

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT
ELPHINSTONE (AREA E)
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, April 26, 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. Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023 | Pages 1 - 2 |
| 3. Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of March 29, 2023 | pp 3 - 5 |
| 4. Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023 | pp 6 - 7 |
| 5. Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of March 20, 2023 | pp 8 - 10 |
| 6. West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of March 28, 2023 | pp 11 - 13 |

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 7. Re-Referral Board Policy - Official Community Plan Amendments | pp 14 - 23 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|

NEW BUSINESS

DIRECTORS REPORT

NEXT MEETING

ADJOURNMENT

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: 

- 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

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 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 SCRD 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:

- SCRD 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

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

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 SCRD 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 SCRD 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 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.



REFERRAL

Sent: April 18, 2023

Respond By: May 19, 2023

Referral To:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> shíshálh 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 shíshálh 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 SCRD'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 SCRD'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. SCRD 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 SCRD, 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 SCRD, this donation should generally adhere to the following criteria:
 - i. The land or infrastructure is provided in a “turn-key” format, acceptable to SCRD.
 - ii. The land or infrastructure is provided in a location acceptable to SCRD 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 SCRD 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 project 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.