

# SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

## ROBERTS CREEK (AREA D) ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, January 27, 2026 at 4:30 p.m.

IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICES AT  
1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, BC

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

### 2. ELECTION OF CHAIR

### 3. AGENDA

3.1 Adoption of the Agenda

### 4. MINUTES

- |     |  |             |
|-----|--|-------------|
| 4.1 | Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025                 | Pages 1 - 3 |
| 4.2 | Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of September 22, 2025         | pp 4 - 6    |
| 4.3 | Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of September 22, 2025                  | pp 7 - 9    |
| 4.4 | Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of September 23 & November 25, 2025     | pp 10 - 15  |
| 4.5 | West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of September 23 & November 25, 2025 | pp 16 - 21  |

### 5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5.1 ii. Update on BCTS operating plan referral

### 6. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS

### 7. REPORTS

- |     |   |            |
|-----|---|------------|
| 7.1 | District of Sechelt Community Land Development Analysis Referral              | pp 22 – 33 |
| 7.2 | Addressing Community Concerns Related to Unsightly Refuse on Private Property | pp 34      |
| 7.3 | Official Community Plan Renewal Project Update                                | pp 35 - 38 |
| 7.4 | Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) Operations Model – Implementation Plan    | pp 39 - 47 |

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

**9. DIRECTORS REPORT**

**10. NEXT MEETING**

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

**AREA D – ROBERTS CREEK  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, September 23, 2025, 4:30 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA D ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICES AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair	Mike Allegretti
	Members	William Ferguson Meaghan Hennessy
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Alternate Director	Mary Louise Hardy (Non-voting Board Liaison)
	SCRD GM, Manager, Planning and Development	Ian Hall
	SCRD Planning Office Assistant	Genevieve Dixon
	SCRD Recorder	Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>		Chris Glew
<b>ABSENT:</b>		Jim Budd Caroline Tarneaud Robert Hogg Gerald Rainville Lesley-Anne Staats

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:31 pm.

**AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted as presented.

**MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated:

- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Update on BCTS operating plan referral**

A letter containing APC comments was sent to BCTS. These comments were also received by Electoral Area Services Committee on September 18 and will proceed to Board for consideration of approval on October 9. Staff are having a follow-up meeting later this week with BCTS on this year's referral response. Area D APC had a recommendation related to advocacy to the province which will be considered by Board on October 9 and could lead to a letter to Provincial minister(s).

### **Development Applications Report**

As a general response to comments/asks from APCs, a report that lists all development approvals is now being produced monthly and is posted on [www.scrd.ca/planning](http://www.scrd.ca/planning), under bulletins. Direct link: <https://www.scrd.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/2025-AUG-31-Current-Development-Applications-Report.pdf>. Produced at month end, target is to upload in first 10 days of the month. A real-time map-based version is under development.

### **APC Meeting Schedule, Format, and Location**

A member asked about the background on current meeting schedule, format and location as the timing does not work for all members, and there may be times when SCRD staff is not needed at meetings. It was explained that last year staff was directed to conduct a review of APC meetings and surveyed members (who are not all the same as the membership roster now) about what supports would be helpful to their roles. The new arrangement was based on this feedback of requesting staff presence to answer questions, and to a location that gave the option of hybrid meetings. Scheduling was designed as best as possible to accommodate the various feedback. The survey questions may have different answers now with new members. Another review will be underway to update feedback and preferences.

## **REPORTS**

### **Status Update: Integrating Seven OCPs into One**

GM Hall provided an introduction to the report. APC's will be receiving a short questionnaire in advance of the workshop, which will help guide workshop design. Please take the time to fill this out and return by September 25.

**Key points of discussion:**

- It was clarified that the report shows an initial concept of how an integrated OCP can be achieved and is being shared with APCs for information and discussion.
- It is an exercise in the technical feasibility of integrating. Board direction is to have one OCP that is compliant with legislation.
- The workshop on October 1 from 5:00 to 9:00 will be a deep dive into what are the similarities and differences among the current OCPs.
- How should we be prepared for next week? Being comfortable speaking about what has worked well, what is unique, what in another OCPs are you curious about, and what is the capacity for growth in your area. At the workshop there will be plenary sessions as well as single area sessions and mixed area sessions.
- One of the major items in the current Area D OCP is controlling development on the highway. The community doesn't want to have mini-malls. Where does this fit in the new integrated OCP? It might be found on page 45, approach for local considerations, and is a great question to dig into on October 1.
- The framework has headings and subheadings but doesn't include the content related to the concerns of the individual areas. How are we going to get these concerns into this document?
- This report and analysis just looks at current OCPs and where they are aligned and different. It doesn't imply a structure. Project timeline is that it is still a few months away from how the OCP will be structured.
- What is relation to this project with the housing requirements of the province (Bill 44)?
- Two concerns from the public are: are we going to lose everything that makes us special, and concerns that if there are policy changes in other areas they will apply to our area and we don't want to forced to accept these changes. If there is a change in zoning for one area, would it apply to other areas even if there is objection to it. Concern that the individual characteristics will get lost in the shuffle.
- One end of spectrum is how specific and prescriptive do we want to be in terms of land use designation? At the other end is a general residential zone, and communities don't like that either. The question for the APCs is do you have thoughts about how "tight" or "loose" land use regulations should be?
- Future bylaw amendments could be specific to an individual area.
- Is there going to be a push to do something involving the province and BCTS to deal with water, especially where there is no regional water. There is not much in the OCPs now around water concerns and protection of aquifers. West Howe Sound is the only area with aquifer protection.
- In the current Area D OCP, there is a recommendation for a 1500-hectare park in Mt. Elphinstone. This is an interesting legal and technical question, complicated by jurisdiction and the history of parks. APC members could speak to the reasons for the creation of the park, e.g., habitat protection, aquifer protection, and buffer zone.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** There was no Director's Report

**NEXT MEETING** October 28, 2025

**ADJOURNMENT** 5:24 pm

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

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

**Monday, September 22, 2025, 5:45 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA A ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDARROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICES AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair	Gordon Littlejohn
	Members	Sean McAllistair (virtual) Catherine McEachern (virtual) Michelle Cunnigham (virtual) Bob Fielding (virtual) Tom Silvey (virtual)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Electoral Area A Alternate	Christine Alexander (Non-voting Board Liaison)
	Manager, Planning & Development Planning Office Assistant SCRD Recorder	Jonathan Jackson Genieveve Dixon Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Electoral Area A Director	Leonard Lee (Non-voting Board Liaison)
	Members	Yohan Burega Jane McOuat Farrer Jay O’Keeffe Dennis Burnham

---

**CALL TO ORDER** The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm.

**AGENDA** The agenda was adopted as presented.

**MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025, with the correction that Alan Skelley is no longer a member.

The following minutes were received for information:

- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025

- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Update on BCTS operating plan referral**

A letter containing APC comments was sent to BCTS. These comments were also received by Electoral Area Services Committee on September 18 and will proceed to Board for consideration of approval on October 9. Staff are having a follow-up meeting later this week with BCTS on this year's referral response. Area D APC had a recommendation related to advocacy to the province which will be considered by Board on October 9 and could lead to a letter to Provincial minister(s).

### **New Development Application report FRW00017, 13685 Lee Rd**

At the July 28, 2025 Area A APC Meeting, it was recommended that the application as presented be supported. This APC recommendation was received by the Electoral Area Services Committee at their September 18 meeting where it was recommended that the proposed frontage waiver be approved. If SCRD Board approves the Committee's recommendations, then the applicant would continue to work with SCRD staff and the approving officer at MOTT to finalize the proposed subdivision.

## **REPORTS**

### **Status Update: Integrating Seven OCPs into One**

Staff acknowledged receipt of correspondence from Area A APC member Michelle Cunningham that used AI for a comparative analysis of the seven OCPs. A copy was sent to Area APC members. Staff will take this into consideration.

Manager Jackson introduced the report.

