday, April 25, 2023

ADJOURNMENT 9:32 p.m.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

**AREA F – WEST HOWE SOUND
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

April 25, 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WEST HOWE SOUND (AREA F) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

PRESENT:	Chair (Acting)	Miyuki Shinkai
	Members	Dave Haboosheh Kevin Healy Ryan Matthews ^[1] _{SEP} Jonathan McMorran
ALSO PRESENT:	Director, Electoral Area F	Kate-Louise Stamford (Non-Voting Board Liaison)
	Recording Secretary	Diane Corbett
REGRETS:	Members	Susan Fitchell Tom Fitzgerald Katie Thomas ^[1] _{SEP}

Prior to the meeting, it was arranged by email that Miyuki Shinkai would assume the Chair position in light of the anticipated absence at this meeting of the Chair and Vice Chair.

CALL TO ORDER 7:05 p.m.

AGENDA The agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES

West Howe Sound (Area F) Minutes

The West Howe Sound (Area F) APC minutes of March 28, 2023 were approved as circulated.

Minutes

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments

APC members commented on themes in the minutes of the APCs with regards to the draft Official Community Plan Amendments Board Policy; there were similar ideas and struggles across the APCs, and issues, questions and complexity around “affordable” housing and densification.

REPORTS

Re-Referral Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments

The APC discussed the re-referred draft Board Policy on Official Community Plan Amendments. The following observations and comments were noted:

- Am wrapping mind around what it means for an OCP to be “renewed”.
- There is a contrast or contradiction to wanting the area to stay this way forever, and needing a place for the grandkids to live. The evolving nature of OCPs is related to having more people. Every person added needs more water.
- Metro Vancouver is more defined, saying: we are going to have x amount of people here over next x years; who will take what? If you want transit and community services, you’ll have to accept this many people, and will have to put them on a route that has transit. My experience is there is too much money spent on studies going in circles, rather than saying: here’s money for water, or build a trail.
- Water supply issue is something that can be solved, but is an extensive solution. There are opportunities there. There is a need to tie new development to progressing towards more water.
- Inquiry about exploring development of Squamish Nation lands on the Sunshine Coast and consulting with Squamish Nation. Do they have to comply with OCPs? Will the land be exclusively for First Nations? Could that be a source of truly affordable housing for development close to transit?
- Comment received by email prior to meeting was read aloud: Would like to see criteria that more clearly prohibits the planting of invasive species if the property is adjacent to a water source such as stream, creek, river, lake, or ocean, as well as crown land.
- Invasive species are normally an issue whether or not it’s a riparian area. It is throwing off the historical balance of what was there before. Would want that criterion broad-based.
- Invasive species are everywhere... It is hard to determine what is an invasive species.
- Like the way the Board Policy is laid out; it is easy to go through.
- Appreciation that staff included for consideration in the report the piece on current trends in inquiries, new applications and recent application reviews.
- I like the idea of being bold in providing housing, and not just densifying to solve the housing problem, but also bringing a community benefit.
- The report seemed to be pointing toward directing applicants to say: additional housing is great, but there needs to be something more, like trails or other community amenities. I didn’t like that part of it. Say why would I want this in my neighbourhood, other than the greater good? There are 8 billion people now. Where are you going to put these people?
- This policy requires a bit more responsibility from applicants. They have to read through this amendment policy to see if their desire to create investment is the right place to be. We are asking for stewardship on their part. It will encourage applicants to be more responsible and consider the future of the Sunshine Coast and support for each other’s

well being.

- Are there any guidelines for potential developers?
- Was unsure of what we were to do with this report. Was unsure about what this is about. Would like more time for discussion and feedback. What was asked for us for this meeting was not intuitive.
- Point 9, Economy: the economy part is important for the next generation to continue; would like to see a bit more detail on that.
- Reconciliation and Heritage Conservation sections: could have more criteria.
- Topography section: perhaps could have more information.
- This will be a guideline to start to fill the gap with the old Official Community Plans.

Interest was expressed in an opportunity to get together with other areas' APCs to hear the presentation of the amendments.

