



ACT Project

CEDAR VALLEY APPROVAL PROCESS REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

JANUARY 2005

PREPARED BY

Jon Ellis & Associates

DISTRICT OF MISSION, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Program Partners:



PREFACE

The project documented in this report received a grant under the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) program. ACT is a municipal, housing regulatory reform initiative sponsored by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and jointly managed with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), the Canadian Home Builders' Association (CHBA) and the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA).

ACT, launched in 1990, seeks to stimulate changes to planning and building regulations and residential development approval procedures to improve housing affordability, choice and quality. The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements recognized ACT in 1998 as one of the top global best practices for improving the living environment.

ACT awards grants to municipal governments, builders, developers, non-profit organizations, industry associations, educational institutions, planners and architects across Canada to change housing regulations and streamline approval processes. ACT grants are awarded under three categories: Demonstration, Approval Process and Promotion. Assistance has been given to a wide range of projects across Canada.

All completed ACT projects are documented in short project overviews or solution sheets, and a number of case studies have been produced as well, to share the benefits of regulatory reform with others. These documents are available to help builders, developers, local building and planning officials, and others recognize and seize opportunities to improve housing affordability, choice and quality through regulatory reform in their communities.

For more information on ACT and ACT projects (both completed and in progress), visit the ACT Web site at www.actprogram.com, or contact:

ACT Administration
c/o The Federation of Canadian Municipalities
24 Clarence Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 5P3
Phone: (613) 241-5221 ext. 242
Fax: (613) 241-1515
E-mail: info@actprogram.com

DISCLAIMER

This project was partially funded by the ACT Program. The contents, views and editorial quality of this report are the responsibility of the author(s), and the ACT Program and its partners accept no responsibility for them or any consequences arising from the reader's use of the information, materials or techniques described herein.

DISTRICT OF MISSION

CEDAR VALLEY

APPROVAL PROCESS REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

I. STUDY DESIGN	page 1
A. Study Objectives	1
B. Study Procedure	1
C. Report Format	3
II. EFFICIENCY STRATEGIES	page 4
A. Focus Issues	5
B. Define Jurisdictions	9
C. Increase Accountability	12
III. CEDAR VALLEY ACTIONS	page 15
A. Focus Issues	15
B. Define Jurisdictions	17
C. Increase Accountability	18
IV. SHORT-TERM ACTIONS	page 21
A. Focus Issues	21
B. Define Jurisdictions	21
C. Increase Accountability	21
V. LONG-TERM ACTIONS	page 23
A. Focus Issues	23
B. Define Jurisdictions	24
C. Increase Accountability	25

APPENDICES

A. APPROVAL PROCESS, SUMMARY TEMPLATES

including: Definitions of Important Terms; Templates for Official Community Plans, Zonings, Subdivisions, Development Permits, Development Variance Permits, and Building & Technical Permits

B. EVALUATION PROCESS, SUMMARY TEMPLATES

including: Evaluation Procedures and Evaluation Criteria

C. COMMENTS FROM OUTSIDE AGENCIES

including: Comments found in a sample of recent subdivision applications, and Suggested standard comments for existing outside agencies and internal departments

I. STUDY DESIGN

A. STUDY OBJECTIVES

After about five years of work, a Comprehensive Development Plan for the Cedar Valley area of the District of Mission was enacted by Council as a component of the municipal Official Community Plan in 1998. This Plan is intended to guide the transition of Cedar Valley from a suburban acreage area to an urban area within the municipality. It is envisioned that the Plan will be realized in four phases over a period of 10 to 20+ years. In order to facilitate the development of Cedar Valley, and as part of the federal Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) program of CMHC, municipal staff began a review of the existing development approval process to ensure that it is as streamlined as possible within the context of Council's obligations to the community.

This study is a part of the response to the intentions of the ACT program as well as staff's concerns for process streamlining. It has two principal objectives beyond simply reviewing the existing situation. The first is to outline an efficient approval process for development in Cedar Valley, and to delineate any actions that would be necessary to implement such a process. The second is to describe procedures for maintaining and improving the efficiency of that system over time. It is understood that any changes proving to be successful in Cedar Valley may eventually be applied more widely throughout Mission, and potentially for the purposes of the federal ACT program, to other municipalities within B.C. and other provinces within Canada.

B. STUDY PROCEDURE

This is a relatively focused study; accordingly, the procedures used here were direct and to the point:

- information and opinions were gathered,
- observations and conclusions assembled, and
- specific suggestions and recommendations forwarded.

The second and third steps are documented within this report. As for the first step, information and opinions were obtained largely from the following four sources:

1. Document Review

Documents specific to Cedar Valley provided by the District of Mission included:

- Land Use Procedure Bylaw
- LAN.3 Development Notification Signs
- LAN.31 Rezoning Applications,
Neighbourhood Communication Fact Sheet &
Special Needs Housing Communication Fact Sheet
- LAN.32 Tree Retention Replanting Policy
- LAN.36 Contaminated Sites
- LAN.39 Lot Grading Policy
- LAN.40 Financial Contributions for Community Amenities Policy
- LAN.41 Guide to Land Development
- LAN.47 Official Community Plan Referral
- LAN.50 Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages
- O.C.P. Map 3 - Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan
- Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan document

2. Contact with Outside Agencies

The following government agencies and private companies were each queried about their roles in the general development approval process. Four general questions were submitted to each in writing; one telephone follow-up was made (or attempted) with each. Not all have any specific concerns with Cedar Valley and not all responded in the same level of detail.

- BC Ministry of Transportation
- Fraser Health Authority
- BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection
- Fisheries & Oceans Canada
- BC Agricultural Land Commission
- School District # 75
- RCMP
- BC Hydro
- Terasen Gas Ltd.
- Telus
- Canada Post
- Shaw Cablesystems

In addition to the above inquiries, the comments received from these agencies on twelve actual permit applications submitted from 2000 to 2003 are collated in Appendix C.

3. Contact with Other Municipalities

The following municipalities were chosen and contacted by the consultant, and asked about specifics of their approval processes. Surrey was chosen because it is local; Brampton because it is known to have a client-oriented administration; and the remainder because they are mid-sized B.C. cities similar to Mission. Some were extremely forthcoming.

- Abbotsford, B.C.
- Chilliwack, B.C.
- Cranbrook, B.C.
- Fort St. John, B.C.
- Revelstoke, B.C.
- Surrey, B.C.
- Vernon, B.C.
- Brampton, Ont.

4. Meetings with developers

The consultant met with Mission's Development Process Advisory Committee, with individual developers suggested by Mission staff, and with other residential developers already known by the consultant. Specific observations made by this group are folded into the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report.

C. REPORT FORMAT

The purpose of this study is to identify specific actions that can be undertaken to streamline the development approval process in Cedar Valley. Cedar Valley is an area poised to redevelop from a suburban acreage area to an urban area under the guidance of a brand new Comprehensive Development Plan. However, Cedar Valley is not qualitatively different from any other area in Mission, and except for an immediate focus on rezonings, the approval process there should generally be no different than anywhere else in BC (save for Vancouver and Whistler which, for now, have different charters).

Consequently, this report considers the entire property development approval process from Community Plans to technical permits; examines streamlining improvements to the entire process; and then highlights - in Chapter III - the specific actions that would streamline the approvals which will be occurring in Cedar Valley. Chapters II, IV and V outline improvements suggested for the entire approval process. These chapters constitute the overall improvement context within which the Cedar Valley actions are proposed.

II. EFFICIENCY STRATEGIES

NB. Many of the terms and concepts (*written in italics*) in this report are defined and/or developed in Appendices A & B, attached. The detailed definitions are not included within the body of the report in order to facilitate the discussion of the strategies and actions.

Efficiency strategies are of two basic types:

- those aimed at achieving technical efficiencies, and
- those promoting systemic efficiencies.

In very general terms, they can also be characterized respectively as short term strategies and long term strategies.

Technical efficiencies are those that can be achieved by the application of a different technology or technique to a specific aspect of the development control system. Examples of technical efficiencies include:

- published information brochures (as Mission LAN.41),
- translating this information into appropriate languages, and
- accommodating electronic applications.

These techniques tend to be very specific, easy to implement and of limited consequence (saving some time and/or some money, but little else). They are, however, of immense value in jump-starting an efficiency program and setting positive expectations for continued work.

Systemic efficiencies are those that accrue from changes to the approval system itself. Examples of systemic efficiencies include:

- eliminating referrals to other *regulators*, and
- involving *CRGs* early rather than late in the process.

These techniques tend to address the approval system in a more general way, can be complex to implement, and can have an extended pay-back period. These changes can effect not only the *time and costs* of an approval system, but also its *public and private benefits*. They must therefore be undertaken with considerably more vigilance than would be given to any technical efficiencies.

Strategies to create these efficiencies, discussed in detail below, fall into three categories. Listed in the order of their ability to effect long-term efficiencies, they are:

- A) focusing the issues to be regulated,
- B) defining the regulatory jurisdictions, and
- C) increasing the accountability of regulators.

A. FOCUS THE ISSUES TO BE REGULATED

When a person submits a land use application to a municipality, the first thing confronting him or her is a list of information that must accompany the application. Providing this information can be time consuming, annoying and expensive. And it can be especially aggravating if the reasons for providing that information are not obvious to the applicant.

The type and amount of information required by the regulators is directly related to number and severity of the community issues that the proposal will raise. Requiring the data at the time of application is designed to save the applicant time by avoiding later delays due to insufficient information. Unfortunately this means that, for each individual proposal, a lot of specific information may be required before it is known whether or not that proposal will raise the corresponding issues.

Controlling the issue/information load is designed to facilitate quicker approval (or rejection) of individual applications. It is usually done in one or more of three ways, those being:

- 1) grouping applications by attribute,
- 2) pre-planning, and
- 3) involving *CRGs*.

1. Grouping Applications

The issues that an individual application generates can usually be attributed to specific particulars of the proposal - size, use, location, ownership, etc. Attempts are often made to group applications based on one or more attributes, and then prescribe a restricted list of required information for each group. The District of Mission currently uses a system of grouping by permit type; different permits, controlling different things, requiring different supporting information. As illustrated in Appendix A, this strategy is quite efficient in differentiating the data requirements between rezonings, subdivisions, building permits, etc. It has been suggested that this technique be refined by differentiating simple permits from complex permits of the same type. Such a refinement may indeed reduce processing time if “complexity” can be appropriately defined.

Nonetheless, the ability of these general groupings (refined or not) to predict the issues that will arise on any specific proposal is not very high. To overcome this, a *regulator* has two options:

- keep the list of required data fixed, whether it is working or not, or
- gradually expand the list based on continuing experience.

Most choose the latter and, in time, the list of required information accumulates well beyond the actual issues raised by any single application. It is not uncommon for an increase in data to also be accompanied by a more complex referral stream, involving more agencies, advisory bodies, etc. In this way, most grouping techniques eventually become time-wasters rather than time-savers.

An often used variant of the latter coping strategy - expanding the list - is to encourage an applicant to apply concurrently for multiple approvals (rezoning+subdivision, subdivision+development variance, etc). Given a system based on issue grouping, this would likely save the applicant time. While this course may simply be an admission that multiple approvals will ultimately be required, it may also be an indication that, for this application, the grouping technique has failed.