An APC Workshop is planned for October 1, 5:00 to 9:00 pm, in person at the SCRD office. The workshop purpose is to invite all APC members as local context experts to contribute input about their community's unique character, including questions such as: What should be preserved? What should be strengthened? What character considerations can be shared across multiple areas?

### **Key points of discussion:**

- Concerns that Area A is different than the rest of the coast in that the area is not as concerned about increasing density, and has a lot of seasonal residents. There is a great deal of concern over the possibility of losing our voice, so members are looking forward to workshop to address these concerns.
- There are three phases of public engagement. Phase 1 will conclude with the workshop and a report will be issued in November. Phase 2 engagement will run from January through to March and will address where growth will go, specific land use designations, and local area concerns. There will be further public engagement, then a draft OCP is

planned for Fall 2026, then there will further opportunity for feedback. The October 1 workshop will help clarify thoughts at high level, and there will be ongoing communication with APCs.

- Area A hasn't yet determined how it wants to identify its desired characteristics. We are still at an early stage. The last OCP process took a year and a half and went through 8 different drafts. We need to engage our community to find out the community's concerns and issues. How do we draw out the public's views, how does staff help us to do this?
- Why do we want a single OCP? A lot of work went into developing the Area A OCP. One OCP is more efficient in terms of keeping up with legislative requirements. It is better for regional advocacy around issues such as transportation. It will be clearer where there are commonalities and where there are differences. One advantage of one OCP is that the SCRD doesn't have to respond to housing requirements (Bill 44) by individual areas so can make decisions more strategically as a region
- Critical infrastructure isn't evident as a major area of focus, for example, solid waste. Gaps should be identified, and should be included in implementation framework heading.
- Technical studies will be looking at sensitive environmental areas, fire flow, sewerages, ocean outfall, housing needs and density that would require sewers.
- There is concern about how development permit areas (DPAs) are designated. Do individual property owners have to make application every time? Things are being held up too much.
- The process is not doing a deep dive into DPAs now. Some keys things in the implementation plan will consider servicing.
- After the development of one OCP, there will be one zoning bylaw and APCs will be involved in this process as well.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** There was no Director's Report

**NEXT MEETING**      October 27, 2025

**ADJOURNMENT**      6:45 pm

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

**AREA B - HALFMOON BAY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Monday, September 22, 2025, 5:45 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA B ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICES AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair	Kim Dougherty
	Members	Joshua Van Klinken Suzette Stevenson Andy Jones-Cox Nicole Huska (virtual)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Manager, Planning & Development Planning Office Assistant SCRD Recorder	Jonathan Jackson Genevieve Dixon Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Electoral Area B Director	Justine Gabias (Non-voting Board Liaison) Duncan Smith Barbara Bolding Eleanor Lenz
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Members	Robert Baziuk Alda Grames

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

**AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted as presented.

**MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated:

- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- 

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Update on BCTS operating plan referral**

A letter containing APC comments was sent to BCTS. These comments were also received by Electoral Area Services Committee on September 18 and will proceed to Board for consideration of approval on October 9. Staff are having a follow-up meeting later this week with BCTS on this year's referral response. Area D APC had a recommendation related to advocacy to the province which will be considered by Board on October 9 and could lead to a letter to Provincial minister(s).

It was noted that regarding Recommendation No. 2 of the Area B APC minutes of July 28 that the wetland is identified as a sensitive ecosystem on the SCRD web mapping site.

## **REPORTS**

### **Status Update: Integrating Seven OCPs into One**

Manager Jackson provided an introduction to the report. This report shows an initial concept of how an integrated OCP can be achieved and is being shared with APCs for information and discussion.

An APC Workshop is planned for October 1 from 5:00 to 9:00 at the SCRD offices. The workshop purpose is to invite all local context advisors (APC members) to contribute insight about their community's unique character considerations, including questions such as: What should be preserved? What should be strengthened? How can we balance growth?

### **Key points of discussion:**

- The strength of the report is that it showed both the commonalities and the differences.
- Area B has the second-newest OCP and some unique traits such as the only area with economic considerations, and the culture and community theme. It is also unique in that it has three community hubs, and the hospital land is part of Area B. It is also very geographically diverse. The technical studies will have information on sea level rise.
- There is a need to highlight what is important to Area B, for example, agriculture, community hubs (under culture and community in report), mobile home designations, reconciliation

- A member suggested changing section headings on page 43 as follows:
  1. Introduction
  2. Community Well Being:
    - Economy, Service and Infrastructure, Access, Reconciliation
  3. Housing
  4. Environmental Stewardship (or Resiliency)
  5. Development Permit Areas
  6. Maps
  7. Implementation
- Discussion about headings and priorities included a debate as to whether numbering implies priority. This could be clarified in the introduction. Points expressed included that staff are the experts in structuring, and that the OCP needs to be specific about priorities because it is ultimately a policy document. The Board has adopted two pillars, environment and housing, so the assumption is that they are equal in importance, and there is also overlap in these areas. All themes will be considered as a whole and will be aligned with legislation.
- Area B wants a section on agriculture but not all aligned with the ALR. If agriculture shows up in the final framework, it would include Area B, and the question is how it is applied. The SCRD will be looking for input on how this is used, such as agricultural uses outside of ALR.
- Engagement of stakeholders includes organizations such as Vancouver Coastal Health, other local governments, community agencies and groups, Ministry of Transportation and Transit, and developers. It was suggested that the SCRD also engage with subject matter experts and if possible, share the list so members can recommend experts who may have been missed.
- Principles or values will come later. When the zoning bylaw is drafted it will be more specific as to intent and conditions.
- Definitions will be very important, such as what is rural character, what is densification, what is recreation. Recreation is bigger than facilities, it includes places to gather. Is there a difference between village core and community hub?
- Regarding crown land issues such as parks and the Douglas fir area, we can have a guiding ask around crown land but we can't impose regulations on crown land.
- One member opposed storm water management being included in the OCP as it would be redundant because storm water management is already a BC Building Code requirement.
- In round 1 of engagement, we've been engaged in process but not content, so how does the SCRD plan to engage us in the future in a more fulsome way? There will be a more formalized engagement plan going to the Board in December.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** There was no Director's Report.

**NEXT MEETING** October 27, 2025

**ADJOURNMENT** 8:15 pm

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

**AREA E - ELPHINSTONE  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, September 23, 2025, 5:45 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA E ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICES AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Acting Chair	Catherine Grey
	Members	Mary Degan Nara Benchley (virtual) Lynda Chamberlin (virtual)  Ashley St. Clair (virtual)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Alternate Director	Fiona Beatty (virtual) (Non-voting Board Liaison)
	SCRD GM, Manager, Planning and Development	Ian Hall
	SCRD Planning Office Assistant	Genevieve Dixon
	SCRD Recorder	Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>		Arne Hermann Devin Arndt Clinton McDougall Laura MacDonald
<b>ABSENT:</b>		Michael Sanderson

---

**ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Members have decided to rotate the Chair position. Catherine Gray volunteered to chair this meeting.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm.

**AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted as amended with addition of DPA report under Business Arising and Alternate Director's Report under Director's report

## **MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated:

- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

As part of the recent APC review, staff committed to reporting back on outcomes or updates from prior agenda items.

### **Update on BCTS operating plan referral**

A letter containing APC comments was sent to BCTS. These comments were also received by Electoral Area Services Committee on September 18 and will proceed to Board for consideration of approval on October 9. They haven't heard back from BCTS yet but staff are having a follow-up meeting later this week with BCTS on this year's referral response. Area D APC had a recommendation related to advocacy to the Province which will be considered by Board on October 9 and could lead to a letter to Provincial minister(s).

### **Development Applications Report**

As a general response to comments/asks from APCs, a report that lists all development approvals is now being produced monthly and is posted on [www.scrd.ca/planning](http://www.scrd.ca/planning), under bulletins. Direct link: <https://www.scrd.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/2025-AUG-31-Current-Development-Applications-Report.pdf>. Produced at month end, target is to upload in first 10 days of the month. A real-time map-based version is under development.