Director Stamford responded to APC members' inquiries and comments. The Director invited APC members to send to her any further ideas they may have on the draft Board policy that she could pass to the Board.

Recommendation No. 1 *Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments*

The Area F APC recommended support for the outline and the value statements as presented in the report titled Board Policy – Official Community Plan Amendments.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's report was received.

NEXT MEETING Tuesday, May 23, 2023

The Director thanked Miyuki for taking on the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT 8:30 p.m.



REFERRAL

Sent: April 18, 2023

Respond By: May 19, 2023

Referral To:

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> shísháhl Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> Min. of Transportation and Infra. | <input type="checkbox"/> District of Sechelt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Skwxwú7mesh Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Town of Gibsons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SCRD Building Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Min. of Forests, Lands and Nat. | <input type="checkbox"/> Islands Trust |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SCRD Infrastructure Services | <input type="checkbox"/> School District #46 | <input type="checkbox"/> Vancouver Coastal Health |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SCRD Corporate Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advisory Planning Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Resources Advisory | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Area Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Type of Referral: Board Policy

Electoral Area: all

Summary of Referral:

Update: The draft OCP amendment policy is on the APC agenda for a second time to provide more time for discussion and feedback.

SCRD's 7 OCPs are aging and in need of renewal. Meanwhile, SCRD is experiencing rising numbers of applications to amend OCPs, such as applications to change land use designations or density. Staff observe the need for policy direction in advance of full OCP renewal, to guide applicants, staff, community and decision makers in preparing and evaluating proposed applications toward innovative OCP amendment applications that will benefit the region for the long term.

The draft policy proposes a framework for interdisciplinary evaluation that ensures clear direction for managing emerging values as well as those already embedded in SCRD policies and strategic plan: housing affordability, natural asset protection, climate action, reconciliation, water conservation, corridor planning, park land dedication and more.

This is proposed to be a guide for Board decision making, which is also intended to be operationalized via staff: from inquiry management, through pre-application negotiation, technical review and Board reports.

SCRD Board is interested in seeing an updated draft policy after referring it to shísháhl Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Nation, APCs as well as some community organizations. Your feedback is much appreciated.

Julie Clark, Senior Planner
Planning and Development Division
Sunshine Coast Regional District

Attachments Enclosed:

Report: Draft OCP Amendment Policy

Phone: (604) 885-6804 (Ext. 6475)

Email: Julie.clark@scrd.ca

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Special Committee of the Whole – July 26, 2022

AUTHOR: Julie Clark, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: BOARD POLICY - OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the report titled Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments be received;

AND THAT staff be directed to develop a Board Policy for Official Community Plan amendments to be brought back later in Q3 for review and consideration;

AND FURTHER THAT the draft OCP policy be referred to APCs for feedback.

BACKGROUND

At recent public information meetings for Zoning Bylaw 722, staff received feedback that the bylaw update had not gone far enough toward innovative community building to address current crises such as housing shortages and building climate resilience. Staff heard repeated requests related to the urgency for innovation and/or for denser development in some areas and specifically there were calls to “be bold and be brave.”

Legislative Context

[Zoning](#) bylaws are tools to implement local government land use planning visions expressed in official community plans and regional growth strategies; and a hierarchical policy alignment must be maintained. BC’s *Local Government Act* requires official community plans (OCPs) to include a statement of objectives and policies to guide decisions on planning and land use management within the area covered by the plan. To achieve this, OCPs must further include policies and mapping to ensure approximate location, amount, and type of land use and in the case of residential development, also specify the general location and amount of density. In achieving this spatial implementation of land use and density, other factors such as hazardous conditions, environmentally sensitive areas and the phasing of services must also be identified and guided by OCP policy. For these reasons, Zoning Bylaw 722 has a limited scope and cannot directly accomplish some of the requests received from the public during consultation, as it is guided by six different OCPs; all of which are aging policy documents. The result is that procedurally Zoning Bylaw 722 is geared to be a refresh to its predecessor (Bylaw 310) and the call for bolder change that considers the type of community we want to build is part of a deeper policy dive that involves reviewing SCRDS OCPS and ensuring commensurate levels of consultation.

