



| COUNCIL AGENDA | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Date: June 28, 2021 July 27, 2021 | Item: 51 R-2 |



R-2

DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
750 17TH STREET, WEST VANCOUVER BC V7V 3T3

COUNCIL REPORT

| | |
|----------|--|
| Date: | June 10, 2021 |
| From: | Courtney Miller, Senior Urban Design Planner Erika Syvokas, Community Planner |
| Subject: | Implementation of the Neighbourhood Character Working Group's Recommendations |
| File: | 0117-20-NCWG 2020 |

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5135, 2021" be read a first time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5122, 2021" be read a first time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Boulevard Bylaw No. 4886, 2016 Amendment Bylaw No. 5131, 2021" be read a first, second and third time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Soil Removal, Deposit, Blasting and Rock Breaking Bylaw No. 5130, 2021" be read a first, second and third time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Business Licence Bylaw No. 4455, 2005 Amendment Bylaw No. 5137, 2021" be read a first, second and third time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw No. 4368, 2004 Amendment Bylaw No. 5138, 2021" be read a first, second and third time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Municipal Ticket Information System Implementation Bylaw No. 4383, 2004 Amendment Bylaw No. 5139, 2021" be read a first, second and third time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed "Fees and Charges Bylaw No. 5025, 2019 Amendment Bylaw No. 5134, 2021" be read a first, second and third time.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT proposed “Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5122, 2021” and “Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5135, 2021, be presented at a public hearing scheduled for July 27, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. in the Raven Room, and that notice be given of the scheduled public hearing.

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to bring forward bylaw amendments, policies and guidelines that implement the Neighbourhood Character Working Group's (NCWG) recommendations.

2.0 Executive Summary

At the December 7, 2020 Council meeting, the NCWG presented its final report to Council. At this meeting, Council directed staff to report back with implementing policies and guidelines with reference to the working group's recommendations. This report responds to this direction with proposed amendments to the Official Community Plan (OCP), Zoning Bylaw, other corresponding bylaws, and updated coach house design guidelines. Other associated deliverables – such as educational best practices materials, guidelines and website updates – would be subsequently prepared, pending Council's adoption of the bylaw amendments.

3.0 Legislation/Bylaw/Policy

Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, regulates land use and overall municipal policies and objectives.

Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010 regulates development of property and buildings in the District.

Boulevard Bylaw No. 4886, 2016, regulates the use and occupation of highway boulevards.

Waterworks Regulation Bylaw No. 4490, 2006 regulates the waterworks system, the fixing of rates, connection fees, and meter rents with respect to the use of water.

Soil Removal and Deposit Regulation Bylaw No. 3786, 1992 regulates the removal from and deposit of soil on lands within the municipality, to require the holding of a permit for such purpose, and to fix a fee for such a permit.

Blasting Bylaw No. 4024, 1996 regulates and prohibits the use of explosive agents for blasting, and requires persons engaged in blasting to give security for damage.

Business Licence Bylaw No. 4455, 2005 provides for the granting of business licences, to fix and impose licence fees, and to regulate certain businesses.

Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw No. 4368, 2004 is a bylaw respecting the enforcement of bylaw notices in conjunction with North Shore Bylaw Adjudication Registry.

Municipal Ticket Information System Implementation Bylaw No. 4383, 2004 is a bylaw to implement the Municipal Ticket Information System pursuant to the *Community Charter* S.B.C. 2003.

Fees and Charges Bylaw No. 5025, 2019 establishes fees and charges for services and information.

The *Local Government Act* requires that a public hearing be held regarding the proposed OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments.

4.0 Council Strategic Objective(s)/Official Community Plan

2020-2021 Council Strategic Goals and Objectives

Council's Strategic Plan 2020-2021 includes the goal to "significantly expand the diversity and supply of housing, including housing that is more affordable". Specifically:

1.4 Create policies and guidelines for single family residential zones with reference to the findings in the Neighbourhood Character Working Group report.

Official Community Plan

The OCP includes a suite of policies to advance housing objectives in the District. These include policies to regenerate single-family oriented neighbourhoods with sensitive infill options (such as smaller homes on smaller lots and coach houses) and policies to respect neighbourhood character. Specifically:

2.1.1 Amend neighbourhood subdivision standards (including consideration of site-specific applications) to enable the development of smaller houses on smaller lots in existing detached residential areas.