## **REPORTS**

### **Status Update: Integrating Seven OCPs into One**

GM Hall provided an introduction to the report.

An APC Workshop is planned for October 1 from 5:00 to 9:00 at the SCR D offices. The workshop purpose is to invite all local context advisors (APC members) to contribute insight about their community's unique character considerations, including questions such as: What should be preserved? What should be strengthened? How can we balance growth?

**Key points of discussion:**

- It is will be interesting to see what how nebulous or specific the comments regarding each Area's uniqueness will be at the October 1 workshop.
- Staff reported that regarding the Natural Assets Inventory, 40% of data has been received. A technical memo will be presented in October or November.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

The Director's Report given by the Alternate Director was received.

**NEXT MEETING**      October 28, 2025

**ADJOURNMENT**      6:09 pm

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

**AREA E - ELPHINSTONE  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, November 25, 2025, 5:45 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA E ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICE AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair Members	Clinton McDougall Mary Degan Nara Benchley Michael Sanderson Catherine Gray (virtual) Lynda Chamberlin (virtual) Devin Arndt (virtual) Arne Hermann (virtual)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Electoral Area E Director  SCRD GM, Planning and Development SCRD Recorder	Donna McMahon (Non-voting Board Liaison) Ian Hall Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Members	Ashley St. Clair Laura MacDonald

---

**ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Members have decided to rotate the Chair position. Clinton McDougall volunteered to chair this meeting.

**CALL TO ORDER**     The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm.

**AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted with the addition of Notes and Feedback on the APC Meeting Format under Business Arising from the Minutes and New Business.

**MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated:

- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of September 22, 2025
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of September 22, 2025
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025
- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Notes and Feedback on APC Meeting Format**

Director McMahon reported on the recommendations from the November 20 meeting of the Electoral Areas Services Committee, as follows:

#### **“Recommendation No. 4**

The Electoral Area Services Committee recommended the following changes to the current APC operating model be considered:

- Continued training for recording secretaries, Chair and members;
- Review the timelines for APC feedback and reporting back to the Electoral Area Services Committee;
- Preference for in-person meetings at centrally located facilities;
- Provide hybrid meeting attendance options for members who can't attend in-person;
- Meeting start times that are closer to 7:00 pm to accommodate working members;
- Consider Planning staff member attendance for some meetings that are technical in nature
- Potential option for APC Chairs to coordinate questions for staff prior to or after the meeting.

AND THAT staff report back with an implementation plan that is reflective of the proposed changes to the APC model. “

#### **Recommendation No. 1** *APC Meeting Format*

The Area E APC members recommend support of these recommendations with the request that “centrally located facilities” be clarified to mean centrally located facilities in each of the electoral areas, and that the possibility of staff members to attend virtually be considered.

## **REPORTS**

### **Town of Gibsons Official Community Plan Referral to SCRD**

#### **Key Points of Discussion:**

- Referring to page 22 of the agenda package where staff expressed concerns that ditches that feed into fish-bearing streams don't need an DPA, it was acknowledged that the province regulates this but delegates responsibility to local government.
- The waterway classification depends on if a stream is fish-bearing.
- Many ditches that originate in the Town of Gibsons connect with other streams which will eventually end up in riparian areas and fish-bearing streams in the SCRD. Members appreciated that this issue was identified by SCRD staff.

- It was noted that on page 19 of the agenda package there was reference to “times of peak water use – such as during heavy lawn sprinkling.” There should be public messaging that encourages alternatives to grass lawns that use less water.
- It was noted that water restrictions are the same in the SCRD as in the Town of Gibsons.
- Referring to page 22 of the agenda package that refers to boundary expansion, it was noted that the process of boundary expansion is driven by the property owner
- It is important to preserve ALR designations.
- It is important to acknowledge the economic impacts as part of the process of boundary expansion. These impacts include the gains and losses, both current and future, of any privately proposed boundary adjustment which may create expanded opportunities for Gibsons but also potential losses for SCRD, not just physical and environmental, but also financial.

**Recommendation No. 2** *Town of Gibsons Official Community Plan Referral to SCRD*

The Area E APC recommends that the item referring to impacts on fish-bearing streams in Section 3.1 of Attachment A, Land Use Planning, be flagged for a request to the Town of Gibsons for clearer language.

**Recommendation No. 3** *Town of Gibsons Official Community Plan Referral to SCRD*

The Area E APC recommends, referring to Section 3.1 of Attachment A, Land Use Planning, that dialogue and cross boundary collaboration with the Town of Gibsons be pursued related to environmental factors, such as: areas of high ecological value, climate action plans, wildlife corridors, tree canopy cover, water infiltration, parks and trails, and also considers transportation corridors and economic implications.

**Recommendation No. 4** *Town of Gibsons Official Community Plan Referral to SCRD*

The Area E APC recommends that regional housing needs assessments be included in opportunities for collaboration.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

The Director's Report was received.

**NEXT MEETING**      January 27, 2026

**ADJOURNMENT**      6:47 p.m.

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

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

**Tuesday, September 23, 2025, 7:00 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA F ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICES AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair	Miyuki Shinkai (virtual)
	Members	Byron Roehrl Jon McMorran (virtual)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	SCRD GM, Manager, Planning and Development SCRD Planning Office Assistant SCRD Recorder	Ian Hall Genevieve Dixon Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>		Sue Fitchell Roan Blake Marlin Hanson
<b>ABSENT:</b>		Tim Rockford

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

**AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted as presented with addition of Development Applications Report under Business Arising.

**MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated:

- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of July 28, 2025
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of July 29, 2025

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Update on BCTS operating plan referral**

A letter containing APC comments was sent to BCTS. These comments were also received by Electoral Area Services Committee on September 18 and will proceed to Board for consideration of approval on October 9. They haven't heard back from BCTS yet but staff are having a follow-up meeting later this week with BCTS on this year's referral response. This may appear again with further updates.

The Chair reported that West Howe Sound Community Association joined with Elphinstone Community Association and sent a letter to BCTS.

### **Development Applications Report**

As a general response to comments/asks from APCs, a report that lists all development approvals is now being produced monthly and is posted on [www.scrd.ca/planning](http://www.scrd.ca/planning), under bulletins. Produced at month end, the target is to upload in first 10 days of the month. A real-time map-based version is under development.

## **REPORTS**

### **Status Update: Integrating Seven OCPs into One**

GM Hall provided an introduction to the report.

There will be a workshop on October 1, 5:00 to 9:00, at the SCRD offices. At the workshop topics for discussion will include what is unique in each area, how to accommodate housing needs, and natural assets.

### **Key Points of Discussion:**

- It seems like a good format for a final OCP.
- The current OCP doesn't address climate change impacts such as flooding. Can this be addressed in the new OCP?
- OCPs must contain statements about greenhouse gas emissions. Some risks such as aquifers can be managed through development permit areas. Other risks can be brought up at workshop.
- Current OCPs don't address droughts and this can be brought up as a risk.
- One of the biggest concerns for Area F is that there is no community space in Langdale. The area needs green space and parks.
- SCRD has initiated a parks review.
- Langdale Elementary is doing a lot of nature programs using the adjacent forest, using active transportation. We had recommended higher density in the neighbourhood of the school but are concerned we would lose this green space.

- Higher density can make more open spaces (forests) available (e.g., development will contribute green space)
- Land near the school is wetland and would be prohibitive to develop.
- This land is now used by mountain bikers to access Sprockids Trails.
- The province has a program using provincial land for community use at nominal cost.
- There is not a lot of focus on indigenous peoples or reconciliation in the current OCP.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** There was no Director's Report.

**NEXT MEETING** October 28, 2025

**ADJOURNMENT** 7:37 pm

**SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT**

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

**Tuesday, November 25, 2025, 7:00 pm**

---

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AREA F ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN THE CEDAR ROOM OF THE SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT OFFICE AT 1975 FIELD ROAD, SECHELT, B.C.