Current Trends in Inquiries and New Applications

SCRD receives applications to amend OCPs from time to time. There is a current trend of initial proposals requesting to deviate from adopted OCPs without demonstrating specific community benefits in return, consideration of planning best practices or the broad array of existing SCRD policies and plans that seek to build a resilient and livable community. These applications take a considerable amount of resource time and often result in community division on how to move forward. SCRD does not have current policy direction that clearly guides OCP amendment applications. This makes it additionally challenging for staff to calm this division by being able to concretely refer to and articulate agreed upon values for the professional recommendations that are being made for the betterment of long-term community-building.

Trends in Recent Application Reviews

Looking back on the last 2-3 years of OCP amendment applications, staff observations about OCP review processes are reflected, as follows:

- One particularly strong application, that achieved many planning best practices and offered a strong community benefit did not get approved, where community dissent strongly influenced decision making;
- Multiple applications were entertained that did not include planning best practices, and from a planning best-practice perspective, likely ought to have been turned down early. While they were not ultimately approved, the length of the process led to community division that was avoidable as well as a substantial use of staff time that could have been better allotted to doing proactive planning work.
- In each of these review processes, a clear policy might have changed the course of the application for the betterment of the community, by providing policy thresholds for which the application would be considered through and by enhancing timing of the review and/or the ultimate decision. Such a policy would benefit applicants (clearer target, consistency, faster process), the community (transparency, potential for better planning outcomes) and SCRD (more efficient processes and improved policy alignment).

OCPs Are Aging Infrastructure

SCRD has seven existing OCPs which are aging. OCPs are key planning 'infrastructure' for the Sunshine Coast. Like physical infrastructure, there are increased risks as these policy documents age. Aging OCPs increase the likelihood that applications to amend them, resulting from development pressure. Amendments, if done well, have the potential to achieve greater land use density or more diverse uses that can result in positive planning outcomes. Careful negotiation is required to ensure the benefit remains with the community for the long-term, and not just for the developer.

If such applications are approved without a rigorous consideration for the appropriateness of the proposed use and density at the subject location and negotiation of adequate community benefit, an increase in future community challenges is likely to result from the unplanned land use. Such challenges may include climate impacts, social equity concerns, land use and neighbourhood conflicts, as well as long-term inefficiencies, inabilities or cost impacts to providing community infrastructure and services.

Despite these challenges, developer-initiated OCP amendments can present a significant opportunity to shape land use patterns and decisions in a positive way that support long term community benefits, if there is policy to support rigorously reviewed and negotiated outcomes.

Urgency

Staff share the community's sense of urgency to meaningfully address the many environmental, social and economic challenges facing the Sunshine Coast and are eager to embark on this critical community conversation. Future comprehensive updates to SCR D's seven OCPs will form the legacy of our community for future generations, but it will take time, resources and deep community conversations to inform decision making and ensure we get it right (a multi-year renewal project has been approved to commence later this year/following completion of the zoning bylaw project).

Proposed Bylaw 722 is intended as a steppingstone to this larger metric of upcoming planning work and the recent Regional Growth Baseline Work serves as a compass to guide the way. Despite these efforts, recent climatic events, housing demand and developer willingness suggest that there is an urgent need to consider how and when we consider amendments to SCR D's OCPs in the interim.

Such processes move at the speed of legislated requirements, community relationships and trust, as well as the provision and availability of resources. SCR D is committed to that deep work, yet there is a practical and urgent need to apply increased rigor to OCP amendment applications now, with a framework of criteria for negotiating that is consistently carried through from the beginning of an inquiry to decision making.

Following up on the above-noted recent community feedback and operational observations, staff have decided to propose to develop a Board Policy to guide the review of OCP amendment applications to help ensure the decisions we make today, build a legacy that we are proud to pass onto future generations. The purpose of this report is to provide information and obtain direction from the Electoral Area Directors on developing a Board Policy that provides an assessment criterion for Official Community Plan Amendment applications.