2. Pre-planning (Comprehensive Development Plans)

Pre-planning through Comprehensive Development Plans (CDPs) can deal with many development issues in advance of applications being made. This is the case in Cedar Valley, which has a relatively new CDP. Most of the draft Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan furthers this function very well. Many of the comments received on specific applications (see Appendix C) are “general advisories” that would also be better incorporated into the approval process at this stage.

The two main values of CDPs are:

- that they identify and resolve the vast majority of development issues, and
- that they do so away from any emotional reaction that may accompany a specific proposal.

The two main shortcomings of CDPs are:

- that they tend to identify only general issues and then resolve them in fairly general terms, and
- that they tend to identify only the issues, and their supporting market conditions, that were apparent at the time.

While pre-planning is considerably better at streamlining the approval process than grouping applications, it is only a snapshot of people’s attitudes, that does not stand up well over time. Without some form of internal renewal, even the most expertly crafted CDP has a functional shelf life of only 5 to 15 years (10 to 30 years with renewal). Moreover, a CDP is of no help as soon as an application generates an issue that the plan did not anticipate - which could be the week after the plan’s adoption (or could be never).

When utilized, internal renewal systems tend to take one of two forms. The more common is to build triggers into the CDP which, when activated by future occurrences, precipitate the review and adjustment of specific aspects of the plan. Triggers usually relate to changes in infrastructure assumptions (a proposed highway is abandoned, a trunk sewer is extended north instead of south), environmental assumptions (an old-growth forest burns to the ground, salmon become extinct), or market assumptions (demand collapses for small commercial premises, apartments are in great demand). The less common system is to incorporate areas of flexibility into the plan and build in *CRGs* to oversee that flexibility. This method can deal with all the areas dealt with by triggers, and can also highlight changes in public attitude (as with environmental protection, drinking driving, smoking, etc.) which may necessitate a reinterpretation of the plan.

Virtually every municipality has historically undertaken some form of pre-planning, and new provincial regulations are making it more of a municipal obligation. Nonetheless, there is a gap in the process that the new requirements will not necessarily close: CDPs (and other such plans) are commonly seen as something related to, but quite apart from the approval process itself. This attitude is incorrect, and it tends to preclude CDPs from achieving their potential as approval tools. To ameliorate this situation, CDPs should include a foreshadowing of the regulations - including alternative regulations - that could flow from the plan's provisions. This would help bridge the gap between goals and rules, ultimately making the approval process more seamless and efficient.

3. Engaging CRGs

The only way around the “collecting of approximations” - the functional basis of both above techniques - is to simply engage *CRGs* throughout the approval process. *CRGs* are those groups of people who actually define the issues and can resolve those issues with a high level of social authority (see Appendix A for a detailed definition). *CRGs* are routinely engaged in the pre-planning process to provide social legitimacy to its conclusions, and they can certainly do the same for individual permits, given proper support.

This is a simple, straight forward strategy that unfortunately is far more difficult to implement than either the issue grouping or pre-planning techniques. *CRGs* must be continuously found, organized, informed and supported in order for this technique to be effective with individual permit applications. The Cedar Valley Ratepayers Association was involved over a number of years in the preparation of the Cedar Valley CDP; re-establishing that working relationship is an obvious starting point for this strategy in Cedar Valley. Bringing them into the approval process, as well as encouraging applicants discuss their proposals with them at an earlier stage than is now the case, will largely implement this strategy in Cedar Valley.

As an independent initiative, developing *CRGs* in a single neighbourhood would be a major municipal commitment to approval streamlining. At the least, it would divert staff from more traditional planning work for extended periods; at the most, it could lead to permanent additions to the municipal staff. However, *CRG* development would be a mere adjunct to a normal CDP public consultation process, and it is in this context that this strategy is most often contemplated. The start-up time for this strategy can be measured in months or years, rather than days or weeks. The payback is a vastly more streamlined approval process than either of the other techniques can achieve.

B. DEFINE THE REGULATORY JURISDICTIONS

When a person submits a land use application to a municipality, that application is often referred to a myriad of other *regulators* - government agencies and service providers - for their approval, comment, or information. This is the single aspect of the current approval process with the greatest potential for delay. To check this, we looked at twelve (of 101) subdivision applications submitted from 2000 through 2003, see Appendix C. The turn-around times of these referrals was astonishingly elastic - spanning from 1 day to 76 days. The elasticity even extended to the apparent transit time between agencies - from 1 day to 39 days. Given the documentation at hand, it was impossible to tell why there was such a variation; no doubt the reasons were many and varied. However, from this small sample, it is apparent that there is no correlation between the length of delay and the usefulness (to the applicant) of the response.

The first thing an outsider notices about this referral procedure, when discussing it with all the actors involved, is the internal latitude for institutional interpretation of the process' purpose, and specific requirements placed on each of the actors. Except for Mission, virtually every agency minimized its own importance to the approval process, especially when compared to other agencies. Most had a firm grasp of their own authority, but had little feel for their responsibility to the process.

To improve the referral process, some operational clarity is required. Any one of the participants could establish the clarity, but the obvious one to do so is the District of Mission. This process can be started by adopting three operational goals for the approval process. These are goals to guide continuing improvements in the referral process and as such, may never be fully achieved. The goals are:

- 1) identify one principal *regulator*,
- 2) maximize pre-planning input by outside agencies, and
- 3) formalize cooperative monitoring with outside agencies.

1. One Principal Regulator

The responsibility for insuring the orderly development of real property falls to the District of Mission. Mission is the principal *regulator* (full stop).

To a large extent, this goal simply states the obvious. It should be supported by the further notion that, in this role, Mission will establish the terms of engagement for all participants in the approval process. The terms will include:

- the types of input are appropriate at different stages of the approval process,
- acceptable turn-around times for that input at different stages of the approval process,
- how changing concerns of outside agencies are incorporated into the approval process, and
- the procedures for addressing non-compliance with the terms of engagement.

These terms of engagement will have to be negotiated individually with each outside agency, striving for as much consistency as possible across all agencies. Once negotiated, adherence to the terms will be expected.

2. Pre-planning Input

The pre-planning phase of the development approval process - OCPs, CDPs, etc. - is the appropriate stage for outside agencies to provide general advice and any approval criteria generally applicable to potential developments within the area being planned.

In this respect, outside agencies will be functioning more as *CRGs* than as *regulators*. Many, if not most, of the comments received from these agencies on actual permit applications (see Appendix C) fit into the categories of general advisories or generally applicable regulations. This information, incorporated into a CDP, can provide good contextual data that a developer can apply to a proposal in advance of an actual permit application. The draft Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan contains a wealth of this type of information from two specific agencies; similar documents from all outside agencies would be extremely beneficial. The District of Mission will facilitate this timely input by outside agencies by ensuring that their representatives are accommodated at all pre-planning consultations, and if desired, by scheduling separate sessions for the agencies, as a group, within the consultation process.

Having this type of information form part of the pre-planning stage will greatly simplify, and shorten, the approval process for individual permit applicants. Much of the information that is now the subject of specific referrals will be known and directly administered by the District of Mission. Many referrals will become unnecessary, those remaining will be focused on the particulars of each proposal.

3. Cooperative Monitoring

Outside agencies will have the responsibility of monitoring development approvals from their point of view, and of advising the District of Mission of any problems resulting from those approvals.

Each outside agency will continue to have its own reasons to be involved in the development of property. It is important for them to maintain an overview of the approval process so that their concerns continue to be addressed. Problems could arise if either their concerns are being interpreted in a manner that they had not anticipated, or their particular concerns change. In such an event, they (with the District of Mission) should develop solutions which will then be applied to subsequent development applications. The District of Mission will facilitate this monitoring by routinely delivering all approvals - and making supporting documentation available - to outside agencies at the same time that approvals are delivered to applicants.

C. INCREASE THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF REGULATORS

When a person submits a development application to a municipality, he is beginning a potentially lengthy discussion with an organization whose well being is in no way dependent on the progress or outcome of that discussion. The municipality is the only player in the approval process who has - and is widely seen to have - no real self-interest in the outcome of that application. The community has an interest, and the applicant most certainly has an interest. This situation is the norm throughout Canada, and has both good and bad points. In terms of streamlining the approval process, this situation deserves some attention.

Municipal corporations have a dual personality that the approval process brings into glaring focus. Municipalities are made up of many groups of people, all of whom the corporation is deemed to represent. For the purposes discussing the development approval process, two groups are paramount: the applicants (developers) and the community (everyone else). These two groups are completely inter-dependent, but often at odds; and the municipal corporation represents them both. Tricky. To be effective, an approval process must impartially engage all points of view. To be efficient - that is, to generate more resolutions than challenges, it must as well be accountable to all those involved. This accountability will not lead to universal endorsement of the decisions wrought through the process, but it can create sufficient respect for the process itself that those decisions will be accepted.

The strategy of increasing accountability can reduce time and costs, but its main potential is in increasing customer satisfaction, or at least in reducing customer aggravation. The approval process is the main continuous point of interaction between a municipality and its citizens, and customer satisfaction is an important criterion for evaluating the approval process. Customer satisfaction can be enhanced by three streams of activity, those being:

- 1) focus responsibility for approvals within the municipal administration,
- 2) provide specific support for approvals staff, and
- 3) provide for continuous public evaluation of the approvals process.

1. Focused Responsibility

Give specific members of the municipal staff the responsibility of designing and operating an approval process that recognizes the needs of the applicants, while supporting the aspirations of the community as a whole.

This strategy acknowledges that communicating with the public is as important to a municipal corporation as providing sophisticated policies and efficacious services. And it recognizes that communicating is a separate job, with different demands, requirements and rewards. Initiatives of this type can range from simply designating certain existing staff members as “customer liaisons”, to establishing a new separate department to handle all permits and public consultations. They all, however, focus on the act of communicating per se, rather than on the motivations or contents of those communications. In this role, staff do not determine whether or not an application is approvable, and why. Instead, they ensure that those questions are answered in a clear and timely manner.

The simplest initiative of this type is to assign a liaison function to the staff who currently vet permit applications for completeness and/or preliminary compliance. A specific person would then become the primary contact, throughout the approval process, between the applicant and the District. In addition to being a communications channel, this person could also be responsible for routing application referrals and tracking compliance with any turn-around targets. For this initiative to succeed, management should monitor two aspects of the workplace:

- the case load of each liaison person would have to be limited to the number that could be satisfactorily serviced (satisfaction is a time-sensitive criterion, so some flexibility would be needed to deal with the ebb and flow of applications), and
- inquiries from the liaison (on behalf of an applicant) would have to be given priority throughout the system to facilitate timely responses.

The most comprehensive initiative would involve establishing a separate structure (department, division, administrative group, etc.) with the sole responsibility of ensuring optimum communications between the municipal corporation and its clients. This would not include communications involving Council, individual councillors, or the media, but could involve everything else (at the corporation’s discretion). The approval process would benefit from this group being responsible for arranging and implementing all associated public communications, from CDP public consultations to inquiries from the applicants of specific permits. This would ensure that the communication process is (and more importantly, is seen to be) separate from the agenda of any participant in the process; it would be neutral and thus impartial.