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair	Miyuki Shinkai (virtual)
	Members	Byron Roehrl (virtual) Marlin Hanson (virtual)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Electoral Area F Alternate Director GM, Planning and Development SCRD Recorder	Ian Winn Ian Hall Vicki Dobbyn
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Member	Sue Fitchell
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Members	Tim Rockford Roan Blake Jon McMorran

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

**AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted as presented.

**MINUTES**

The following minutes were accepted as circulated:

- West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025

The following minutes were received for information:

- Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of September 22, 2025
- Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of September 22, 2025
- Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025
- Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of September 23, 2025

## REPORTS

### Town of Gibsons Official Community Plan Referral to SCRD

#### Key Points of Discussion:

- General Manager Hall reported that the Town of Gibsons has been working to complete the current version, and have given first reading. They are seeking feedback from the SCRD particularly around areas of collaboration. The feedback in the report has gone to the Town of Gibsons but they are still accepting additional feedback. A public hearing has not been scheduled yet.
- The SCRD OCP is due for completion in early 2027.
- There was a question about the connectivity of the new Langdale well.
- There is ongoing concern about fire services so there is support for fire protection expansion.
- Area F is the gateway to Gibsons and the whole Sunshine Coast, so the Town of Gibsons should support fire protection expansion.
- There is support for a recycling pick up program.
- There is a lack of transportation to Area F. It is a challenge for young people working in the evening in the summer to return home. There is frequent hitchhiking.
- Services for active transportation and bus services are needed in Area F
- Marine Drive needs bike lanes, pedestrian lanes, and speed limit signs
- Parking lots at Langdale are full and people are parking on the road so there is a need for expanded parking lot capacity at the terminal.
- There should be a more mutual way of assisting with water protection and water services.
- Community spaces are great to share with the Town of Gibsons so there should be opportunities to collaborate.
- In Section 3.3 it referred to bike tourism in Section 9 (Economic Development), and it was noted that Area F has a green belt that is a really good resource. It is important to maintain non-auto routes from Area F to Gibsons as they are of benefit as active transportation.
- It was noted that there should be an affordable housing development coordination plan between Area F and the Town of Gibsons because Area F has a lot of potential land, whereas the Town of Gibsons has limited land capacity.
- There is an underlying theme of connectivity between the Town of Gibsons and Area F.
- There are municipal boundaries between the Town of Gibsons and Areas E & F and the Squamish Nation but there are many services that are shared between them. As highlighted in the feedback provided by SCRD staff to the Town of Gibsons, these shared services require a high level of inter-governmental collaboration.
- An understanding of the needs of each of the local governments that must align with the needs of neighbouring jurisdictions must be reflected in all OCPs.
- Nature knows no boundaries so it is important that policies in all the OCPs go through the same rigorous inter-governmental collaboration and alignment

processes that will ensure biodiversity conservation and environmental protection.

- There is a boundary between the Town of Gibsons and Area F but the home address for Area F is Gibsons. We would like to see integration in service by both Area F and the Town of Gibsons and communication about highways and roads. Inter-governmental coordination and planning is appreciated.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

The Director's Report given by Alternate Director Winn was received.

**NEXT MEETING**      January 27, 2026

**ADJOURNMENT**      7:30 p.m.



# Staff Report Request for Comment

---

**TO:** Roberts Creek Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026  
**AUTHOR:** Chris Humphries, Planner 2  
**SUBJECT:** **District of Sechelt Community Land Development Analysis Report Referral to SCRD**

---

## OVERVIEW

### Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to request advice from the Roberts Creek Advisory Planning Commission (APC) on a referral response to the District of Sechelt Community Land Development Analysis Report. Staff have prepared comments across a range of service areas, with a focus on the following key areas:

- Policies or objectives which could impact SCRD service delivery
- Implications for regional growth
- Opportunities for collaboration
- Considerations going forward

APC members are being requested to provide comments using the same framework, considering the implications of the District of Sechelt's findings from the perspective of SCRD service delivery and the APC's role as local context advisor.

Comments prepared by staff are found in Attachment A, and the staff report prepared for the Committee of the Whole is found in Attachment B.

The District of Sechelt Community Land Development Analysis Report is online here: [https://yoursaysechelt.ca/download\\_file/163/522](https://yoursaysechelt.ca/download_file/163/522).

Comments and recommendations from the APC will be provided to the SCRD Board and may be forwarded to the District of Sechelt for consideration following Board direction.

---

## BACKGROUND

A full background can be found in the attached staff report. The District of Sechelt is finalizing this foundational analysis in advance of updating its OCP and is seeking comment from jurisdictions and agencies that may be impacted.

**DISCUSSION**

Staff responsible for services delivered within the District of Sechelt and in areas interfacing with the district were referred the draft document as of October 7, 2025.

This report seeks feedback and input from the Roberts Creek APC on the District of Sechelt’s Community Land Development Analysis with these same considerations in mind, from the perspective of the APC.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The District of Sechelt’s Community Land Development Analysis Report has been referred to SCRD. Advice on response is requested from the Roberts Creek APC, using the four key bullets noted in the discussion section above as a guiding framework for those comments.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

A - 2025-NOV-27 Summary of SCRD Staff Referral Comments

B - 2025-NOV-27 COW Report for Decision - DoS CLDA Referral Response Decision Report

Reviewed by:			
Manager			
GM	X - I. Hall		

# Attachment A

## Summary of Referral Comments from SCRD Staff

This document outlines staff comments by division and service area for the District of Sechelt's Community Land Development Analysis (CLDA) Report, which was referred to SCRD for comment. The CLDA takes a complete communities approach to data collection and community input, and comprises the first phase the District of Sechelt's OCP renewal project.

### 1. Infrastructure

#### 1.1. Water

- **Service impact:**

The geographic location of where this growth will actually occur within the DoS could have substantial water infrastructure implications.

- **Opportunities for collaboration:**

Improvements to fire flow and drought preparedness will require collaborative action rather than resting strictly on the DoS

- **To consider going forward:**

- Water system modelling should be conducted to confirm impacts of proposed rezonings in the OCP that might increase water supply needs.
- Awareness and collaboration, in particular for situations where a property or properties within certain geographic areas are subject to upzoning.

- **Recommended Language/Rewording:**

- Section 4.4.1 – Water Infrastructure (p. 64):

The entirety of section 4.4.1 can be reworded as follows:

All District residents enjoy access to clean drinking water. This service is provided by the SCRD. The primary water source for the District is Chapman Creek, and the water is treated at the Chapman Creek Water Treatment Plant. The water is distributed to the community through the reservoirs known as Selma 1 and Selma 2.

In terms of preparedness for future growth, additional water supply and improved water efficiency will be required to meet demand over the next 25 years.

In addition to providing drinking water, the water infrastructure system also provides water to fight fires. Fireflow capacity was modeled and determined to be insufficient in significant portions of the District under the 25-year scenario, with the exception of the Downtown area. Addressing these deficiencies

requires significant infrastructure upgrades, including upgraded water mains and storage reservoir in West Sechelt, to support future development. It should be noted that Chapman Creek is fed by two alpine lakes and the Chapman Creek watershed, the district's water supply may be affected by climate-related events such as droughts and wildfires and to a lesser degree also by flooding.

- Section 5.3 – Infrastructure (p. 78): Staff suggested alternative wording to the following statement: “Additionally, fireflow remains insufficient in many areas, posing risks to public safety.” Instead, it’s suggesting “fireflow remains not meeting the Sechelt’s standards in some areas”

## 1.2. Solid Waste

No comments/concerns raised.

## 2. Parks, Recreation, and Transportation

### 2.1. Parks and Recreation

- **Implications for regional growth:**
  - Consideration for provision of land for future expansion of existing recreational facilities and/or development of new facilities. Operating two separate small recreation facilities remains challenging from a sustainability perspective. Additionally, one facility is landlocked.
  - Consideration for co-locating pools/arenas/curling rinks/dryland facilities would provide opportunities for more energy efficient buildings (co-gen heating), shared common areas and services (customer service, change rooms, etc). Location of recreation facilities along major collector routes (bus service) also critical. SCRD is initiating a recreation facilities need assessment; results can be shared when complete.
- **Opportunities for collaboration:**
  - Collaboration with SCRD Parks for areas along the DoS/SCRD border or in shared watersheds for the purpose of park amenity development and environmental stewardship to potentially amplify these assets’ benefits and functionality.
  - Consideration for reviews of services provided by each jurisdiction and how that contributes to the overall community inventory (i.e. playgrounds, greenspaces, neighborhood parks, community halls/buildings/beach accesses).
- **To consider going forward:**
  - Generally, coordination in short- and long-term planning of facilities and services.