DISCUSSION

Analysis

In response to requests to "be bold and brave", noting recent application review trends and the increase in inquiries and applications for OCP amendments that depart significantly from existing OCPs, staff propose to develop a Board Policy for OCP amendments, akin to the current DVP Board Policy. The proposed policy is intended to encourage and reward innovative OCP amendment applications that will benefit the region for the long term. This tool is proposed to be:

- an interim solution for the duration of time before new OCPs and regional growth strategy are completed (it would be reassessed at this time);
- A guide for the Board which is operationalized with staff: from inquiry management, through pre-application negotiation, technical review and Board reports;
- A signal to the development community of growing expectations for rural density proposals, foreshadowing new OCP principles and policies;
- Foster transparency: gives the development community the framework needed to build stronger proposals before approaching SCR D, and a common frame of reference for negotiation;

- An evaluation framework that unites land use planning best practices, community wishes, staff technical review and Board decision making; and
- A framework for interdisciplinary evaluation that ensures clear direction for managing emerging values as well as those already embedded in SCRD policies and strategic plan: housing affordability, natural asset protection, climate action, reconciliation, water conservation, corridor planning, park land dedication and more.

A draft policy is attached for reference and to provide an example of the anticipated framework and content. The intent of this policy is to recognize the need to consider OCP amendment applications in advance of comprehensive OCP updates and policy harmonization and provide a framework to guide and encourage the implementation of planning best practices through these applications. **It is important to note that the policy provides review criteria only and is not a yardstick, prescription or requirement.**

An alternative approach, taken by some local governments, would be to hold such OCP amendments in abeyance until OCPs and other guiding documents are updated. Given the urgency of need for action specifically around climate resilience and housing on the Coast, such an approach is not recommended as it may bar much-needed innovative community-building solutions from advancing. By developing this policy framework now, there is an opportunity to strive for land use development excellence and be regional leaders in considering innovative solutions, while harnessing appropriate community benefits. If guided by innovative policy, OCP amendment applications can also be pioneering solutions that may be considered more broadly in future OCP work.

Organization, Intergovernmental and Financial Implications

- A stronger framework of policies and regulations (regional growth strategy, modern OCPs, modern zoning and development bylaws) are needed to drive the expectations for excellence in rural development that meets the current and future needs of the Sunshine Coast;
- When in place, such a framework steers the marketplace to do the biggest refinements to their development proposals before submitting an application, rather than refining mostly through the public review process (Public Information Meetings, Public Hearings, etc.) of an OCP amendment;
- This work should be borne primarily by the applicant and to a much lesser degree by staff, decision makers and community. It is expected that implementing a high quality, transparent framework for evaluating OCP amendment applications will reduce staff processing time, help support SCRD Board decision making and reduce community division;
- Inadequate applications and potential subsequent approvals represent financial, legal and reputation risks to SCRD;
- Developing and implementing such a Board policy would be a signal of the internal and external culture shift required to meet the challenges of our time; and
- Risks of not implementing a framework is anticipated to prolong the time of receiving (potentially) inadequate applications that must run their course, taking more staff, Board and community time.
- The only anticipated direct financial implication to the adoption of such a policy would be a slightly positive effect of allowing re-allocation of existing, budgeted staff time to required proactive planning work (no net budget impact; potential for faster progress on Board-directed projects).

Timeline for next steps or estimated completion date

- If the Board would like to proceed, staff propose to bring a refined draft forward for review in Q4 2022.
- Internal SCRD collaboration and APC referral is planned to refine the draft. It is possible that a special meeting or orientation session for APCs could be conducted in coordination with ongoing work on Bylaw 722.

Communications Strategy

If this policy work proceeds to adoption, staff would prepare a communications plan to notify residents and the development community of the policy framework for OCP amendments.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This proposed policy development aligns with many areas of the SCRD’s Strategic Plan.

CONCLUSION

SCRD Planning staff has heard requests from the community to be bold and brave in the short term to propel housing solutions in appropriate locations. Staff observe there are an increasing number of OCP amendment inquiries and applications coming forward, some citing housing-creation as their intent, while others have also included broader suggested community benefits. Staff review, community understanding and Board consideration of these applications would be assisted by a more rigorous policy framework to weigh the merits of the application against the implementation of planning best practices to ensure a long-term community-building benefits.