2. Staff Support

Provide training and incentives for the staff operating the approval system that together help them be more effective, and then reward them when they are effective.

Training should primarily relate to communications, but could also include specific survey courses in specific aspects of municipal administration. Primary areas of training should include public relations, customer relations, mediation & negotiation, conflict resolution. Survey courses would be helpful generally, but more especially if the communications staff were to undertake preliminary vetting of permits vis a vis specific disciplines such as planning or engineering.

Incentives are difficult within the civil service. However, given the nature of the work, establishing flexible working hours for communications staff would be a natural start. If case load levels are established, then the District could try extra holiday time (or an equivalent bonus) for achieving a set number of successful approvals within a specific time.

3. Public Evaluation

Establish a continuous evaluation system that includes the *regulators* but, in fact, relies primarily on the *CRGs* and applicants to grade the approval process.

To be effective, an evaluation system must be open and convenient to all those who are effected by the approval process. A detailed discussion of an evaluation process and evaluation criteria is contained in Appendix B. This system should be formalized so that its findings over time come from a consistent perspective. Most importantly, the system as well as its findings must be public and open to public debate, so that its evaluations come to be seen as trustworthy and fair.

III. CEDAR VALLEY ACTIONS

The following actions are distilled from the general actions outlined in Chapters IV and V of this report. The actions here pertain specifically to Cedar Valley, a suburban acreage area on the verge of redeveloping to more urban uses in accordance with a new Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP). Consequently, the time frame for actions outlined here is focused on the approvals that immediately follow a CDP; that is, rezonings, subdivisions and development permits, along with any necessary CDP amendments.

This focus is also apparent in the problems with the approval system as reported by the system's users. The reported problems centre on site preparation requirements and the uncertainty of the "political" consultation process. Specific problems included:

- significant and unaccountable delays in referrals to outside agencies (most often mentioned: DFO, MWLAP, Telus);
- inconsistencies in development rules such as site grading versus tree retention requirements; and
- public hearings that do not proceed in a timely manner.

The first and third of these problems are dealt with directly by the suggested actions in this chapter. Problems of the second type, mutually exclusive regulations, must be resolved individually but that resolution must begin with CRGs focusing the specific issues raised in each case.

A. STRATEGIES to FOCUS ISSUES

A₁ Immediate Actions

1. Re-establish the working relationship with the Cedar Valley Residents' Association (CVRA) that existed during the preparation of the Comprehensive Development Plan. Enlist the help of this group in defining and resolving issues arising from individual development proposals as they are submitted to the District. This may not be easy; they are volunteers, and they are tired after an exhaustive planning program. Nonetheless, this group will be a critical *CRG* within Cedar Valley and it is important to begin the process of incorporating their expertise into a streamlined approval process. If other groups also played an active role in the development of the Cedar Valley CDP, then contact should also be re-established with them.

The key to *CRGs* becoming part of a streamlined approval process is for them to comment as early as possible. In an ideal situation, an applicant and the *CRGs* together would schematically develop a proposal to the level of completeness necessary for a formal permit application. In many cases, this can be done in less than three hours; major issues are tabled and resolved, and the formal application is well on its way through perfunctory refinements to a speedy approval. For this scenario to be practicable, the *CRGs* must be as available and as credible as the developers with whom they will meet.

2. Cease work on the Memorandum of Understanding with DFO & MWLAP. Instead, clearly differentiate the regulatory sections of the Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan (the guts of the MOU) from the procedural sections. Then adopt those regulatory sections as a Technical Appendix to the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan. This appendix will be administered by the District of Mission, and will be amended by resolution of Council. In making these amendments, Council will undoubtedly rely heavily on any new “improved” regulations proffered from time to time by the relevant federal and provincial ministries.

A₂ Later Actions

1. Assist the Cedar Valley Residents’ Association (CVRA) in developing an organizational structure that will ensure that they are:

- representative of the community, and
- able to provide informed and timely input into development applications as they arise.

Volunteer neighbourhood organizations such as the CVRA need logistical support from the District in order to function well as *CRGs* within an on-going approval process. This support is of three basic types:

- Most need a physical premises in which to meet.
- All need to be given basic development information in a timely manner, and they need technical clarifications when they ask for them.
- All need to know that their input will be treated differently than that of other *participants* in the approval process.

In exchange for this support, the CVRA must satisfy Council that they are indeed representative of their community, since that is their main value to the approval process. In the Business Improvement Area (BIA) model, most Councils are satisfied with the operators being registered societies having constitutions and bylaws that foster appropriate representativeness. Being registered under the Societies Act, requires a level of accountability that bolsters the group's credibility with the public.

2. Extrapolate the provisions of the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan to those sets of regulations that could be consistent with each provision. This document becomes a useful workbook for refining, with CRGs, the real-life implications of the Plan and identifying issues that may not have been noticed during the planning process. Identifying issues in advance of actual permit applications allows them to be resolved in the abstract which, not only improves the Plan but also expedites permit processing. This activity is the planning equivalent of a military war game; hypothesizing problems, and then developing solutions or at least tactics to find solutions.

B. STRATEGIES to DEFINE JURISDICTIONS

B₁ Immediate Actions

1. Cease work on the Memorandum of Understanding with DFO & MWLAP. Instead, clearly differentiate the procedural sections of the Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan (the guts of the MOU) from the regulatory sections. Then adopt those procedural sections as Council policy for a period not to exceed ten years (the term of the MOU). This will accommodate a transition to the single *regulator* model outlined in B₂.1, below.

B₂ Later Actions

1. Develop a permanent procedural protocol with DFO & MWLAP through which the District of Mission administers the Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan as an appendix (A₁.2, above) to the Cedar Valley CDP. Approvals would be monitored by DFO & MWLAP for consistency with their specific mandates.

2. Develop procedural protocols with *secondary regulators* that
 - ensure timely input by those agencies into the planning process,
 - permit the District of Mission to administer any development requirements on behalf of those agencies, and
 - allow each agency to adequately monitor permits for consistency with its specific requirements.

C. STRATEGIES to INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY

C₁ Immediate Actions

1. In order to avoid unnecessary adjournments to Public Hearings, structure the hearings to include a final Public Information Meeting (PIM) with the same agenda in the same venue and held immediately prior to the Public Hearing. This is a purely procedural adaptation, and in no way diminishes the need for earlier PIMs, should the subject warrant them. The purpose of this final PIM is to augment those documents which are the subject of the Public Hearing by:
 - receiving any information from the public not already included in the public hearing documents, and
 - entertaining late questions from the public arising from this new information or the information contained in the public hearing documents.

Ads for the Public Hearing should highlight this split format, and a one-page explanation of the format should be available with the agenda at the venue entrance. This should allow eleventh hour inquiries to be answered, late discussions to be entertained, and the legal purity of the hearing process to be maintained.

2. Make permit applications and explanatory materials available on the internet, in a format that permits them to be downloaded and submitted later as hardcopy.
3. Rather than translating application materials into other languages, retain a translation service to provide translators for specific ESL applicants, for a fee to recover direct costs. Materials not subject to frequent change could be translated into another language where compelling numbers exist, but a translation service will still likely be required by applicants. If the District arranges the translation, then it could be confident that the translation is complete and accurate. If the applicant simply brings his niece, then there could be problems later.

4. Provide for electronic referrals to other *primary regulators* and *secondary regulators*. Start by determining the electronic format(s) that is most widely acceptable, and accept applications in that format.

5. Compile “minimum standard requirements” from other *primary regulators* and all *secondary regulators* based on the most recent comments received (see examples in Appendix C) from each of them on Cedar Valley development applications. Then advise them that these minimum standards will be used to implement new response time targets as follows:

- 5 working days (faxes and e-mails accepted) to advise Mission that the minimum standards will not be sufficient, and if required
- 15 additional working days to provide the site specific requirements.

A non-response (or an unusable response) at either deadline will result in the minimum standards being applied to the application.

6. Provide customer relations training for staff whose jobs bring them into direct contact with the public on a regular basis. Most community colleges teach these skills, many can design specific field classes for as few as four students. The B.C. Justice Institute can provide very useful training for staff who are responsible for undertaking extensive public consultation programs.

C₂ Later Actions

1. With other *primary regulators* and each *secondary regulator*, determine the minimum information required to answer the one question at the 5-day turn-around (C_{1.2}, above). Once determined, include a suitable referral form in all permit application packages. Aim for simplicity and consistency across all agencies, resulting in one simple form. Start by suggesting that the necessary information from the applicant about the proposal would consist of:

- its location,
- the intended use or uses,
- the density of each use, and
- schematic subdivision and/or siting of structure(s).

The District would then add information about:

- the current zoning,
- existing abutting rights-of-way,
- the level of development of abutting roadways, and
- the location of abutting utilities.

(The final piece of information assumes that a data collection system has been implemented with the various utility providers.)

2. Monitor the referral system to ensure that site specific requirements (those required by the 30-day turn-around) are not becoming too repetitive. If they are, then make them the new minimum standard (to be applied at the 5-day turn-around).

3. Assign each permit application to a specific staff person who, from application to approval (or rejection), will be the sole contact with the applicant and will be responsible for expediting the permit through the process. Initially this will probably be a plan checker with a mandate to be pushy. Eventually it could evolve into a new higher level position involving some approval authority. As the position develops, some notion of an appropriate “case load” should be developed in order to insure adequate staffing (and to facilitate performance incentives).

4. Compile service evaluation data as an integral part of the approval process, from applicants, *CRGs*, and other *regulators*; use this information to produce an annual performance report on the approval process.

IV. SHORT-TERM ACTIONS

A. ACTIONS to FOCUS ISSUES

1. Identify potential *CRGs* - existing neighbourhood organizations - and determine their willingness and ability to participate in the development approval process.
2. Where neighbourhood *CRGs* have been identified, confirm with them types of permits in order develop consensus regarding the purpose of each, and to eliminate overlaps and/or gaps between them (see Appendix A).

B. ACTIONS to DEFINE JURISDICTIONS

1. To facilitate approvals by the District of Mission, establish technical appendices to existing CDPs, capable of being amended by Council resolution, that incorporate the known measurable requirements of other *primary regulators* and all *secondary regulators*.

C. ACTIONS to INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY

1. In order to avoid unnecessary adjournments to Public Hearings, structure the hearings to include a Public Information Meeting (PIM) with the same agenda in the same venue and held immediately prior to the Public Hearing. The purpose of the PIM is to augment those documents which are the subject of the Public Hearing by:
 - receiving any information from the public not already included in the public hearing documents, and
 - entertaining questions from the public arising from this new information or the information contained in the public hearing documents.

Ads for the Public Hearing should highlight this split format, and a one-page explanation of the format should be available with the agenda at the venue entrance. This should allow eleventh hour inquiries to be answered, late discussions to be entertained, and the legal purity of the hearing process to be maintained.