2.1.2 Update zoning provisions (including consideration of site-specific applications) to increase the supply of coach houses ("detached secondary suites") in existing detached residential areas.

2.1.8 Ensure that new single-family dwellings respect neighbourhood character by:

- a. Reviewing regulations controlling the scale of new single-family dwellings; and
- b. Applying and updating built-form guidelines, as relevant, in regards to neighbourhood context and character, streetscape and natural features.

5.0 Financial Implications

The majority of the proposed amendments do not have financial implications. Staff are proposing to modify the current fees for a development permit for a detached secondary suite (coach house) and to add a fee for rock removal over the permitted amount. The proposed amendment to the Fees and Charges Bylaw, described later in this report, would allow for the collection of increased application fees to offset the costs associated with staff review and processing.

6.0 Background

6.1 Previous Decisions

At the December 7, 2020 Council meeting, Council passed the following resolutions:

“THAT

1. the Neighbourhood Character Working Group Recommendations, attached as Appendix A to the report from the Senior Planner dated November 18, 2020, be received; and

2. staff report back with implementing policies and guidelines with reference to the Neighbourhood Character Working Group's recommendations by the second quarter of 2021.”

6.2 History

The citizen-led NCWG was formed in 2018 with the mandate to “propose, consider and review regulations and policies that respect neighbourhood character, protect heritage and reduce the impacts of development in the District's single family dwelling zones”.

After a comprehensive two-year process – which included extensive background research, technical analysis, and public engagement – the NCWG submitted its final report with 35 recommendations to: reduce actual building size; encourage suites and coach houses; limit visual impact of buildings as seen from the street; encourage landscaping; simplify process(es) and encourage neighbourhood consideration.

Recent milestones regarding this topic are summarized below:

2013 – Council endorsed “housing and neighbourhood character” and “housing bulk” as priority work items, leading to the preparation of a discussion paper with options for consideration.

2014 – Staff engaged the community to seek input on draft regulations, informing Council consideration of Zoning Bylaw amendments. Council directed staff to further engage the community on a range of regulatory options.

2015 – Council considered a process for additional engagement, directing staff to work with the community to address concerns regarding the size, siting, massing, grading and landscaping of single-family dwelling zones.

2016 – Council adopted Zoning and Boulevard Bylaw amendments to address lot consolidation, site landscaping and boulevard regulations, directing staff to report back on the remaining issues. Council subsequently redirected resources to prioritize the consideration of tree protection and management.

2018 – The NCWG was formed and began meeting in August.

2020 – Following an extensive and considered process, the NCWG delivered its final recommendations to Council, with staff directed to reference these through implementing policies and guidelines (the subject of this report).

7.0 Analysis

7.1 Discussion

Following Council's direction from the December 7, 2020 meeting, staff undertook a detailed review of the NCWG recommendations. As described in the NCWG report the recommendations respond to issues related to building size, housing diversity, landscaping, approval processes and impact of construction on neighbours. Key to the overall intent of the proposed changes is that they would offer homeowners more choice in terms of housing options with bonuses for coach houses and secondary suites that would offset the proposed reduction in floor area for single family houses.

For the most part, staff are recommending the implementation of bylaw amendments as proposed by the NCWG. For some recommendations, the NCWG suggested flexibility for how staff could approach or "fine-tune" bylaw amendments to meet the preferred outcome. Accordingly, in some instances, staff have proposed a modification or alternative solution to achieve the same intent as the NCWG recommendation.

The implementation strategy is proposed to be divided into two categories: "Short-Term" and "Medium-Term" deliverables. A final category, "Not Recommended," identifies a small minority of items included in the NCWG report that staff are not recommending for implementation.

- "Short-Term" deliverables contained within this report include amendments to the OCP and Zoning bylaws, a streamlined process and updated development permit guidelines for detached secondary suites (coach houses) and amendments to corresponding bylaws. The OCP and Zoning bylaw amendments are proposed to be put into effect on January 31, 2022 (pending Council adoption) in order to allow industry and property owners

time to adapt to the new regulations. Corresponding bylaws are proposed to be effective immediately if adopted by Council.

- “Medium-Term” deliverables have been identified that require the bylaw amendments to be adopted first before developing and which further relate to implementation (i.e. process and educational NCWG recommendations).

The following sections describe the short- and medium-term deliverables and provide an explanation of the NCWG recommendations that are not recommended by staff.