Staff propose to develop a Board Policy for OCP amendments to be used in addition to current OCPs. Staff see this as an interim solution in advance of and during the process of OCP renewal, to raise and clarify application expectations and direct development effort toward multiple urgent community needs.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Draft Board Policy: Official Community Plan (OCP) Amendments

Reviewed by:			
Manager	X - J. Jackson	Finance	
GM	X - I. Hall X - R. Rosenboom X - S. Gagnon	Legislative	X - S. Reid
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Other	X - Y. Siao X - R. Shay

Sunshine Coast Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Application Assessment Criteria Board Policy

Intent

This Board Policy is intended to provide guidance to assess the merits of proposed Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment applications in the Sunshine Coast Regional District. Development proposals that require an OCP amendment will be evaluated against the criteria below.

The criteria listed here are a sample of best practices with which to evaluate OCP amendment applications and may not be an exhaustive list. SCRD is open to other innovative criteria that meet the intent of current bylaws, align with SCRD authority and stretch toward sustainable development.

Criteria

1. Location

- a) Subject property is located within 500 metres of a major transportation corridor for which transit services are currently or planned to be provided (applicable to all OCP areas having transit services).
- b) Proposed development would limit the number of crossings of watercourses and seek to protect environmentally sensitive areas.
- c) Location is not in an identified area of climate vulnerability: sea level rise, storm surge, debris flood.
- d) Proposed development eliminates direct vehicular driveway access to the Sunshine Coast Highway and seeks to limit or reduce direct vehicular driveway access to other arterial roads.
- e) Proposed development is in close proximity to or directly accessible by transit, to existing or planned commercial development and civic services such as parks, schools and recreation centres.

2. Land Use Compatibility and Density

- a) Compatibility of land use with adjacent planned land uses.
- b) Appropriateness of proposed density with planned density of surrounding area.
- c) Proximity of planned and existing utility infrastructure with proposed development.
- d) Proposed development provides a housing choice that is appropriately-located and contributes to the range of housing affordability on the Sunshine Coast
- e) The proposal seeks to implement complete community and low-carbon land use attributes.
- f) If located at or near a rural-municipal edge, proposal responds to adjacent municipal land use planning

3. Community Amenity Contribution

- a) Proposed development provides a significant Community Amenity Contribution (CAC), deemed acceptable by SCRD, which benefits the public good and would not otherwise be achievable through established plans, bylaws and policies. *Note: A CAC shall be calculated by the amount of contribution (in-kind or monetary) in addition to all other requirements and payments that are otherwise required by established plans, bylaws, policies and legislation.*

Sunshine Coast Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Application Assessment Criteria Board Policy

- b) If the CAC involves the donation of land or infrastructure to SCR D, this donation should generally adhere to the following criteria:
 - i. The land or infrastructure is provided in a “turn-key” format, acceptable to SCR D.
 - ii. The land or infrastructure is provided in a location acceptable to SCR D that logically supports existing OCP policies and community needs, with consideration given to promoting the use of transit, walkable community cores, as well as environmental protection and enhancement.
 - iii. A cost-benefit analysis of the asset has been completed to ensure long-term benefit to the public good, which may consider risk mitigation factors, such as maintenance costs.

4. Environmental Enhancement

- a) The application proposes to protect and enhance waterbodies, watercourses, aquifers, flora and fauna (particularly those at risk), and other natural features in a manner that provides greater benefit than otherwise required by existing policy or legislation.
- b) The application seeks to reduce Green House Gases (GHGs) through design, protection of carbon sinks, and/or proximity that encourages walkability, cycling, and use of transit.
- c) If the application involves or is adjacent to agricultural lands it seeks to enhance and protect farming activities and soils that are suitable for agriculture.
- d) The proposal does not result in an exclusion from the Agricultural Land Reserve, unless a 2-for-1 replacement with like or better soil qualities is proposed at a location deemed acceptable to SCR D and the Agricultural Land Commission.
- e) The application commits to removing invasive plants and limiting or correcting previous land alteration practices and provides restoration that enhances native biodiversity.
- f) The project protects an area that is integral to a wildlife corridor.