2. Make permit applications and explanatory materials available on the internet, in a format that permits them to be either downloaded and submitted as hardcopy, or filled out and submitted on line subject to the payment of the application fee.
3. Establish a fast track approval process, for a higher fee. Other local municipalities (Vancouver, Richmond) have tried this to cover those aspects of the process over which they have complete control, although no guarantees are made. The increased fee can be quite arbitrary; Richmond charges an extra \$1,000, in Vancouver the extra charge is negotiable.
4. Rather than translating application materials into other languages, retain a translation service to provide translators for specific ESL applicants, for a fee to recover direct costs. The same arrangement could be made for public consultations involving significant ESL communities.
5. Provide for electronic referrals to other *primary regulators* and *secondary regulators*. Start by determining the electronic format(s) that is most widely acceptable, and accept applications in that format.
6. Provide customer relations training for staff whose jobs bring them into direct contact with the public on a regular basis. Most community colleges teach these skills, many can design specific field classes for as few as four students. The B.C. Justice Institute can provide very useful training for staff who are responsible for undertaking extensive public consultation programs.
7. Begin gathering customer satisfaction data from permit applicants, and other *participants* in the approval process, including *CRGs* and other *regulators*. See Appendix B for a detailed discussion of evaluation process and evaluation criteria.

V. LONG TERM ACTIONS

A. ACTIONS to FOCUS ISSUES

1. Assist the any existing neighbourhood associations in developing an organizational structure that will ensure that they are:
 - representative of the community, and
 - able to provide informed and timely input into development applications as they arise.

Volunteer neighbourhood organizations need logistical support from the District in order to function well as *CRGs* within an on-going approval process. This support is of three basic types:

- Most need a physical premises in which to meet.
- All need to be given basic development information in a timely manner, and they need technical clarifications when they ask for them.
- All need to know that their input will be treated differently than that of other *participants* in the approval process.

In exchange for this support, neighbourhood groups must satisfy Council that they are indeed representative of their community, since that is their main value to the approval process. In the Business Improvement Area (BIA) model, most Councils are satisfied with the operators being registered societies having constitutions and bylaws that foster appropriate representativeness. Being registered under the Societies Act, requires a level of accountability that bolsters the group's credibility with the public.

2. Extrapolate the provisions of existing Comprehensive Development Plans to those sets of regulations that could be consistent with each provision. This document becomes a useful workbook for refining, with *CRGs*, the real-life implications of the Plan and identifying issues that may not have been noticed during the planning process. Identifying issues in advance of actual permit applications allows them to be resolved in the abstract which, not only improves the Plan but also expedites permit processing. This activity is the planning equivalent of a military war game; hypothesizing problems, developing solutions or tactics to find solutions.

3. Where neighbourhood *CRGs* have been identified, confirm with them specific provisions of existing controls that must be met if new developments are to avoid raising issues that will complicate their approval. Then describe the forms of development that meet those provisions, and could therefore be approved as a matter of course. Ultimately, reward any such “outright” proposals with quick processing, reduced fees, etc. This ultimate goal would require that plan checkers have been given the tools and authority to approve outright proposals without referral beyond themselves.

4. CDPs often presume certain market conditions that will support the plan’s implementation. For example, the Cedar Valley CDP assumed a level of uptake for townhouses that does not appear to be happening, skewing the plan’s phasing. Existing CDPs should be reviewed to determine the impacts of differing market conditions on their implementation. If significant impacts are uncovered in any plan, then it should be adjusted to either minimize or prioritize resulting variations. Moreover, future CDP processes should include the evaluation of how proposed policies would be effected by market changes.

5. The authors of CDPs usually take for granted that policies will be implemented by means of the existing type of regulations. Consequently, there is rarely a detailed discussion with *CRGs* of how those regulations will be used, which can cause a gap in the understanding of what the plan’s results will actually look like. Existing CDPs should be reviewed to determine the impacts of differing sets of regulations on their implementation. If significant variations are apparent, then the plan should be adjusted to either minimize or prioritize those resulting variations. Moreover, future CDP processes should include the evaluation of how proposed policies would be rendered as regulations.

B. ACTIONS to DEFINE JURISDICTIONS

1. Continue to refine referral systems based on a single *regulator* within the District of Mission. Specifically, develop procedural protocols with *regulators* that:

- ensure timely input by those agencies into the planning process,
- permit the District of Mission to administer any development requirements on behalf of those agencies, and
- allow each agency to adequately monitor permits for consistency with its specific requirements.

C. ACTIONS to INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Building on the experience in Cedar Valley, compile “minimum standard requirements” from other *primary regulators* and all *secondary regulators* based on the most recent comments received (see examples in Appendix C) from each of them on Cedar Valley development applications. Then advise them that these minimum standards will be used to implement the following response times:

- 5 working days (faxes and e-mails accepted) to advise Mission that the minimum standards will not be sufficient, and if required
- 25 additional working days to provide the site specific requirements.

A non-response (or an unusable response) at either deadline will result in the minimum standards being applied to the application.

2. Establish guaranteed time-lines for those aspects of permit processing over which the District has complete control. This strategy would be most useful in the case where a system of “outright” approvals exists, and for straight forward, technical permits that are processed entirely in-house. Time-lines must be achievable and should be guaranteed only by the return part or all of the permit fees.

3. Building on the experience in Cedar Valley, create specific positions within the District staff, applicant advocates, who are the sole contact between the applicant and the administration, and who are responsible for ensuring that each application is processed expeditiously.

4. Building on the experience in Cedar Valley, compile service evaluation data as an integral part of the approval process, from applicants, *CRGs*, and other *regulators*; use this information to produce an annual performance report on the approval process. See Appendix B for a detailed discussion of evaluation process and evaluation criteria.

APPENDIX A

APPROVAL PROCESS, SUMMARY TEMPLATES

The existing approval process in the District of Mission has evolved over many years to its present form. The District's authority to control the development of land comes from the Province of B.C.; currently that authority is specifically outlined in the Local Governments Act. The District's control covers a wide range of planning and building activity, from the delineation of broad planning principles to the safe installation of an electrical outlet. This control is manifested in several distinct approval components, from Comprehensive Development Plans to various technical permits.

The Cedar Valley area is covered by a brand new Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP). The next wave of development approval activity will concentrate on rezonings and subdivisions, along with a number of development permits and CDP amendments. Nonetheless, this study looks at the entire range of development approvals because, in due course, they will all apply to Cedar Valley.

- - - - -

This study makes a number of suggestions that would result in the administration of the approval process being more of a community partnership that it is now. The information contained herein is useful to the extent that these suggestions are of interest to Council.

This appendix contains descriptions of each type of plan or permit currently used in the District of Mission. They are intended to be explicit summary templates around which public consensus can be maintained for each step in the approval process. As such, they should be verified (and altered as required) by District staff and approved, as summary templates, by Council. Once in use, they should be publicly reviewed (and altered as required) at least bi-annually.

· Important Definitions	pg 1
1. Official Community Plan Template	pg 4
2. Zoning Templates	pg 6
3. Subdivision Template	pg 10
4. Development Permit Template	pg 12
5. Development Variance Permit Template	pg 14
6. Building & Technical Permit Templates	pg 16

Some aspects of the approval process outlined in this appendix are not referenced in any other documents made available to this study by the District of Mission. Those aspects which have very specific meanings when used in this study are defined here.

IMPORTANT DEFINITIONS

“Community Review Group (CRG)” means any structured group for whom the approved plan or permit must be acceptable in order for that plan or permit to stand unchallenged over its expected life time. A CRG can also be thought of as any structured group who could question a specific approval with sufficient social authority to precipitate its reversal or abandonment. A structured group is any group with a constitution and bylaws that are open to public inspection - usually a registered society, association, etc.

CRG members are the people to whom society has given the authority to make and change public policy. In a democracy, they are ultimately the electors. The electors will critique public actions, whether their opinions are asked for or not, and whether they are “fully informed” or not. As long as we maintain a democratic form of government, they will not go away; they will not be diverted; they will be satisfied or there will be hell to pay.

The electors’ primary method of guiding public actions is to send representatives to Councils and Legislatures every now and again with a “mandate” to govern. But this mandate is too general, and it is conferred too infrequently, to be of any use in a development approval process. Public Hearings are the forums that are intended to inject the will of the electors into the approval process. They usually fail.

In relation to the approval process, a distinction is made between elector as participant (see definition below) and elector as a CRG. The distinction is completely arbitrary, and is made only to show two distinct relationships that electors can have to the approval process. The process merely accommodates participants, but incorporates CRGs.

It is important to note that, as used here, a CRG is always an organized group of people - never an ad hoc group or individual person. Within the context of an approval process, this distinction is important for three reasons:

- ad hocs and individuals almost never have (nor should they have) as much social influence as an organized group;
- when putting forward a unified position, groups of similarly minded people invariably filter out the personal responses of any individual group members, bringing a broader perspective to the discussion; and
- compared to individuals, structured groups are easier to find and engage - and are more reliable long-term partners - in the approval process.

Common examples of useful CRGs are ratepayers' associations, tenants' associations, trade unions, professional associations, political parties, and single-interest societies.

“Longevity” means the reasonable range of time that an approved plan or permit can be expected to remain in place, with minor amendments, before it is deemed to be outmoded and replaced.

“Participant” means any specific person who deems himself/herself to be sufficiently effected by a particular approval to become directly involved in that approval process. Such an individual may or may not be a member of a group that is involved as a CRG.

“Regulator, Primary” means any organization with the ability to control some aspect of land development, by means of its statutory authority granted by one or more levels of government (see organizations 1 through 6, below). The District of Mission is always the primary regulator, with approval authority channeled through five officials who, for the purposes of this study, are not differentiated.

“Regulator, Secondary” means any organization that provides an essential service to property, often through a legislated monopoly, and whose concurrence is sought by the primary regulators, thereby influencing the development approval process (see organizations 7 through 13, below).

The thirteen organizations listed below can influence land development as either primary or secondary regulators, and are referenced throughout this appendix by the following numbers:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. District of Mission | 7. School Board # 75 |
| 2. BC Ministry of Transportation | 8. RCMP |
| 3. Fraser Health Authority | 9. BC Hydro |
| 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection (MWLAP) | 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. |
| 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada (DFO) | 11. Telus |
| 6. BC Agricultural Land Commission | 12. Canada Post |
| | 13. Shaw Cablesystems |

“Submissions” means the information that must accompany a development application made to the District of Mission (see A through N, below, derived from Mission LAN.3, LAN.36 and LAN.41).

The fourteen types of information listed below may be required to accompany a development application and are referenced throughout this appendix by the following letters:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| A. Land Title - (L) | I. Landscape Plan - (P) |
| B. Owners’ Consent - (L) | J. Financial Contributions - (T) |
| C. Subdivision Plan - (T)(P) | K. Fact Sheets; neighbourhood & special housing - (T)(P) |
| D. Site Plan - (L)(T)(P) | L. Tree Retention Plan - (T) |
| E. Developed Schematics - (T)(P) | M. Notification Sign - (T)(P) |
| F. Building Elevations - (P) | N. Site Profile; contaminated sites - (L) |
| G. Architectural Rendering - (P) | |
| H. Signage; non-residential - (P) | |

Also noted above, is whether each requirement exists for Legal (L), Technical (T), or Public Information (P) purposes.

1. OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLANS

includes: Comprehensive Development Plans, and Amendments

■ PURPOSE

Intentions

OCPs explicitly establish a community's collective goals and aspirations for the future, primarily as they relate to the use and development of property. These plans also, by implication if not more directly, indicate the community's wishes for continuing social relationships and the institutions and settlement patterns that support them.

Concerns

OCPs are specifically concerned with:

Roles meaning the general purpose that an area is meant to serve.
(e.g. central business district; market residential; neighbourhood service; cultural/recreational; industry/employment; etc.)

Ranges meaning any acceptable flexibility within identified roles.
(e.g. low to mid density housing; public or private recreation but not both; office and/or clean industrial employment; etc.)

Options meaning any acceptable choices among distinct roles.
(e.g. area 'A' can be either commercial or high density residential, or both; right-of-way 'B' can be either a local roadway or a bikeway; etc.)

Triggers meaning any future events or developments that could precipitate review of all or part of a plan.
(e.g. infrastructure assumptions - if a proposed highway is abandoned, then review 'A', 'B' and 'G'; basic market assumptions - if expected residential uptake out paces anticipated commercial uptake by x%, then review 'A', 'G' and 'J'; etc.)

Longevity

OCPs can be expected to be useful for 10 to 30 years.

■ ACTORS

Primary Regulators

The District of Mission (#1) is the primary regulator of an OCP. Depending on the particulars of the area covered, an OCP can also involve any of listed organizations 2 through 6 as primary regulators.

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

Secondary Regulators

Depending on the particulars of the area being planned, an OCP can involve any of listed organizations 7 through 13 as secondary regulators.

CRGs

Mission Council is the primary CRG of an OCP, in that Council is the acknowledged representative of the citizens of Mission. Other groups of citizens will be virtually as important; they will vary with each OCP, but (in probable order of importance) they will likely include: · relevant neighbourhood associations, · relevant professional and trade associations, and · single interest societies.

Participants

Other participants will vary with each OCP, but will likely include Individual property owners and tenants with concerns outside those expressed by CRGs; “professional citizens”; and members of the media.

■ IMPLEMENTATION**Submissions**

No submissions, as defined here, are required in the preparation of an OCP since the plan is initiated, undertaken, and completed by the District of Mission.

Time

The time required to enact an OCP varies considerably depending on the size, location, and complexity of the area for which the plan is being prepared. A reasonable range of time is 2 to 6 years from inception to enactment.

Costs

The costs required to enact an OCP vary considerably depending on the size, location, and complexity of the area for which the plan is being prepared. A reasonable cost range is \$250,000 to \$750,000 from inception to enactment - such costs falling to the District of Mission. Other participants may incur costs through their involvement in the planning process, but such costs are voluntary, not required.

2. ZONING ¹

includes: zoning text amendment¹; rezoning with OCP amendment²;
rezoning - single family dwelling³; rezoning - all other⁴

■ PURPOSE

Intentions

Zoning provides the legal foundation for specifically regulating the development of land in accordance with the OCP. It does this by establishing verifiable development parameters, such as: · detailed activity descriptions (land uses), and · quantifiable limitations on the physical form of any structures (regulations).

Concerns

Zoning is specifically concerned with:

Land Use meaning permitted activities differentiated so as to facilitate regulations.

Density meaning the intensity of property use expressed in quantifiable ratios of use to land area (with use expressed as building area, number of dwelling units, or number of people).

Siting meaning the locational constraints on structures expressed in quantifiable distances from structure to property edge.

Bulk meaning the size constraints on structures expressed in quantifiable dimensions of building height, width and depth.

Longevity

Zoning on any one property can be expected to be useful for 5 to 30 years.

■ ACTORS

Primary Regulators

The District of Mission (#1) is the primary regulator in a zoning or rezoning. Depending on the particulars of the site, zoning can also involve listed organizations 2, 3, 4 and 6 as primary regulators.

Secondary Regulators

Depending on the particulars of the site, zoning can involve listed organizations 7, 8 and 9 as secondary regulators.

CRGs

Mission Council is the primary CRG of a zoning or rezoning, in that Council is the acknowledged representative of the citizens of Mission. However, any relevant neighbourhood associations will be virtually as important. Depending on the particulars of the proposal, development industry associations may bring important points of view.

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

Participants

Other participants will vary with each zoning or rezoning, but will likely include effected property owners and tenants with concerns outside those expressed by CRGs; and perhaps some “professional citizens”; and members of the media.

■ IMPLEMENTATION ¹**Submissions**

Initial zonings, and text (housekeeping) amendments to existing zoning, are initiated by the District of Mission. Submissions consist only of the actual text of the proposed bylaw, as required for public inspection, and any desired explanatory documents.

Time

A reasonable range of time for zonings of this type is 4 to 6 months from inception to bylaw enactment.

Costs

For District initiated zonings, costs are likely to range from \$5,000 to \$50,000 for staff and/or consultant time.

■ IMPLEMENTATION ²**Submissions**

Rezoning with OCP amendments are initiated by individual application to the District of Mission. Information required to accompany each application includes listed items A, B, D, E, F, G and H.

Time

A reasonable range of time for rezonings of this type is 1 to 4 months from inception to application, and 4 to 6 months from application to bylaw enactment.

Costs

For privately initiated rezonings of this type, costs are likely to range from \$5,000 to \$50,000, including consultant and off-site engineering fees, plus municipal fees as follows:

Community Amenity Fee: as determined by Council

Application Fee: from \$500 to \$3,300

OCP Amendment Fee: \$550

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan

J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

■ IMPLEMENTATION ³

Submissions

Rezoning for single family homes are initiated by individual application to the District of Mission. Information required to accompany each application includes listed items A, B, C, J[?], K[?] and L[?].

Time

A reasonable range of time for rezonings of this type is 1 to 4 months from inception to application, and 4 to 6 months from application to bylaw enactment.

Costs

For privately initiated rezonings of this type, costs are likely to range from \$5,000 to \$50,000, including consultant and off-site engineering fees, plus municipal fees as follows:

Community Amenity Fee: as determined by Council

Application Fee: from \$1,600 to \$2,200

■ IMPLEMENTATION ⁴

Submissions

Rezoning for other than single family homes are initiated by individual application to the District of Mission. Information required to accompany each application includes listed items A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J[?], K[?] and L[?].

Time

A reasonable range of time for rezonings of this type is 1 to 4 months from inception to application, and 4 to 6 months from application to bylaw enactment.

Costs

For privately initiated rezonings of this type, costs are likely to range from \$5,000 to \$50,000, including consultant and off-site engineering fees, plus municipal fees as follows:

Community Amenity Fee: as determined by Council

Application Fee: from \$500 to \$3,300

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape
Plan

J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

3. SUBDIVISION

includes: strata subdivision

■ PURPOSE

Intentions

Subdivision provides the legal mechanism for dividing land into predetermined parcels, facilitating the organized layout of communities and the individual ownership of land.

Concerns

Subdivision is specifically concerned with the:

Number of lots being created;

Location of those lots relative to other lots and nearby rights-of-way;

Size of the lots being created; and

Shape of the lots being created.

Longevity

Subdivision to any one property can be expected to be useful for 25 to 100 years.

■ ACTORS

Primary Regulators

The Approving Officer for the District of Mission (#1) is the primary regulator of a subdivision. Depending on the particulars of the site, subdivision can also involve listed organizations 2, 4 and 6 as primary regulators.

Secondary Regulators

Depending on the particulars of the site, subdivision can involve listed organizations 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13 as secondary regulators.

CRGs

Mission Council is the primary CRG of a subdivision, in that Council is the acknowledged representative of the citizens of Mission. However, any relevant neighbourhood associations will be virtually as important. Depending on the particulars of the proposal, development industry associations and the associations of other allied professions may bring important points of view.

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

Participants

Other participants will vary with each subdivision, but will likely include effected property owners and tenants with concerns outside those expressed by CRGs; and perhaps some “professional citizens”; and members of the media.

■ IMPLEMENTATION

Submissions

Subdivisions are initiated by individual application to the District of Mission. Information required to accompany each application includes listed items A, B, C, K[?] and L[?].

Time

A reasonable range of time for subdivisions is 4 to 6 months from inception to application, and 6 to 8 months from application to plan registration.

Costs

For privately initiated subdivisions, costs are likely to range from \$2,500 to \$10,000 per hectare, including site servicing costs, consultant fees, off-site engineering fees, land surveyor fees, utility company fees, and plan registration fees, plus municipal fees as follows:

Development Cost Charges: as posted by the District

Cash in Lieu of Parkland: as determined by Council

School Site Acquisition Fee: \$215 to \$365 per unit

CFWC Fee: \$865 to \$1,585 per unit

Application (& final approval) Fee: from \$900 to \$1,150+\$40 per lot

Current Taxes: as assessed

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

■ PURPOSE

Intentions

Development permits provide for a more detailed review (per Concerns listed below) of a development proposal than would be undertaken through the other permits. They are used in predetermined Development Permit Areas, for intensive single family areas, and as may be required by Council.

Concerns

Development permits are concerned with the building design and its impacts on:

- the architectural form & character of the immediate neighbourhood;
- the natural environment of the site and surroundings;
- any heritage sites in the immediate vicinity; and
- any potential hazards that the design may create.

Longevity

A development permit on any one property can be expected to be useful for 5 to 25 years.

■ ACTORS

Primary Regulators

The District of Mission (#1) is the primary regulator of a development permit. Depending on the particulars of the site, a development permit can also involve listed organizations 2 and 4 as primary regulators.

Secondary Regulators

Depending on the particulars of the site, a development permit can involve listed organizations 7 and 8 as secondary regulators.

CRGs

Mission Council is the primary CRG of a development permit, in that Council is the acknowledged representative of the citizens of Mission. Depending on the particulars of the proposal, relevant neighbourhood associations, development industry associations, and the associations of other allied professions may bring important points of view.

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan

J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

Participants

Other participants will vary with each development permit, but will likely include neighbouring property owners and tenants with concerns outside those expressed by CRGs.

■ IMPLEMENTATION**Submissions**

Development permits are initiated by individual application to the District of Mission. Information required to accompany each application includes listed items A, B, D E, F, G, H², I.

Time

A reasonable range of time for development permits is 1 to 4 months from inception to application, and 2 to 3 months from application to permit approval.

Costs

For privately initiated development permits, costs are likely to range from \$1,000 to \$10,000 for a variety of consultant fees, plus municipal application fees (including LTO registration) of \$330 to \$1,690.

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape
Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

5. DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS

■ PURPOSE

Intentions

A development variance permit is the mechanism by which Council, at the specific request of an applicant, varies a requirement of a District of Mission bylaw.

Concerns

A development variance permit is concerned with any requirement of a development control bylaw except restrictions on land use and density of land use.

Longevity

A development variance permit on any one property can be expected to be useful for 5 to 25 years.

■ ACTORS

Primary Regulators

The District of Mission (#1) is the primary regulator of a development variance permit. Depending on the particulars of the site, a development permit can also involve listed organizations 2 and 4 as primary regulators.

Secondary Regulators

Depending on the particulars of the site, a development variance permit can involve listed organizations 7 and 8 as secondary regulators.