A. Short-Term

OCP amendments

1. The working group recommended expanded consideration of atypical subdivision configurations such as panhandle lots. To address this, staff are proposing an amendment to OCP Policy 2.1.1 to expand the existing direction to explicitly consider alternate site configurations.
2. An amendment to OCP Policy 2.1.8 is proposed to add consideration of neighbourhood character in development permit applications, rezoning applications, and variance applications. This amendment will require corresponding updates to the submission requirements for these application types.
3. The working group recommended simplifying or streamlining the process for approval of one-storey zoning compliant coach houses by removing the requirement that a development permit be required for these types of coach houses (building permit only). The rationale being that one-storey coach houses without basement do not require site manipulation and are less impactful to neighbouring properties or the streetscape than one-storey plus basement or two-storey coach houses with or without basements. This recommendation will aid in achieving OCP objectives and will help incentivize coach houses. An amendment to OCP Policy BF-B3.1 for detached secondary suites (coach houses) is required to specify that a development permit is required for coach houses that are one-storey plus basement, two-storeys with or without basements, or for any coach house requiring a variance.
4. The coach house design guidelines have been updated to clarify and strengthen the existing design guidelines coach houses.

Zoning Bylaw amendments

1. Building size and massing

a) Floor Area Ratio (FAR)¹:

- i. Reducing FAR from 0.35 to 0.30 on lots greater than 681.3 m² (7,333 sq. ft.).
- ii. Reducing FAR to a fixed buildable 206.2 m² (2, 200 sq. ft.) on lots between 408.8 m² (4,400 sq. ft.) and 681.3 m² (7,333 sq. ft.).
- iii. No change to lots less than 408.8 m² (4,400 sq. ft. – i.e. FAR remains at 0.5).

b) Reducing the total exemption for garages, carports and accessory buildings from 63.5 m² (683 sq. ft.) to 41 m² (441 sq. ft.). This amendment would allow options for homeowners to either provide parking for two cars or one car with accessory space (e.g. workshop, storage, etc.) to align with parking reductions from Council's climate action amendments.

c) Floor area calculations:

- i. Excluded basement calculation – the basement floor height is proposed to be lowered relative to natural grade (from 0.9 m/3 ft. to 0.45 m/1.5 ft.) above grade) and a maximum height of 2.75 m (9 ft.) below the main floor level is proposed for the purposes of floor area exemption. This change is intended ensure that basements are less visible and to deter falsely increasing the size of the basement exemption (and as a result allowing larger houses) by digging the basement floor deeper.
- ii. Including all semi-enclosed spaces in FAR calculations with a restriction on privacy walls to limit these to the required safety height in the building code and including interior courtyards and exterior areas enclosed more than 85% as these spaces add to the apparent size of homes. These proposed zoning amendment also respond to the issue raised by the working group to limit the amount of blank side wall facing neighbouring houses.

¹ For the described reductions in floor area to the principle house sites can “earn” the floor area back through the bonuses proposed for secondary suites and coach houses as described in the Housing Diversity section. For lands within the Future Neighbourhood Development Permit Area no change is proposed to floor area or subdivision standards as those lands are subject to area planning based on the Development Permit Area and policy guidance in the OCP. Also for RS6 (Eagle Island) these changes are not applicable as sites in this zone are not permitted to have coach houses.

- iii. Including over-height covered deck space in FAR calculations by:
 - Including all covered deck areas beyond 1.2 m (4 ft.) from building face in FAR, regardless of the height of the roof above the deck.
 - For cases where the roof overhang is greater than 4.4 m (14.4 ft.) above the ground or main floor height, the FAR calculated below is doubled. This would be consistent for how interior double height spaces are counted.
 - iv. Highest Building Face (HBF)
 - Street facing HBF overhang limited to 1.2 m (4 ft.).
 - 33% exclusion must be contiguous.
 - v. Reducing the front yard setback by 3 m (10 ft.) for garage doors that are oriented perpendicular to the street. The intent is to encourage fewer garage doors exposed to the street view.
 - vi. Restrictions to address grade manipulation including how grade is calculated and retaining wall restrictions.
 - vii. Limiting the height of butterfly and shed roofs to match flat roofs.
 - viii. Limiting the maximum buildable floor area for RS zones RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS9 and RS10 to 150% of the FAR of the minimum lot size in the zone (based on today's zoning). Staff are recommending that the restriction is not applicable to RS1 and RS8 zones which only exist in the Upper Lands Future Neighbourhoods Development Permit Area and would be developed based on planning for those areas, or to the RS6 zone (Eagle Island). The proposed cap on floor area would be consistent with the restriction applied to consolidated lots.
- d) Allow for expansion of subdivision opportunities.
- i. As previously described, staff are proposing an amendment to the OCP provision expanding the existing direction to explicitly consider alternate site configurations.
 - ii. The working group also recommended reducing the minimum lot size where subdivision is permitted by 5%. Overall, approximately 11,400 RS zoned lots (excluding Eagle Island and the Upper Lands) would be impacted by this working group proposed zoning change. The