5. Climate Resilience & Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- a) The application seeks to contribute to climate resilience efforts in response to the Climate Risk Assessment and provides benefit to the greater public good, such as:
 - i. Maximizes retention of existing native trees, soil and vegetation
 - ii. Uses climate-resilient planting for future shade
 - iii. Climate-ready stormwater management
 - iv. Provides rainwater capture/retention opportunity
- b) Applications involve innovative climate-resilient design that warrants consideration to support piloting new ideas that could set new standards for climate resilience on the Sunshine Coast.
- c) Project seeks to reduce emissions associated with single occupant vehicle trips and fossil fuel heating.

6. Community Health and Equity

- a) The project applies an equity lens to development.
- b) The project is or will be informed by a socio-economically diverse group of people (including, potentially, those who it is intended to serve).
- c) The project outcome intends to serve people with barriers to adequate housing or transportation services.
- d) The project includes aspects that build social capacity, especially for equity-deserving groups.

Sunshine Coast Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Application Assessment Criteria Board Policy

- e) The projects considers community child care needs.
- f) The project design promotes and connects to safe Active Transportation routes between the proposed location and community amenities.
- g) The project design integrates indoor or outdoor community gathering spaces.
- h) The project furthers food security by producing or processing local food for a local economy.
- i) The project unites affordable housing opportunities with opportunities for growing and/or processing food.
- j) The project protects or enhances farm land and soil for future agricultural capability.
- k) The project protects or enhances habitat for pollinators.

7. Impact of Amendment on Infrastructure and Amenities

- a) The proposal provides a benefit towards enhancing public infrastructure for the development or the larger area.
- b) The location of proposed density is within a logical proximity to the availability of existing or planned SCRD services and utilities.
- c) Proposal demonstrates innovation in or a high-degree of efficiency related to community drinking water.

8. Affordable Housing

- a) The application proposes innovative housing solutions that assist with the provision of affordable housing, particularly long-term rental, on the Sunshine Coast in a location that promotes walkability, cycling and transit usage in any of the following ways:
 - i. Through a registered housing agreement that protects market rental and/or below-market rental.
 - ii. Increases the housing stock of apartments, townhouses and duplexes at an appropriate location and in a manner that will provide more affordable means of homeownership.
- b) The proposed development involves senior level government, a government agency, SCRD, or non-profit backing (collaboration, land or financial partnership) to assist with the provision of affordable housing in a strategic location.
- c) The application involves an affordable housing solution that assists with aging in place for Sunshine Coast residents.

9. Economy

- a) The proposed development involves the construction of an employment-generating use that when complete would provide a significant number of jobs that pay a living wage.
- b) The proposed development involves the provision of a use that would be a significant benefit to tourism on the Sunshine Coast, while ensuring best-practice sustainable development initiatives.
- c) The proposal propels economic growth that benefits environmental and social community needs, such as climate resilience, culture, heritage and the provision of housing.

Sunshine Coast Regional District Official Community Plan Amendment Application Assessment Criteria Board Policy

10. Topography

- a) The proposal is a response to the presence of steep slopes, ravines or flooding hazards that preclude certain uses or types of development and require an OCP amendment to facilitate a use or form of development that is more appropriate for the topography, location, and risks associated with the subject lands.

11. Reconciliation

- a) The project advances the reconciliation goals of the corresponding Nation through collaboration.

12. Heritage Conservation

- a) The full scope of the project is aligned with the *Heritage Conservation Act*
- b) The project seeks to protect and enhance a building, site, or natural feature that has heritage value worthy of long-term protection through any combination of bylaw, covenant, designation, or public ownership

13. Design

- a) Proposed development demonstrates a high degree of innovation, creativity and sensitivity in its overall design, including site layout, building design, stormwater management and landscaping.
- b) Proposed buildings associated with the development demonstrate leadership for the Sunshine Coast in green-building design or advanced Step Code requirements.
- c) Proposed developments adjacent to forested areas should demonstrate a high degree of site, building and landscaping design that is Fire Smart, while also considering onsite fire suppression capabilities.
- d) Site design and landscaping is designed to preserve significant trees and promote onsite stormwater management and aquifer recharge.
- e) The proposal adequately considers emergency response needs including access for protective services.