CRGs

Mission Council is the primary CRG of a development variance permit, in that Council is the acknowledged representative of the citizens of Mission. Depending on the particulars of the proposal, relevant neighbourhood associations, development industry associations, and the associations of other allied professions may bring important points of view.

Participants

Other participants will vary with each development variance permit, but will likely include neighbouring property owners and tenants with concerns outside those expressed by CRGs.

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

■ IMPLEMENTATION

Submissions

Development variance permits are initiated by individual application to the District of Mission. Information required to accompany each application includes listed items A, B and D.

Time

A reasonable range of time for development variance permits is 1 to 2 months from inception to application, and 1½ to 2 months from application to permit approval.

Costs

For privately initiated development variance permits, costs are likely to range from \$1,000 to \$10,000 for a variety of consultant fees, plus municipal application fees (including LTO registration if required) of \$265 to \$1,140.

6. BUILDING PERMITS

includes: demolition permits, excavation permits, foundation permits, electrical permits, plumbing permits, sign permits, and all other technical permits

■ PURPOSE Intentions

Building permits, and other technical permits, are intended to insure public safety, and are especially useful in verifying the safety of those things that an average consumer could not be expected to verify.

Concerns

Building permits, and other technical permits, are concerned with: Building codes administered by local authorities; and Engineering standards established by professional associations.

Longevity

A building or other technical permit on any one property can be expected to be useful for 5 to 25 years.

■ ACTORS Primary Regulators

The District of Mission (#1) is the primary regulator of building and other technical permits.

Secondary Regulators

There are no secondary regulators of building and other technical permits.

CRGs

Relevant technical experts, and their professional associations, are the primary CRGs of building and other technical permits.

Participants

There are no likely participants who will get involved in the issuance of building and other technical permits.

■ IMPLEMENTATION Submissions Time Costs

1. District of Mission 2. BC Ministry of Transportation 3. Fraser Health Authority 4. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection 5. Fisheries & Oceans Canada
6. BC Agricultural Land Commission 7. School District #75 8. RCMP 9. BC Hydro 10. Terasen Gas Ltd. 11. Telus 12. Canada Post 13. Shaw Cablesystems
A. Land Title B. Owners' Consent C. Subdivision Plan D. Site Plan E. Development Schematics F. Building Elevations G. Architectural Rendering H. Signage I. Landscape Plan
J. Financial Contributions K. Fact Sheets L. Tree Retention Plan M. Notification Sign N. Site Profile

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION PROCESS

As a result of this exercise, it is entirely likely that some actions will be undertaken to make the approval process in Cedar Valley more efficient than it is now. In order to determine that such actions are working, it is necessary to establish criteria against which the various efficiencies of an approval process are measured. Since property development is a subject that is fundamentally important to virtually every member of the community, then it is important that the approval process be evaluated by criteria that are acceptable to all concerned

- - - - -

This study makes a number of suggestions that would result in the administration of the approval process being more of a community partnership than it is now. The information contained herein is useful to the extent that these suggestions are of interest to Council.

This appendix contains detailed descriptions of four basic sets of evaluation criteria. They are intended to be explicit summary templates around which public consensus can be maintained for an open evaluation process. As such, they should be verified (with alterations as required) by District staff, approved by Council, and then publicly reviewed (and altered as required) bi-annually.

- | | |
|-------------------------|------|
| 1. Evaluation Procedure | pg 1 |
| 2. Evaluation Criteria | pg 4 |

1. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

With appropriate evaluation criteria in place, it is necessary to instigate evaluation procedures that maintain public confidence in the approval process and the development control system. To do this, these procedures must engage and challenge those who are directly effected by the development regulations. Five procedural aspects should be considered:

A. Evaluators

Evaluation of the approval process should be carried out by those who are most directly effected by the process: the approval CRGs, first; and the approval applicants, second. It is important that the process is not evaluated by the people who run it - the regulators; and it is important that this be widely seen to be the case. Self-evaluation of any government function has become a certain way to destroy public confidence in that service. It should be avoided.

Engaging applicants in the evaluation process is relatively easy; opinions and data can be collected as an integral part of the application process. Indeed, this should be done so that data will be as current as possible. The application process should include the possibility (probability) that additional data will be requested after (maybe long after) the issuance of a permit in order to ensure that all effects on time and costs are known. It may be advantageous to include a form of application fee rebate to encourage the provision of post-issuance data.

Engaging CRGs in the evaluation process will be more of a challenge, but no more of a challenge than engaging them in the approval process. They should be included as evaluators at least to the extent that they have become part of the approval system. Even if CRGs have not yet been incorporated into the approval process, then neighbourhood associations, professional and trade associations and other such groups should be polled from time to time to determine their detailed evaluations of the process.

B. Evaluation Scope

Evaluation of the approval process should be done within the context of the entire land development control system. In order to actually develop his land, an applicant must eventually traverse the entire control system. An efficiency at one step is of no ultimate value to him if it does not carry through the entire approval process. As well, efficiencies that remain internal to the approval process are of no value to the public, since their goals are not found within the system but rather with the system's total effect on the community. For all concerned, the actual value of an approval process is measured by the nature of its output, not by its internal workings.

It is not uncommon for inefficiencies (or outright contradictions) to creep into a development control system simply because it is a multi-stepped process (often with a multiplicity of regulators). Such problems can only be found - and fixed - if the control system is evaluated as a whole.

C. Evaluation Data

Evaluation of the approval process should be based on acceptable performance criteria and good performance data. Criteria must be explicitly adopted and re-examined from time to time to ensure its continued acceptability to the general community. Performance data should be continuously collected - as a matter of routine as much as possible. Much of the data can be collected quite routinely from applicants and regulators as permit applications are processed. The rest can become part of the Planning Department's on-going data gathering chores. Assembling, collating and analyzing the performance data on a timely basis will have to become a specific responsibility within the municipal administration.

D. Evaluation Schedule

Evaluation of the approval process should be a continuous as well as public exercise. There are two principal objectives to be achieved by continuous evaluations. Firstly, problems are found and fixed before they become crises. Or, in other terms, effectiveness and efficiency are maintained at the highest possible level, accruing maximum benefits to all. Secondly, appropriate lines of communication between the District and relevant CRGs are developed and (more importantly) kept continuously open.

The first objective is important to the short-term effectiveness of an evaluation system. Efficiencies quickly realized will certainly be appreciated by all concerned, and crises (no matter how brilliantly solved) do not instill confidence in the general public. The second objective clearly contributes to these short-term effects as well, but it is also crucial to the long-term acceptance of the approval process as an instrument of public policy. Continuous, meaningful contact between the District and groups identified as CRGs is the surest way of engendering public trust of municipal actions. The key here is “meaningful”; a key which a continuous evaluation regime provides.

E. Evaluation Implementation

As noted above, evaluations should be implemented quickly and continuously. This promotes the highest possible level of effectiveness for the approval process, and incorporates a continuous partnership between the District and the public that is seen to be practical and useful.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

As a result of this exercise, it is entirely likely that some actions will be undertaken to make the approval process in Cedar Valley more efficient than it is now. In order to determine that such actions are working, it is necessary to establish criteria against which the various efficiencies of an approval process are measured.

Sustaining our community objectives through the individual enjoyment of private land is one of the basic underpinnings of our society. The processes that guide that public/private dynamic are fundamentally important to virtually every member of the community. Consequently, it is important that they be evaluated by criteria that are acceptable to all.

An EFFECTIVE development approval process will meet two basic goals:

- maximize the public benefits obtainable through land development; and
- maximize the private benefits obtainable through land development.

An EFFICIENT approval process will meet two additional goals:

- minimize the time required to obtain an approval; and
- minimize the cost involved in obtaining an approval.

Comprehensive evaluation criteria measuring an effective and efficient approval process will cover, at least, these four goals.

A. Maximize the PUBLIC BENEFITS obtainable through land development

In this context, “public benefits” means those social objectives accruing to all citizens, over which governments exercise some stewardship, and especially:

- SAFETY (the freedom from harm inflicted by disease or misadventure)
evaluation data:
 - health stats
 - accident stats
- SECURITY (the freedom from harm inflicted by another person or persons)
evaluation data:
 - crime stats
- OPPORTUNITY (the ability to freely pursue goals and aspirations)
evaluation data:
 - education stats
 - employment stats

■ **COMMUNITY** (the ability to freely associate with other persons and groups)

evaluation data:

- neighbourhood organizations
- churches
- fraternal, vocational organizations
- social clubs

■ **INFLUENCE** (the ability to generally affect change in the community)

evaluation data:

- citizen participation in change
- citizen acceptance of change

B. Maximize the PRIVATE BENEFITS obtainable through land development

In this context, “private benefits” means those individual conditions over which governments exercise some influence, and especially:

■ **DOMICILE** (the individual use and enjoyment of real property)

evaluation data:

- land ownership
- land resale rates

■ **STABILITY** (financial security accruing from land ownership)

evaluation data:

- land values (especially when compared to)
- other, non-real estate economic indicators

■ **INHERITANCE** (the ability of assets to flow through multiple generations)

evaluation data:

- land title transfers
- company ownership transfers

C. Minimize the TIME required to obtain a development approval

■ **To the APPLICANT**

evaluation data:

- elapsed time
 - from project conception to first application
 - from first application to final resolution (include appeals)
 - from final approval to completion (occupancy, sale, etc.)
- accountable time

- To the REGULATOR
evaluation data:
 - elapsed time
 - from first knowledge to application (for Permit 'A' , 'B' , etc.)
 - from application to resolution (of Permit 'A' , 'B' , etc.)
 - accountable time
- To any OTHERS
evaluation data:
 - elapsed time
 - accountable time

D. Minimize the COST involved in obtaining a development approval

- To the APPLICANT
evaluation data:
 - direct costs
 - indirect costs (to support the process, to sustain operations, lost opportunities)
- To the REGULATOR
evaluation data:
 - direct costs
 - indirect costs (to support the process, to sustain operations)
- To any OTHERS
evaluation data:
 - direct costs
 - indirect costs
 - indirect costs

APPENDIX C

STANDARD COMMENTS FROM OUTSIDE AGENCIES

The current approval process involves collecting comments on development applications from a variety of outside agencies. This appendix contains the comments of those agencies from 12 of the 101 Subdivision Applications made from 2000 through 2003, and attempts to collate them into standard responses.

- - - - -

This study makes a number of suggestions that would result in the administration of the approval process being more focused on a single regulator that it is now. The information contained herein is useful to the extent that these suggestions are of interest to Council.

This appendix contains the most common comments of outside agencies involved in the approval process, based on the very small sample noted above. A more thorough compilation - including applications for other types of permits - would constitute an explicit stance around which municipal staff could organize the involvement of outside agencies in the approval process. These comments would be considered as the “standard” unless the agency indicated otherwise for a specific application. They should initially be verified (with alterations as required) by District staff, and approved by the involved agencies. Once in use, they should be reviewed (and altered as required) at least bi-annually.