- Service provision is equitable/accessible but not duplicated where there could be potential overlap close to regional interfaces (e.g. playgrounds, community halls, sports fields).

## 2.2. Transit and Transportation

- **Service impact:**
  - Section 4.1 – Transportation analysis and findings (p. 28 -38): The key discussion items support the priorities of the *Transit Future Plan* and *Transit Future Action Plan*.
  - Supportive of increased housing and commercial/services density around existing transit routes to maximize transit route services
- **Implications for regional growth:**
  - Transit expansion is outlined in the Transit Future Plan (2014) and the Transit Future Action Plan (2022).
  - Request that DoS maintains awareness of the following:
    - Direct routes make transit systems effective and sustainable.
    - Each transit trip is most commonly part of a walking trip, elements of walkability, such as intersection density are critical to realize the transit ridership potential of any density.
    - Road network planning needs to consider Transit (larger/collector roads to accommodate the size & turning radius of buses, as well as safety considerations like pull outs.
- **Opportunities for collaboration:**
  - Transit objectives and policies within the CLDA align with future transit expansion priorities.
  - SCRD and BC Transit intend to update the Transit Future Action Plan in 2027. This is the ideal time to plan for growth and involvement by the DoS will be an important part of the planning.
  - SCRD hopes to launch 2026 Planning for transit on-road infrastructure needs (i.e. bus pull outs, exchange stations, etc.) and would value the DoS participation.
  - Connectivity considerations between the DoS and Electoral areas should be a focus (i.e. pathways, trails).

## 3. Planning and Development

### 3.1. Land Use and Planning

- **Service impact:**
  - Boundary adjacent considerations include:

- Rezoning in West Sechelt from single to multi-residential (CLDA p. 64–65) may increase development application referral volumes and complexity for SCRD.
  - Development permit area policies (e.g., Aquifer Protection, Coastal Hazard) may require SCRD review and alignment in adjacent areas (CLDA p. 79–83).
- Fire flow needs tied to future development scenarios (CLDA p. 66–67) may trigger planning-level (and Infrastructure Services Department) scrutiny of zoning and density approvals.
- Projected growth (page 60) shows an anticipated ~1,500 new households over 20 years (component D of the housing needs report). With this population growth we would anticipate greater demand for SCRD shared services, including water, parks and public spaces access, and recreation opportunities.
- **Implications for regional growth:**
  - Land use intensification in Sechelt may influence expectations for zoning and subdivision approvals in adjacent SCRD areas (CLDA p. 72–74).
  - There is potential for inconsistent development form or land use conflicts at the municipal–rural interface (CLDA p. 77–78). Similarly, there is potential for inconsistent development form or land use conflicts at the municipal–rural interface (CLDA p. 77–78).
  - Ongoing planning for affordable forms of housing represents an important point of regional collaboration. The report notes the relatively low volume of housing for low to moderate income households, and ongoing efforts to identify land for the purposes of this form of housing represent a key regional housing objective that is an opportunity for continued collaboration.
- **Opportunities for collaboration:**
  - Joint planning for those areas where DoS anticipates growth near the district boundaries
  - Alignment across DoS and SCRD Development Permit Area guidelines to increase rigor and consistency for the development community
    - For some situations, alignment in Zoning Bylaw provisions would also increase consistency and reduce development complexity (where zoning provisions address safety or environmental concerns)
  - Coordinated growth management strategies to align zoning and land use designations across jurisdictions (CLDA p. 80–81).
  - Continue communication and collaboration around key planning initiatives and continue collaboration broadly as both DoS and SCRD OCPs, zoning bylaws, and other planning measures are updated to ensure aligned land use.
- **To consider going forward:**
  - Request formalized edge planning framework between SCRD and Sechelt to guide zoning and development approvals (CLDA p. 80).

- Request annual sharing of growth forecasts and sharing of zoning amendments to support DoS-SCRD planning alignment (CLDA p. 60–63).
- Explore joint policy development for DPAs that span jurisdictional boundaries (CLDA p. 79–83).
- **Recommended Language/Rewording:**  
The report offers only a partial definition of “core housing need” within the housing analysis section (Section 4.3.7 – Discussion (p. 63)). If a household experiences one or more housing issues and cannot afford an alternative in the market they would be considered in core housing need. Use of the 30% indicator (household spend on shelter relative to income) on its own as a measure of housing vulnerability should be used with caution, as it includes higher income households that may choose to access higher cost housing.

## 3.2. Sustainable Development

- **Opportunities for collaboration:**  
Building greater understanding of climate impacts on service levels and climate adaptation strategies that can benefit the entire region are a high priority for collaboration. Also, more consistent and proactive regulatory frameworks can support climate resilience.
- **To consider going forward:**  
Although noted on page 69, the impacts of climate change, such as sea level rise raise questions. For example, what is the ability of stormwater systems to function at higher inundation levels? What are the impacts to septic systems and wastewater outfalls? And what is the impact to foundations, in particular to the Downtown Sechelt Village area identified as better suited for growth. Collaboration on infrastructure risk assessments is invited.

## 4. Emergency Response and Prevention

### 4.1. Fire Protection Services (SCRD Fire Departments only)

- **Service impact:**  
Advocate to MoTT for the following: alternate route study and projections should be reviewed with a focus on the CLDA data if it has not been done already.
- **Opportunities for collaboration:**
  - Mutual training (both within fire department and other agencies) and continued emergency preparedness planning.
  - Adjustments to fire department automatic and mutual aid agreements may be required in response to growth.

- Collaborative action on housing solutions needed. Encampments (as one result of unresolved housing need, though it is acknowledged there are multiple drivers) pose risks for all first responders.
- **To consider going forward:**  
Enhanced training for response to special needs clients.

## 4.2. Sunshine Coast Emergency Program

- **Opportunities for collaboration:**
  - Growth in relationships and increased collaboration between the SCRD and DoS in emergency planning, allocating preparedness spaces, training and EOC development
  - FireSmart specific: Implementation of a standardized Wildfire Development Permit Area with Fire Smart in mind should be considered.
- **To consider going forward:**
  - It would be beneficial for DoS, SCEP and SCRD to have an EOC located within DoS (other than Field Road).
  - FireSmart specific: Establish development guidelines that cover subdivision layouts, fire resistant building materials, and landscaping and vegetation guidelines; and integrate the guidelines into the relevant bylaws.



## Staff Report Request for Decision

---

**TO:** Committee of the Whole – November 27, 2025

**AUTHOR:** Ian Hall, General Manager, Planning and Development  
Chris Humphries, Planner 2

**SUBJECT:** District of Sechelt Community Land Development Analysis Referral

---

### OVERVIEW

#### Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with options to consider regarding staff comments on the District of Sechelt's Community Land Development Analysis report referral. Staff responsible for services delivered within the District of Sechelt and in areas interfacing with the district were referred the report on October 7, 2025. Comments were organized by SCRD service area and are attached to this report (Attachment A).

This report requests Board decision to accept, reject or provide alternate direction with respect to staff's recommendations as presented below.

#### Recommendation(s):

- (1) **THAT comments on the District of Sechelt's Community Land Development Analysis report, as set out in Attachment A of this report, be provided to District of Sechelt for consideration;**
  - (2) **AND THAT this report be referred to Electoral Area B and Electoral Area D Advisory Planning Commissions.**
- 

### BACKGROUND

#### The Community Land Development Analysis

The District of Sechelt is updating its Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw to help manage growth in the community, and address changes in priorities and community needs. The renewal project is divided into multiple phases with the Community Land Development Analysis (CLDA) comprising an initial phase.