proposed 5% reduction in site area for subdivision would allow approximately 240 or 2% of lots to be subdivided. Whereas the maximum buildable floor area cap of 150% of the minimum lot size for the zone would impact approximately 3,400 or 30% of lots; of these, 2,100 or 19% of lots would be penalized since they could not be subdivided. Staff are proposing an alternative approach to better align the maximum floor area and minimum subdivision variables, by recommending allowing a 12.5% reduction in lot size. This would allow approximately 680 lots (6%) to be subdivided and is estimated to remove the maximum buildable floor area penalty (i.e. typical larger lots would generally be able to either achieve the 150% floor area cap or be able to be subdivided).

2. Housing diversity

- a) Provide a FAR bonus for a secondary suite:
 - i. Up to 46.5 m² (500 sq. ft.) or 0.05 FAR bonus whichever is less.
 - ii. The bonus area is located outside of the building footprint for livability but must be adjacent to the principle building.
- b) Provide a FAR bonus for a coach house:
 - i. 74.3 m² (800 sq. ft.) or 0.10 FAR whichever is less.
 - ii. The bonus is applied outright on lots with older homes built prior to 1976, provided that the principal dwelling is retained. The intention of allowing this is to discourage demolition of older homes and encourage the development of coach houses on lots with older houses.
- c) The secondary suite and coach house bonus is exclusive.
- d) Relaxing the restriction of 60% second storey space for coach houses above a garage to allow garage space to be counted on the main level. A modification is also proposed for flat roof buildings to further restrict the upper storey to 50% of the main level. This maintains the requirement for the upper level to be set back to reduce building bulk, but allows coach houses to be built above a garage.
- e) Allowing a secondary suite and coach house on same lot.
- f) Removing the cap on the maximum size of a secondary suite. The working group recommended maintaining the maximum size restriction of 90 m² (969 sq. ft.), however, it is proposed that this cap be removed in order to align with the BC Building Code.

- g) Consideration of stratification of coach houses was recommended by the Working Group, which is already allowed through a rezoning application based on direction in the OCP.
 - h) Additional improvements to coach house regulations:
 - i. Clarification to rear yard setbacks.
 - ii. Allowing the exemption for parking and accessory space 41 m² (441 sq. ft.) to be allocated to living space.
 - iii. Requiring a minimum 30% ground living space to ensure that coach houses have a pedestrian entry and presence at ground level.
 - iv. Allowing a maximum of one enclosed parking space of 20.5 m² (220.5 sq. ft.).
 - v. A cap on the maximum coach house size of 148.6 m² (1,600 sq. ft.) including garage, accessory building exemptions and basement floor area.
 - vi. Dormers restricted to 50% of building width and 30% of total building perimeter.
 - vii. Requiring a minimum of 6 m² of private outdoor space.
 - viii. Allowing for a registered owner who does not occupy, as their principal place of residence, either the principal dwelling unit or the coach house, to have a property manager for the site. Currently this provision is required for a secondary suite but not a coach house. It is proposed that the same conditions apply to both types of suites.
3. On site landscaping, fences and retaining walls:
- a) Reducing the maximum security required with a landscaping plan from \$50,000 to \$25,000 so it does not discourage high quality landscaping (a bond as a percentage of the cost of the landscaping can incent low-cost plans).
 - b) Applying the current maximum 50% impermeable surfaces in the front yard regulation to all street frontages to limit hard surfaces visible from the street.
 - c) Requiring that, in cases where more than 50% of the front yard may be impermeable surfaces in order to provide a pedestrian sidewalk and driveway, the amount over 50%:
 - i. Be a softer/greener form of hard material, such as turf blocks.
 - ii. Must be made up with vegetated permeable surfaces elsewhere on the lot.