■ The Sample of 12 Applications	pg 1
■ Standard Comments	pg 7
1. BC Ministry of Transportation	pg 7
2. Fraser Health Authority	pg 7
3. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection	pg 8
4. Fisheries & Oceans Canada	pg 8
5. BC Agricultural Land Commission	pg 9
6. School District #75	pg 10
7. RCMP	pg 10
8. BC Hydro	pg 10
9. Terasen Gas Ltd.	pg 11
10. Telus	pg 11
11. Canada Post	pg 11
12. Shaw Cablesystems	pg 11

The Sample of 12 Applications

■ 12900 Blk. Bell Street

Application #00-016 for subdivision, dated 25 Oct 2000
Referred 21 Nov 2000 [27 days]

Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection Comments: [turn-around: 27+17=44 days]

* Approval, per Section 82 of Land Title Act.

However, the Approving Officer should consider:

* "Possible bank instabilities as they relate to foundation conditions for new buildings which may be located in close proximity to the top of any stream or pond bank."

Further, the Approving Officer should advise:

* "If the applicant intends to beneficially use water from any natural watercourse, it will be necessary to apply for a Water Licence under the Water Act of BC."

* "If any work in or around <this> or any other watercourse is proposed, it may be necessary to obtain prior approval under Section 9 of the Water Act"

* "The applicant must ensure that no silt or any other material is transported into any natural watercourse or onto any ravine banks during clearing, grubbing and construction operations or at any other time."

Internal(?) Tree Farm Comments: [turn-around: 27+1=28 days]

* "No access, statutory RoW is required."

* "Land Clearing, Burning Permit is required."

■ 31700 Blk. Kenney Avenue

Application #02-003 for subdivision, dated 11 Jan 2002
Referred 11 Feb 2002 [31 days]

Fraser Valley Gas Comments: [turn-around: 31+8=39 days]

* "No easement is required."

* "No statutory RoW is required."

* "No relocation of a service connection is required."

* "No conflicts are apparent."

■ 11500 Blk. Yeo Street

Application #02-004 for subdivision, dated 15 Jan 2002
Referred 14 Mar 2002 [59 days]

Fraser Health Authority Comments: [turn-around: 59+21=80 days]

* Sewage disposal is controlled by MWLAP regulations.

* "With regards to the construction of the community drinking water system, the applicant is required to obtain a construction permit pursuant to Section 2(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Regulations"

■ 31800 Blk. Bench Avenue

Application #02-007 for rezoning/subdivision, dated 25 Feb 2002
Referred 13 Mar 2002 [17 days]

Internal Engineering Dept. Comments: [turn-around: 9 days]

per form:

“Any comments you feel may be applicable to this subdivision application

1. Domestic Water Requirements:
2. Sanitary Sewer Requirements:
3. Storm Sewer Requirements:
4. Road Work Requirements:
5. Other Comments:
6. Fees:”

■ 31900 Blk. Bench Avenue

Application #03-001 for subdivision, dated 06 Jan 2003
Referred 17 Feb 2003 [42 days]

BC Hydro Comments: [turn-around: 45 days; 39 out, 6 back]

* “This new lot can be served with U/G primary to new lot.”

Fraser Health Authority Comments #1: [turn-around:18 days]

* PRELIMINARY APPROVAL, subject to the proposal meeting “the requirements of the Sewage Disposal Regulation and the Subdivision Policy of the Fraser Valley Health Region.”

Fraser Health Authority Comments #2: [turn-around: 42+30=72 days]

* FINAL APPROVAL, subject to:

1. “Two copies of either a Reference Plan prepared by a BC Land Surveyor or an Explanatory Plan prepared by a P. Eng. for the locations of the main and the reserve disposal field for each lot must be submitted to this office for review and record.”
2. “The septic field perimeter must include the locations of the main and reserve disposal field areas, setbacks, buffer, sloping site receiving area, corner spot elevations, observation holes and percolation holes.”

■ 8600 Blk. Cedar Street

Application #03-006 for subdivision, dated 11 Jan 2003
Referred 28 Apr 2003 [76 days]

School District #75 Comments: [turn-around: 76+5=81 days]

per form:

“Availability of school facilities to serve the proposed subdivision

Elementary - nearby

Secondary - bus

Any school sites under negotiation, or to be negotiated before this plan approval

None

Any additional access, walkways etc. required for school children

N/A

Any other general comments

Sidewalk should be developed from Cherry to Eggleston on east side of Cedar.”

Internal Finance Dept. Comments: [turn-around: 76+3=79 days]

per form:

“Amount of taxes and utilities owing and required to be paid

January 1st to April 30th Deputy Treasurer’s estimate of taxes

Other charges outstanding against the land

Business licences required or owing

Any further comments

Assessed Value, 2002, 2003

Mill Rate

before April 30/03

Total”

Internal Engineering Dept. Comments: [turn-around: ?+?=83 days]

per form:

“Any comments you feel may be applicable to this subdivision application

1. Domestic Water Requirements:

2. Sanitary Sewer Requirements:

3. Storm Sewer Requirements:

4. Road Work Requirements:

5. Other Comments:

6. Fees:”

■ 8100 Blk. Coleman Street

Application #03-007 for subdivision, dated 25 Feb 2003
Referred 25 Mar 2003 [29 days]

Telus Comments: [turn-around: 29+42(34 out, 8 back)=71 days]

- * “No easement is required.”
- * “No statutory RoW is required.”
- * “No pole relocations are required.”
- * “No private primary with switch is required.”
- * “Telus aerial service is available on Coleman Street.”

Internal Engineering Dept. Comments: [turn-around: ?+?=35 days]
per form:

“Any comments you feel may be applicable to this subdivision application

1. Domestic Water Requirements:
2. Sanitary Sewer Requirements:
3. Storm Sewer Requirements:
4. Road Work Requirements:
5. Other Comments:
6. Fees:”

■ 30400 Blk. Berg Avenue

Application #S03-010 for subdivision, dated 05 Mar 2003
Referred 29 Apr 2003 [55 days]

Terasen Gas Ltd. Comments: [turn-around: 55+10=65 days]

- * “Please be advised that BC Gas’ facilities will not be adversely impacted by this proposal. BC Gas, therefore, has no objection to the proposal at the above-noted location.”

(30400 Blk. Berg Avenue continued next page)

30400 Blk. Berg Avenue (continued)

Fisheries & Oceans Canada Comments: [turn-around: ??=82 days]

* “It is preferred that the riparian (streamside) area(s) described above be protected by dedication as Municipal Park. However, if this is not possible, the area(s) are to be protected by restrictive covenant and registered against the title of the property(ies).”

* “A permanent fence should be constructed at the covenant boundary between the development area and the covenant area prior to the start of site development.”

* “The style and materials of the fence are negotiable, provided they are sound and permanent with a minimum height of 4ft (four feet). It may be possible to use or incorporate live cedars or other significant vegetation in order to create a “living fence”. The fence is to be posted with small metal signs indicating the area is fish habitat and is protected under the Federal Fisheries Act.”

* “Livestock and/or pets are not to graze or be penned within the area protected by covenant or park.”

* “The covenant or park boundary should be surveyed by a registered BC Land Surveyor, no greater than one (1) week prior to the construction of the fence.”

* “There must be a covenant protection zone established for a distance of three (3.0) meters from the covenant boundary in order to protect the root systems of trees within the covenant area. This means that no excavation, fill, heavy equipment operation or other activities can take place that will impact on the health of the root systems of these trees.”

* “Please note that any proposal to work in or adjacent to any watercourse must be approved by DFO. In this regard, a complete DFO application form including plans of the proposed work must be forwarded to the DFO Mission Office.”

* “All work is to be undertaken and completed in such a manner as to prevent the release of sediment-laden water into any ditch, watercourse, ravine, floodplain or storm-sewer system either directly, or indirectly. In this regard, a sediment, erosion, and runoff control plan by a qualified trained professional must be developed and implemented prior to site preparation and construction. These facilities must be maintained until occupancy permit stage. Moreover, it is the responsibility of the proponent(s) and/or their agent(s) to ensure that these facilities are maintained and working adequately to control all discharges from the site.”

* “Construction and excavation wastes, overburden, soil or other substances deleterious to aquatic life must be disposed of or placed in such a manner so as to prevent their entry into any watercourse, ravine, floodplain or storm sewer system either directly or indirectly.”

* “Any fill used for this project must be inert material, free of contaminants and must be placed so that it will not gain entry into any watercourse, ravine, floodplain or storm sewer system either directly or indirectly.”

■ 34300 Blk. Ferndale Avenue

Application #S03-021 for subdivision, dated 07 Jul 2003
Referred 23 Jul 2003 [16 days]

Telus Comments: [turn-around: 16+5=21 days]

- * "No easement is required."
- * "No statutory RoW is required."
- * "No pole relocations are required."
- * "No private primary with switch is required."

■ 32700 Blk. Best Avenue

Application #S03-024 for subdivision, dated 30 Jul 2003
Referred 22 Sep 2003 [54 days]

Internal Fire Dept. Comments (on D03-036): [turn-around: 5 days]

per form:

"Any comments you feel may be applicable to this subdivision application

1. Address off Kudo <Drive> only.
2. All addresses to be visible from Kudo <Drive> access.
3. Hydrant Location on Kudo <Drive> not shown on sketch."

■ 8100 Blk. Kunimoto Court

Application #S03-027 for subdivision, dated 15 Sep 2003
Referred 08 Oct 2003 [23 days]

Telus Comments: [turn-around: 23+58(15 out, 43 back)=81 days]

- * "Underground service available on Kunimoto Court. Developer to contact Telus Engineering for servicing & permit requirements."

■ 30200 Blk. Berg Avenue

Application #S03-033 for subdivision, dated 27 Oct 2003
Referred 20 Nov 2003 [24 days]

School District #75 Comments: [turn-around: 24+7=31 days]

per form:

"Availability of school facilities to serve the proposed subdivision

Stave Falls Elementary School serves the proposed subdivision.

Any school sites under negotiation, or to be negotiated before this plan approval

None.

Any additional access, walkways etc. required for school children

None.

Any other general comments

None at this time."

Standard Comments from:**1. BC Ministry of Transportation**

No comments available from the sample of 12 applications.

Suggestions

None, based on the sample of 12 applications.

2. Fraser Health Authority

Extracted comments from 2 of the sample of 12 applications:

* Sewage disposal is controlled by MWLAP regulations.

* “With regards to the construction of the community drinking water system, the applicant is required to obtain a construction permit pursuant to Section 2(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Regulations”

* PRELIMINARY APPROVAL, subject to the proposal meeting “the requirements of the Sewage Disposal Regulation and the Subdivision Policy of the Fraser Valley Health Region.”

* FINAL APPROVAL, subject to:

1. “Two copies of either a Reference Plan prepared by a BC Land Surveyor or an Explanatory Plan prepared by a P. Eng. for the locations of the main and the reserve disposal field for each lot must be submitted to this office for review and record.”

2. “The septic field perimeter must include the locations of the main and reserve disposal field areas, setbacks, buffer, sloping site receiving area, corner spot elevations, observation holes and percolation holes.”

Suggestions

* All general advisories, such as those above, should be assembled into a general brochure and made available to prospective applicants for their use in preparing their initial application.

* Any regulations should be made known to the District of Mission and applied in-house on behalf of the agency establishing the regulations.