The CLDA is supported by Union of British Columbia Municipalities' (UBCM) *Complete Communities* program with the goal of reviewing planning through the four lenses of

transportation, daily needs, housing, and infrastructure.

The analysis results in an overview of how and where the district's residents live, work, recreate, shop, and get around. It helps to inform what sort of housing, amenities, services and infrastructure may be required and where for a more complete, resilient community.

Following the CLDA process will be consideration of growth scenarios and development of an Implementation Plan, including actions to work toward creating a more complete community. A growth scenario will be selected that will form the basis of a new Official Community Plan for the District of Sechelt.

### **Regional Collaboration**

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) and the shíshálh Nation engaged with the District of Sechelt and their consultant team to help inform the CLDA and develop the report subject to this referral. SCR D provided input on SCR D services and infrastructure delivery including recreational facilities, public transit, water service, and solid waste management. In doing so, the project team considered the following:

- Limits of current infrastructure and service capacities, and opportunities to maximize or optimize the contributions from SCR D assets
- Mitigating financial and environment-related risks to SCR D infrastructure
- Opportunities for leveraging development for service and infrastructure expansion
- Opportunities for increased interjurisdictional and/or regional coordination in land use planning and service delivery

The CLDA report was endorsed by the District of Sechelt's Committee of the Whole on September 10, 2025 and, though referral of the report is not a legislated requirement, the Committee gave direction that the report be referred to SCR D for comment. The CLDA report can be found within the Official Community Plan section of the District of Sechelt's [Your Say Sechelt website](#).

Though SCR D staff assisted with developing the CLDA and resulting report, there is still opportunity for SCR D to provide the District of Sechelt with comments to consider through the OCP renewal project.

### **DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS**

Through the referral process, SCR D was asked by District of Sechelt to identify:

- Policies or objectives which could impact service delivery
- Implications for regional growth
- Opportunities for collaboration
- Considerations going forward

While more detailed feedback is provided in Attachment A, some high-level observations of the CLDA report are as follows:

- Overall, SCRD and District of Sechelt are aligned in terms of understanding the current realities of service delivery such as water, transit, solid waste and recreation, but there are opportunities for increased clarity around what can be provided now and under possible growth scenarios.
- Resilience and sustainability of infrastructure and services should be considered as the District of Sechelt OCP is developed, and this includes consideration of climate change impacts.
- Interjurisdictional and regional collaboration is key to ensuring complementary land use planning and service delivery inside and outside of the district.
- There are opportunities for furthering collaborative approaches to disaster mitigation and emergency response planning.

***OPTION 1 – That comments on the District of Sechelt’s Community Land Development Analysis Report, as set out in Attachment A of this report, be forwarded to District of Sechelt for consideration, and that the report be referred to Electoral Area B and D Advisory Planning Commissions.***

Staff recommend this option. Should the Committee choose to go with Option 1, a recommendation could be considered, as provided in the Overview section on page one of this report. Comments would be forwarded back to District of Sechelt staff to inform future stages of their OCP renewal work. Recommendations from APCs could be advanced to District of Sechelt following review and decision by the Board.

***OPTION 2 – That comments on the District of Sechelt’s Community Land Development Analysis Report, as set out in Attachment A of this report, be forwarded to District of Sechelt for consideration with additions and amendments***

Should the Committee choose to go with Option 2, a recommendation could be considered, as follows:

THAT the following comments be added/removed from those provided in Attachment A, and an amended set of comments be provided to the District of Sechelt:

- Edit #1
- Edit #2
- Etc. ....

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS**

This referral response supports the Strategic Focus Areas of Water Stewardship and Solid Waste Solutions.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The District of Sechelt referred the recently completed Community Land Development Analysis report to the SCRD for comment. In summary:

- The CLDA comprises the early stages of the district’s OCP renewal project and is intended to steer the district toward more sustainable, complete community development patterns.
- SCRD staff assisted throughout the CLDA lifecycle and with the final CLDA report, with consideration of SCRD services and infrastructure within and adjacent to the boundaries of the District of Sechelt.
- The CLDA report has since been referred to SCRD for comment though it is not a legislated referral.
- SCRD staff have reviewed the referred CLDA report and provided comments for District of Sechelt. Staff highlight opportunities for increased regional coordination, a clearer understanding of current and future limits and opportunities related to service and infrastructure, and increased consideration of resilience and sustainability.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

Attachment A          Summary of Referral Comments from SCRD on District of Sechelt Community Land Development Analysis report

Reviewed by:			
Manager		Finance	
GM	X – I. Hall X – R. Rosenboom	Legislative	
CAO	X – T. Perreault	Other	



# APC Staff Report Information Referral

**TO:** Electoral Area B, D, E, F Advisory Planning Commissions – January 26 & 27, 2026  
**AUTHOR:** Matt Thomson, Senior Planner  
**SUBJECT:** Community Concerns Relating to Unsightly Refuse on Private Property

## OVERVIEW

### Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to inform the Electoral Area B, D, E, F Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) of the recent staff report titled *Community Concerns Relating to Unsightly Refuse on Private Property* that was presented to the Electoral Area Services Committee on December 18, 2025

On January 8, 2026, the Board directed the following:

- THAT a report proposing amendments to *Zoning Bylaw No. 722* to regulate outdoor storage of materials considered unsightly be provided to a Committee in Q2 2026;
- AND THAT the staff report be referred to the Electoral Area B, D, E, and F Advisory Planning Commissions for information.

The staff report prepared for the Electoral Area Services Committee is Attachment A.

### Background

A comprehensive background and discussion is provided in the attached staff report.

### Discussion

This staff report is being provided to APCs for information.

### Next Steps:

Staff will prepare a report that proposes amendments to *Zoning Bylaw No. 722* to regulate outdoor storage of materials considered unsightly in Q2 2026. It is anticipated this proposal will be referred to APCs.

**ATTACHMENT(S):** A - Community Concerns Relating to Unsightly Refuse on Private Property

Reviewed by:			
Manager			
GM	X – I. Hall		



# APC Staff Report Information Referral

---

**TO:** Electoral Area A Advisory Planning Commission – January 26, 2026  
Electoral Area B Advisory Planning Commission – January 26, 2026  
Electoral Area D Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026  
Electoral Area E Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026  
Electoral Area F Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026

**AUTHOR:** Matt Thomson, Senior Planner

**SUBJECT:** **Official Community Plan Renewal Project Update**

---

## OVERVIEW

### Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to share information to SCRD Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) on the following topics of the Official Community Plan Renewal Project:

1. SCRD OCP Organizing Framework
2. Technical Memos: Official Community Plan
3. Housing Primer – Part 2 Technical Memo
4. Official Community Plan Renewal Project Phase 2 Engagement Approach

Staff reports prepared for the Electoral Area Services Committee are enclosed as Attachments A, B, C and D.

**These are provided to APC members as information, for awareness and reference in your role of local context advisors.** This item will be included on January APC agendas as an opportunity for discussion and to ask clarifying questions.

**Because of the large volume of material, it is being provided with additional notice, in advance of agenda distribution.**

---

## BACKGROUND

**Please review the attached staff reports.**

The OCP renewal project will create a new plan to respond to needs and changes in our communities, both now and in the future. A new plan will be easier to use, align with today's legislative requirements, and enable SCRD to achieve community goals in a cost effective way. As SCRD staff prepare for Phase 2 of engagement (January to March 2026), a number of inputs were prepared for the Board in November and December 2025.

Inputs include:

- **SCRD OCP Organizing Framework** – an integrated structure for grouping land uses that reflects needs, community priorities, and alignment with technical studies (November 20 Electoral Area Services Committee);
- **Technical Memos** – Nine supporting technical memo supporting on the two OCP pillars (Housing and Climate/Environment); the purpose of these memos is to support decision-making and future policy development (November 20 Electoral Area Services Committee);
- **Housing Primer Part 2** – An additional supporting technical memo providing additional affordability and housing stock analysis (December 18 Electoral Area Services Committee);
- **Official Community Plan Renewal Project Phase 2 Engagement Plan** – The plan for undertaking engagement in Phase 2, between January and March 2026 (December 18 Electoral Area Services Committee).