- d) Limiting the height of a fence to 1.8 m (6 ft.) as viewed from the street and clarifying the existing regulations for the combined height of a fence and retaining wall.
- e) Limiting soil removal and addition by:
 - i. Reducing the allowance for retaining walls in the front and flanking side yards.
 - ii. Adding a setback for excavated retaining walls from the front or rear site line and requiring a minimum separation between excavated retaining walls.

Corresponding bylaw amendments

Boulevard Bylaw

1. Repeal the Encroachment Bylaw No. 3050 and associated amendment bylaws as there is contradicting and overlapping information between the Encroachment Bylaw and Boulevard Bylaw. All relevant information from the Encroachment Bylaw would be incorporated into the draft Boulevard bylaw.
2. Apply the Boulevard Design plan review fee to all sites. Currently this fee is only for projects above the \$500,000 construction threshold (this is also reflected in the proposed fees and charges amendment).
3. Add new language to allow for removal or liming of trees that are obstructing sightlines in the boulevard.
4. Address the working group comments regarding parking pads not appearing as an extension of the property or property's driveway and requiring any remaining non-landscaped area of the boulevard to be landscaped if a parking pad is permitted.
5. Require landscaping in front of a fence/retaining wall on a street frontage.

Waterworks Regulation Bylaw

Staff are proposing that the minimum threshold for servicing review be raised from works valued in excess of \$50,000 to works valued in excess of \$150,000. The Waterworks Regulation Bylaw is anticipated to be updated in the fall to implement this change responding to issue raised by the working group regarding the threshold for engineering utility upgrades related to renovation projects.

Soil Removal, Deposit, Blasting and Rock Breaking Bylaw

1. Consolidate the Soil Removal and Deposit Regulation Bylaw and the Blasting Bylaw into a new "Soil Removal, Deposit, Blasting and Rock-breaking Bylaw" with the following updates are proposed:
 - a) Updated rock volume calculations to be based on lot size. The new method will provide more clarity regarding the allowable

volume since the building footprint does not need to be finalized prior to calculating the allowable rock removal volume. New volumes are 400 m³ for lots less than 885 m² and 600 m³ for lots over 885 m². This is based on using the current system of 1.5 x the footprint of the building (or in this case the maximum site coverage).

- b) Rock removal permits to be extended to cover coach houses in addition to primary dwellings, garages, access driveways, and parking areas. Currently a separate application for rock removal is required for a coach house.
- c) Removal of ambiguous language surrounding length of rock removal permits and updated to allow 10 working days for lots less than 885 m² and 15 working days for lots over 885 m². This is based on daily blasting rates from industry.
- d) Placing a limit on the quantity of rock that can be removed via splitting. Also, limiting the length of a splitting permit to 15 days to address rock removal continuing for over a month on sites and creating a disturbance for neighbours.
- e) Clarification regarding survey requirements to streamline submissions and decrease permit review times.

Business Licence Bylaw

1. Clarify licencing requirements and fees for detached secondary suites and secondary suites including defining and referencing detached secondary suites (coach houses).
2. Replace the incorrect reference to fees in the schedules attached to the bylaw with reference to the Fees and Charges Bylaw.
3. Add the requirement that a licence be obtained for a detached secondary suite or secondary suite.
4. Update the Table of Contents.

Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw & Municipal Ticket Information System Implementation Bylaw

Add penalties for failure to licence a detached secondary suite or secondary suite, as well as for failure to identify, authorize or provide a Property Managers contact information for a secondary suite or a detached secondary suite.

Fees and Charges Bylaw

1. Remove the separate application fee for a one-storey versus a two-storey detached secondary suite (coach house), and instead have one application fee for a coach house requiring a development permit that is delegated to the Director of Planning and Development Services for consideration (i.e. a one-storey plus basement or two-storey coach house or any coach house requiring a zoning variance).
2. Increase the fee for a coach house that requires Council consideration, generally consistent with other permits requiring Council consideration.
3. Update the wording to align with the proposed Soil Removal, Deposit, Blasting and Rock-breaking Bylaw. This includes consolidating the soil removal and deposit, blasting, and rock breaking fees into one section. No updates to the fees are proposed. Further, an additional fee for rock removal over the permitted amount is proposed.