On November 27, 2025, the SCR D Board adopted the following resolutions:

**Recommendation No. 2** *SCR D OCP Organizing Framework*

THAT the renewed Official Community Plan for the rural areas of the Sunshine Coast Regional District be developed using an integrated structure for grouping land uses, referred to as the Organizing Framework, that reflects servicing needs, community priorities, policy goals and alignment with technical studies and zoning;

AND THAT the Board identify any specific aspects of this approach it wishes to refine or emphasize during Phase 2 engagement.

**Recommendation No. 3** *Technical Memos: Official Community Plan*

THAT the following Official Community Plan technical memos and corresponding studies be approved for inclusion in Official Community Plan development:

1. Housing Primer
2. Utility Services Analysis
3. Greenhouse Gas Targets
4. Natural Asset Inventory
5. Sunshine Coast Pilot Mapping for Conservation and Climate Resilience Planning
6. Sunshine Coast Green Bylaws Toolkit

On December 18, 2025, the Electoral Area Services Committee made the following recommendations (will be considered by the Board on January 8, 2026):

**Recommendation No. 2**

The Electoral Area Services Committee recommended that the report titled Official Community Plan Renewal Project Phase 2 Engagement Approach be received for information.

**Recommendation No. 3**

The Electoral Area Services Committee recommended that the Housing Primer – Part 2 Technical Memo be received;

AND THAT the Housing Primer – Part 2 Technical Memo be approved for inclusion in the Official Community Plan project next steps and OCP development.

**DISCUSSION**

The linked staff reports are provided for information.

APCs have the role of local context advisors in the OCP renewal project and will be called upon to provide input during Phase 2 engagement. Being familiar with the technical background and project methodology will be helpful to fulfilling this role.

At the January APC meeting, members should give consideration to:

1. Are you clear on the how the organizing framework and the technical information in the memos fits into the project? What questions come up for you?
2. What aspects of the technical memos are most relevant to planning in your electoral area? What details do you expect to be of most interest to the community?
3. Within the framework of the engagement plan, are there specific opportunities for community check-ins (i.e. community event to piggyback on, key location, etc.), or organizations that we should be sure to invite to area workshops? Local context details provided by APCs will be invited at the January meeting.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

See attached staff reports.

**LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

See attached staff reports.

**STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS**

See attached staff reports.

**TIMELINE**

See attached staff reports for timing considerations specific to each topic.

As there may be new appointments to Advisory Planning Commissions in late January, additional project orientation support will be available to new members in February and beyond.

An interactive workshop for all APCs is planned for later in Phase 2 of engagement; the information being referred for information will be helpful background for this workshop.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

See attached staff reports.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

A range of materials supporting the OCP development and Phase 2 of engagement were brought forward to the board in November and December of this year. This information is being provided to APCs to ensure they are informed about these inputs. Comments on the local/electoral area-specific details of the engagement plan are invited.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

- A - [SCRD OCP Organizing Framework \(November 20, 2025 EAS\)](#)
- B - [Technical Memos: Official Community Plan; November 20, 2025 EAS\)](#)
- C - [Housing Primer – Part 2 Technical Memo \(December 18, 2025 EAS\)](#)
- D - [Official Community Plan Renewal Project Phase 2 Engagement Approach \(December 18, 2025 EAS\)](#)

Reviewed by:			
Manager			
GM	X – I. Hall		



# APC Staff Report Information Referral

---

**TO:** Electoral Area A Advisory Planning Commission – January 26, 2026  
Electoral Area B Advisory Planning Commission – January 26, 2026  
Electoral Area D Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026  
Electoral Area E Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026  
Electoral Area F Advisory Planning Commission – January 27, 2026

**AUTHOR:** Ian Hall, GM Planning & Development

**SUBJECT:** **Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) Operations Model - Implementation Plan**

---

## OVERVIEW

### Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to share information to SCRD Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) on the Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) Operations Model - Implementation Plan.

---

## BACKGROUND

The attached report was provided to the Electoral Areas Services Committee on January 15, 2026. The Committee concurred with the recommendations on page 1, which will be considered at the Regular Board meeting on January 22, 2026.

Pending Board direction, information about implementation of changes to the APC operating model will be provided to Commission members with as much notice as possible. As noted in the report, it is likely to take 1-2 meeting cycles for changes to be made.

Reviewed by:			
Manager			
GM	X – I. Hall		



# Staff Report

## Request for Decision

---

**TO:** Electoral Area Services Committee – January 15, 2026

**AUTHOR:** Ian Hall, General Manager, Planning and Development

**SUBJECT:** **Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) Operations Model Update - Implementation Plan**

---

### OVERVIEW

#### Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with an implementation plan to effect changes to Advisory Planning Commission meetings.

This report requests Board decision to accept, reject or provide alternate direction with respect to staff's recommendations as presented below.

#### Recommendation(s):

- (1) THAT an implementation plan to update Advisory Planning Commission operations be approved, as follows:**
    - a. That additional portable audio-visual equipment be procured to enable two statutory meetings to be conducted in the community on one day/evening;
    - b. That, as soon as practically possible:
      - i. the schedule for meetings be changed to be in the first week of the month;
      - ii. That the time and location of meetings be updated to be similar to (order may be revised):
        1. Day 1: Area A 6:30 p.m. at Pender Harbour Water Office
        2. Day 2: Area D 6:30 p.m. at Roberts Creek Hall; Area B 7:45 p.m. at Sechelt Aquatic Centre
        3. Day 3: Area E 6:30 p.m. at GACC; Area F 7:45 p.m. at GACC;
      - iii. That Commission Chairs be asked to review agendas and provide questions and expectations to staff prior to meetings;
  - (2) AND THAT staff monitor the impact of operational changes and report any concerns to a future Committee.**
- 

### BACKGROUND

At the November 27, 2025, Regular Board meeting, the following resolution was adopted:

**286/25 Recommendation No. 4** *Advisory Planning Commissions (APC) Operations Model Update*

THAT following changes to the current APC operating model be considered:

- Continued training for recording secretaries, Chair and members;
- Review the timelines for APC feedback and reporting back to the Electoral Area Services Committee;
- Preference for in-person meetings at centrally located facilities;
- Provide hybrid meeting attendance options for members who can't attend in-person;
- Meeting start times that are closer to 7:00 pm to accommodate working members;
- Consider Planning staff member attendance for some meetings that are technical in nature;
- Potential option for APC Chairs to coordinate questions for staff prior to or after the meeting.

AND THAT staff report back with an implementation plan that is reflective of the proposed changes to the APC model.

These changes were informed by feedback from APC members and build on current operations which were directed by the Board in late 2024 and are guided by APC Bylaw No. 453.