B. Medium-Term

The following are proposed to be completed late 2021 or early 2022:

- Updated boulevard guidelines (character, boulevards, landscaping, heritage, etc.).
- Various best practices pamphlets.
- Updated submission requirements to require neighbourhood character consideration.
- Updated Development Variance Permit (DVP) brochure to include consideration for front yard setback proposals to better match existing streetscape patterns and for renovation projects for non-conforming houses.
- Various web page updates and educational materials to encourage discussion with neighbours in the early stages of planning for building permit projects. Further, staff will explore alternative ways of notifying neighbours a project is coming including building permits, as well as consideration for requiring that a context plan be submitted with a building permit application.

C. Not Recommended

The following recommendations from the working group have been considered by staff and are not recommended as described below:

- The working group recommended using form and character development permits for houses greater than 0.3 FAR and houses greater than 10,000 sq. ft. This approach is not permitted under the *Local Government Act* as this type of development permit is limited to higher intensity residential development.

- The working group recommended waiving Community Amenity Contributions (CAC's) on rezonings for small lot subdivisions. With the proposed expansion of subdivision opportunities across the District, this is largely addressed through these proposed amendments. For site specific rezoning applications for subdivision, these would continue to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- The working group recommended reducing the building permit fees for renovation projects. Staff are not recommending fee reduction due to the requirement to cost recover the work related to these types of permits.
- The working group recommended a streamlined board of variance process. Staff reviewed this and are not able to change this process due to legislative requirements. However, updates to the DVP brochure are proposed as described above to allow expanded consideration for the types of renovation and front yard variance projects identified by the working group.
- The working group also recommended consideration for withholding demolition permits until a building permit is issued. Staff are not recommending this as it could contribute to derelict properties and squatting in unoccupied houses; as well this provision was recently changed to not require this except for Community Heritage Register properties.

7.2 Sustainability

The proposed policies and amendments would advance District social, economic and environmental sustainability objectives. Coach houses and smaller homes on smaller lots allow new development to be integrated within existing neighbourhoods, add to the diversity and relative affordability of ownership and rental housing options, and utilize existing infrastructure such as roads, sewer and water. Additionally, the proposed amendments encourage retention of older homes, helping to preserve community identity and character. Further, smaller dwellings and projects designed with lower site modification and placed more sensitively within their context have lower environmental impacts. Finally, proposed amendments include additional requirements for planting on the boulevard and restrictions on impermeable surfaces on private property.

7.3 Public Engagement and Outreach

The NCWG process, as overseen and supported by Council's Community Engagement Committee, included broad community consultation to determine issues of concern and identify potential solutions with respect to neighbourhood character. The NCWG typically met bi-weekly over the course of 26 months, and through its engagement completed 13 outreach events, reaching ~175 participants and collecting ~475 surveys and comment forms with over 5,250 responses to individual questions.

Following Council's December 7, 2020 direction to prepare implementing policies and guidelines, staff met with the members of the now disbanded NCWG to summarize the findings of staff's technical review, present the proposed implementation strategy, and receive comments.

7.4 Other Communication, Consultation, and Research

Planning staff have consulted with District staff from other departments as appropriate. As recommended in this report, a public hearing would be held to consider the proposed OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments, with public notice given in accordance with legislative requirements and District procedures.

8.0 Options

8.1 Recommended Option

That Council give first reading to the proposed bylaw amendments and set the date for a public hearing.

8.2 Considered Options

- a) Give first reading to the proposed bylaw amendments and set an alternative date (to be specified) for a public hearing;
- b) Defer consideration pending the receipt of additional information (to be specified);
- c) Provide alternative direction (to be specified); or
- d) Reject the proposed bylaw amendments.

9.0 Conclusion

Staff have undertaken a detailed review of the NCWG's comprehensive report and recommend Council approval of the bylaw amendments described in this report subject to consideration of public input at the public hearing.

Authors:



Courtney Miller, Senior Urban Design Planner



Erika Syvokas, Community Planner

Concurrence::



Michelle McGuire,
Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design

Appendices:

- A – Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5135, 2021
- B – Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5122, 2021
- C – Boulevard Bylaw No. 4886, 2016 Amendment Bylaw No. 5131, 2021
- D – Soil Removal, Deposit, Blasting and Rock Breaking Bylaw No. 5130, 2021
- E – Business Licence Bylaw No. 4455, 2005 Amendment Bylaw No. 5137, 2021
- F – Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw No. 4368, 2004 Amendment Bylaw No. 5138, 2021
- G – Municipal Ticket Information System Implementation Bylaw No. 4383, 2004 Amendment Bylaw No. 5139, 2021
- H – Fees and Charges Bylaw No. 5025, 2019 Amendment Bylaw No. 5134, 2021