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS**

**Summary of Board-Directed Changes:**

Aspect	Current (2025)	Directed Change
Training for Recording Secretaries, Chairs and members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual member orientation</li> <li>• Two training workshops for Chairs and Recorders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Timeline for meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fourth week of the month, typically</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider if timing can synchronize better with Electoral Areas Services Committee timing for faster flow</li> </ul>
Meeting location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-person meetings held at 1975 Field Rd, Sechelt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-person meetings at centrally-located facilities in each Electoral Area</li> </ul>
Meeting format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All APC meetings conducted in hybrid format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Meeting start time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start times:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area A: 5:30 p.m.</li> <li>• Area B: 7:00 p.m.</li> <li>• Area D: 4:30 p.m.</li> <li>• Area E: 5:45 p.m.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting start times that are closer to 7:00 p.m. to accommodate working members</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area F: 7:00 p.m.</li> <li>• 5 meetings held on 2 nights, using &lt;2 staff members</li> </ul>	
Planning staff attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff attend all meetings as recorders and to introduce agenda items</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning staff member attendance for <b>some</b> meetings that are technical in nature</li> <li>• Staff attend as recorders</li> </ul>
Staff attendance format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hybrid possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Staff engagement with APC Chairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Available, but rarely occurs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APC Chairs to coordinate questions with staff prior to or after meeting</li> </ul>

**Implementation Considerations – Board-directed Areas of Change:**

Change	Considerations/Analysis	Resourcing Comments
<p><b>Timeline</b> - Consider if timing can synchronize better with Electoral Areas Services Committee timing for faster flow</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If meetings were held in first week of the month, minutes could flow to Electoral Areas Services Committee based on current Board schedule</li> <li>• Items recommended by EASC for referral to APCs, then directed by Board, could be sent to APC meeting approximately 10 days later</li> <li>• Not all APC recommendations relate to EASC/rural matters (e.g. BC Timber Sales, regional growth)</li> <li>• Will require timely Chair and Corporate Officer confirmation of minutes</li> <li>• “First week” meeting schedule may provide better flow but is not perfect for every file or for every month</li> <li>• Conducting meetings over three days (practice before the 2025 move to two days) offers scheduling efficiencies/cost savings for staff and supports timely flow of recommendations to standing committees/Board; holding meetings over five days would eliminate requirement for new audio-visual equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No material change to resourcing</li> <li>• Timelines for minutes and agenda turnarounds are tight</li> </ul>

<p><b>Meeting location -</b>                  In-person meetings at centrally located facilities in each Electoral Area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should provide accessibility</li> <li>• Should be a public/community facility</li> <li>• Must have high-speed internet access to facilitate hybrid meeting</li> <li>• Ideally has audio-visual equipment installed (see resourcing note)</li> <li>• Must provide space for public attendance</li> <li>• Minimizes cost to taxpayers</li> <li>• If staff not attending in person, Chair may need to have role in opening and closing facility</li> <li>• Location options that meet requirements:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Area A: Pender Harbour Water Office (recommended; requires space set up with screen, projector and owl camera) or Pender Harbour Secondary School could be explored –</li> <li>○ Area B: Sechelt Aquatic Centre Community Room (space rental, recommended, requires space set up with screen, projector and owl camera) or (future) Halfmoon Bay Hall, or Welcome Woods School could be explored</li> <li>○ Area D: Roberts Creek Hall (space rental, would require screen, projector and owl camera set up) or SCRD Field Rd office, or Roberts Creek School Community Room could be explored</li> <li>○ Area E: Gibsons &amp; Area Community Centre (GACC) (space rental, would require projector and owl camera set up) or Cedar Grove School could be explored</li> <li>○ Area F: Gibsons &amp; Area Community Centre (space rental, would require projector and owl camera set up) or Langdale Elementary School could be explored</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different spaces may introduce costs (rental costs, or could be incremental janitorial costs per SD46 joint use agreement)</li> <li>• If locations are selected that do not have audio visual equipment, either equipment will need to be installed or portable equipment brought in, with staff scheduled to deliver, set up and manage.</li> <li>• For portable audio-visual equipment SCRD currently has 1 owl camera, 1 portable screen, 2 projectors and 2 laptops; an additional owl camera and laptop would be required to facilitate 2 meetings in one evening.</li> <li>• Staff would need to be trained in the set up of audio-visual equipment.</li> <li>• Staff or volunteers may need to set up/tear down space.</li> </ul>
---	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative locations could be considered if facilities are upgraded, new facilities come online, spaces are unavailable for a specific month, etc.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Meeting start times</b>                  - Closer to 7:00 p.m. to accommodate working members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 6:30 and 7:45 starts are acceptable (assumes 75-minute meeting duration), it would be possible to conduct five meetings on three nights</li> <li>Based on proposed locations and audio-visual equipment requirements, a schedule could (with details to be confirmed with facility managers) look like:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Day 1: Area A 6:30 p.m. at Pender Harbour Water Office</li> <li>Day 2: Area D 6:30 p.m. at Roberts Creek Hall; Area B 7:45 p.m. at Sechelt Aquatic Centre</li> <li>Day 3: Area E 6:30 p.m. at GACC; Area F 7:45 p.m. at GACC</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding meeting schedule to be on three nights (currently two) introduces potential demand for more staff time required to record or provide planning staff support to APCs. However, total demand depends on how many meetings are convened/whether items are referred and expectations for staff attendance.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff attendance –</b>                  some meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Propose that Chair would confirm expectations about attendance of staff prior to meeting</li> <li>Scheduling of staff to attend APCs will either reduce service during business hours or require overtime</li> <li>Recorder would always attend (minimum 4-hour shift)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May help manage demand for staff time from planners</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff engagement with APC Chairs –</b>                  before and after meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be an efficient way to support Commissions, similar to agenda review with Standing Committee chairs</li> <li>An agreed-upon timeline for questions before meetings would be helpful to providing quality service and to scheduling work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially more time-efficient avenue for support than attending meetings</li> </ul>

**OPTION 1** – *That starting in Q2 2026 changes to Advisory Planning Commission operations be made as outlined in the recommendations provided in the Overview section on page one of this report.*

*Recommendation*

Should the Committee choose to go with Option 1 a recommendation could be considered as provided in the Overview section on page one of this report.

*Financial Considerations*

Costs associated with APC operation are managed within the base budget for [504] Rural Planning. Very limited cost sharing with [500] Regional Planning may occur for (rare) regional planning matters referred to Commissions. APC recruitment/appointment support is provided by [110] General Government.

Information technology equipment needed to conduct statutory meetings is procured and managed by [117] Information Technology. The estimated cost to acquire one additional owl camera and portable screen is \$3,100. Projectors (which are beyond end of life) should also be refreshed at a cost of \$1,000. Funding is available from base budget. Providing and maintaining these assets increases the service level for the IT division. Future consideration of providing dedicated laptops and cell phones for signal tethering could also be made (incremental cost of \$3,000, of which \$1,000 will be ongoing cell phone charges); having this equipment would increase the capabilities of the kit and add value for community meetings/presentations.

*Organizational Considerations*

There are many variables that will need to be considered to assess the implications of the operating changes on the organization. These variables include:

- Number of meetings convened
- Number of matters referred
- Level of member participation in meetings/quality of recommendations
- Expectations about staff attendance
- Format for staff attendance (in-person vs. virtual)

Generally, staff attendance at APC meetings either introduces overtime costs and/or re-allocates some daytime capacity if shift schedules are adjusted.

Staff propose to monitor resources required for APC operation and to report on issues/concerns.

**OPTION 2** – *That alternative direction on one or more aspects of Advisory Planning Commission operations be provided.*

The Board may choose to provide direction that amends, omits or adds to the parameters recommended in Option 1.

Financial and organizational considerations would be similar to those noted for Option 1.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

This implementation plan is proposed to be accomplished using existing base budget resources. The demand on resources will be variable as it is driven by the number of meetings called, the number of items referred, and expectations about Planner attendance.

The proposed changes to APC operation drive an increase to portable audio visual equipment service level and require purchase of new assets.

Staff propose to monitor resources required for APC operation and to report on issues/concerns.

**LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

Per [Local Government Act s. 461](#), regional district advisory planning commissions may consider all matters that have been referred to them by the regional district board or an electoral area director, respecting land use, preparation and adoption of official community plans, or proposed bylaws or permits. An establishing bylaw (SCRD Bylaw No. 453) is required and guides how APCs operate. No changes to this bylaw are required to facilitate the recommended changes to operations.

**STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**TIMELINE**

Staff are prepared to act on Board direction. It is likely to take 30-60 days (i.e. one-to-two meeting cycles) to procure equipment, arrange space and provide training to Chairs and Planning Office Assistants on facility set up and audio-visual systems before changes are fully implemented.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

This report will be shared with APC members.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The Board directed that changes to the APC operating model be planned. Implementation recommendations consistent with Board direction are provided. Staff are prepared to act on Board direction. It is expected to take 30-60 days to implement the changes.

Reviewed by:			
Manager		Finance	
GM		Legislative	X – S. Reid
CAO	X – T. Perreault	Information Technology	X – D. Nelson