* All approved applications should be forwarded to concerned agencies for their record purposes, and for their review which may lead to future adjustments in advisories and regulations.

3. BC Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection

Extracted comments from 1 of the sample of 12 applications:

* Approval, per Section 82 of Land Title Act.

However, the Approving Officer should consider:

* “Possible bank instabilities as they relate to foundation conditions for new buildings which may be located in close proximity to the top of any stream or pond bank.”

Further, the Approving Officer should advise:

* All general advisories, such as those above, should be assembled into a general brochure and made available to prospective applicants for their use in preparing their initial application.

* “If the applicant intends to beneficially use water from any natural watercourse, it will be necessary to apply for a Water Licence under the Water Act of BC.”

* “If any work in or around <this> or any other watercourse is proposed, it may be necessary to obtain prior approval under Section 9 of the Water Act”

* “The applicant must ensure that no silt or any other material is transported into any natural watercourse or onto any ravine banks during clearing, grubbing and construction operations or at any other time.”

Suggestions

* All general advisories, such as those above, should be assembled into a general brochure and made available to prospective applicants for their use in preparing their initial application.

* Any regulations should be made known to the District of Mission and applied in-house on behalf of the agency establishing the regulations.

* All approved applications should be forwarded to concerned agencies for their record purposes, and for their review which may lead to future adjustments in advisories and regulations.

4. Fisheries & Oceans Canada

Extracted comments from 1 of the sample of 12 applications:

* “It is preferred that the riparian (streamside) area(s) described above be protected by dedication as Municipal Park. However, if this is not possible, the area(s) are to be protected by restrictive covenant and registered against the title of the property(ies).”

* “A permanent fence should be constructed at the covenant boundary between the development area and the covenant area prior to the start of site development.”

* “The style and materials of the fence are negotiable, provided they are sound and permanent with a minimum height of 4ft (four feet). It may be possible to use or incorporate live cedars or other significant vegetation in order to create a “living fence”. The fence is to be posted with small metal signs indicating the area is fish habitat and is protected under the Federal Fisheries Act.”

* “Livestock and/or pets are not to graze or be penned within the area protected by covenant or park.”

* “The covenant or park boundary should be surveyed by a registered BC Land Surveyor, no greater than one (1) week prior to the construction of the fence.”

* “There must be a covenant protection zone established for a distance of three (3.0) meters from the covenant boundary in order to protect the root systems of trees within the covenant area. This means that no excavation, fill, heavy equipment operation or other activities can take place that will impact on the health of the root systems of these trees.”

* “Please note that any proposal to work in or adjacent to any watercourse must be approved by DFO. In this regard, a complete DFO application form including plans of the proposed work must be forwarded to the DFO Mission Office.”

* “All work is to be undertaken and completed in such a manner as to prevent the release of sediment-laden water into any ditch, watercourse, ravine, floodplain or storm-sewer system either directly, or indirectly. In this regard, a sediment, erosion, and runoff control plan by a qualified trained professional must be developed and implemented prior to site preparation and construction. These facilities must be maintained until occupancy permit stage. Moreover, it is the responsibility of the proponent(s) and/or their agent(s) to ensure that these facilities are maintained and working adequately to control all discharges from the site.”

* “Construction and excavation wastes, overburden, soil or other substances deleterious to aquatic life must be disposed of or placed in such a manner so as to prevent their entry into any watercourse, ravine, floodplain or storm sewer system either directly or indirectly.”

* “Any fill used for this project must be inert material, free of contaminants and must be placed so that it will not gain entry into any watercourse, ravine, floodplain or storm sewer system either directly or indirectly.”

Suggestions

* All general advisories, such as those above, should be assembled into a general brochure and made available to prospective applicants for their use in preparing their initial application.

* Any regulations should be made known to the District of Mission and applied in-house on behalf of the agency establishing the regulations.

* All approved applications should be forwarded to concerned agencies for their record purposes, and for their review which may lead to future adjustments in advisories and regulations.

5. BC Agricultural Land Commission

No comments available from the sample of 12 applications.

Suggestions

None, based on the sample of 12 applications.

6. School District #75

Extracted comments from 2 of the sample of 12 applications.
per form:

“Availability of school facilities to serve the proposed subdivision

Elementary - nearby

Secondary - bus

Stave Falls Elementary School serves the proposed subdivision.

Any school sites under negotiation, or to be negotiated before this plan approval

None

Any additional access, walkways etc. required for school children

N/A

None

Any other general comments

Sidewalk should be developed from Cherry to Eggleston on east side of Cedar.”

None at this time.

Suggestions

per form:

“Availability of school facilities to serve the proposed subdivision

Elementary school facilities exist sufficient to serve this proposal.

Secondary school facilities exist sufficient to serve this proposal.

Any school sites under negotiation, or to be negotiated before this plan approval

None identified at this time.

Any additional access, walkways etc. required for school children

None required.

Any other general comments

None.

7. RCMP

No comments available from the sample of 12 applications.

Suggestions

None, based on the sample of 12 applications.

8. BC Hydro

Extracted comments from 1 of the sample of 12 applications.

* “This new lot can be served with U/G primary to new lot.”

Suggestions

* No easement is required.

* No statutory RoW is required.

* No relocation of a service connection is required.

* This proposal can be serviced by U/G primary from abutting rights-of-way.

9. Terasen Gas Ltd.

Extracted comments from 2 of the sample of 12 applications.

- * “No easement is required.”
- * “No statutory RoW is required.”
- * “No relocation of a service connection is required.”
- * “No conflicts are apparent.”
- * “Please be advised that BC Gas’ facilities will not be adversely impacted by this proposal. BC Gas, therefore, has no objection to the proposal at the above-noted location.”

Suggestions

- * No easement is required.”
- * No statutory RoW is required.”
- * No relocation of a service connection is required.”
- * This proposal can be serviced from existing mains in abutting rights-of-way.

10. Telus

Extracted comments from 3 of the sample of 12 applications.

- * “No easement is required.”
- * “No statutory RoW is required.”
- * “No pole relocations are required.”
- * “No private primary with switch is required.”
- * “Telus aerial service is available on Coleman Street.”
- * “Underground service available on Kunimoto Court. Developer to contact Telus Engineering for servicing & permit requirements.”

Suggestion

- * No easement is required.
- * No statutory RoW is required.
- * No pole relocations are required.
- * No private primary with switch is required.
- * Telus service is available on abutting rights-of-way.

11. Canada Post

No comments available from the sample of 12 applications.

Suggestions

None, based on the sample of 12 applications.

12. Shaw Cablesystems

No comments available from the sample of 12 applications.

Suggestions

None, based on the sample of 12 applications.



Affordability and Choice Today Project

CEDAR VALLEY APPROVAL PROCESS REVIEW: IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

March 2, 2006

DISTRICT OF MISSION, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Program Partners:



PREFACE

The project documented in this report received an Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) grant. ACT is a housing regulatory reform initiative delivered in partnership by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (ACT administrator), Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (ACT funder), the Canadian Home Builders' Association, and the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association.

ACT, launched in 1990, encourages housing affordability and choice through regulatory reform. The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements recognized ACT in 1998 as one of the top global best practices for improving the living environment.

Over the years, ACT has created an impressive body of knowledge others can use to facilitate regulatory change in their communities. Projects range from innovative housing forms, secondary suites and streamlined approval procedures to NIMBY, alternative development and renovation standards, and more. ACT projects contribute in many ways to sustainable development. They have also served to enhance working relationships between local governments, the building industry and non-profit organizations.

In summary, ACT promotes regulatory reform through

- its database of solutions, which others may borrow from and adapt freely to meet their needs (see Web site address below).
- grants to local governments, builders, developers, architects, non-profit organizations and others across Canada to help facilitate the development of innovative solutions;
- other means of promoting regulatory solutions, such as workshops that highlight ACT solutions and address specific regulatory barriers.

For more information, visit ACT's website at www.actprogram.com, or contact:

ACT Administration
c/o The Federation of Canadian Municipalities
24 Clarence Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 5P3
Phone: (613) 241-5221 ext. 242
Fax: (613) 244-1515
E-mail: info@actprogram.com

DISCLAIMER

This project was partially funded by ACT. The contents, views and editorial quality of this report are the responsibility of the author(s), and ACT and its partners accept no responsibility for them or any consequences arising from the reader's use of the information, materials or techniques described herein.

District of Mission Memo

Affordability and Choice Today (ACT)

Subject: Final Phases of Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) Project - Cedar Valley Approval Process Review

Introduction

The “Cedar Valley Approval Process Review” report prepared by Jon Ellis and Associates and an implementation summary report was considered by Council at the Regular Council meeting on February 6, 2006. At this public meeting the District of Mission Council resolved as follows:-

“That Council endorse the “Cedar Valley Approval Process Review” final report carried out under the Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) program and implementation summary as contained in a report from the Deputy Director of Planning dated January 26, 2006.”

Background

The District of Mission secured a grant through Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) for a review of the approvals process for land use applications in Cedar Valley. Cedar Valley was selected as a suitable area as it had undergone a comprehensive land use planning process, resulting in the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan (CVCDP). Ideally any process improvements could be considered, if appropriate, for incorporation in other areas in the municipality.

The objective of the review process was to identify and implement processes that could potentially reduce the amount of time, uncertainty and cost for developers to receive local government approvals. This would be achieved by engaging a consultant, utilizing the grant monies, to undertake the review. Jon Ellis and Associates was engaged to carry out the review. Jon Ellis worked with staff, external agencies, community representatives and the Development Process Advisory Committee in preparation of the report. Copies of the report have been on previous Council agendas and a copy has been placed in Council’s reading basket.

Jon Ellis presented the report and the various recommendations to Council at the Regular Council meeting on October 25, 2004. After the presentation there was an opportunity for Council members to make comment or ask questions of Mr. Ellis.

Implementation

The Cedar Valley Approval Process Review Report made a number of recommendations. A summary of these recommendations and their implementation is listed below as follows:

RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION
1. Make land use applications and explanatory information available on-line in a format which is downloadable.	All relevant information to land use applications are available on-line on the District of Mission website (www.mission.ca).
2. Implement electronic referrals to regulators in the land use approval process.	Electronic referrals have been implemented to various accepting external agencies.

3. Specify response times for external agencies to reply and advise that if comments are not received by these times it will be assumed agency has no objection to proposal.	This approach has been implemented with subdivision referrals.
4. Pre-Planning – involving external agencies at plan preparation stage to reduce assessment on application based referrals.	External agencies were heavily involved in Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan preparation. Similarly there is technical representation through the OCP review process.
5. Create staff liaison – a position that functions as the primary contact for the approval process between the applicant and the District.	This position was recently implemented with the creation of a Planning Assistant within the Planning Department.
6. Monitor referral system.	With the creation of the Planning Assistant position in Planning Department, referral systems are more closely monitored.
7. Provide appropriate training for staff.	On-going training is provided for District staff
8. Provide incentives for staff.	Incentives beyond award agreements are difficult to implement.
9. Assign each land use application to a specific staff person for the life of the application.	Recent reassignment of tasks, within the Planning Department have enabled the same staff member to deal with the complete application from start to finish. i.e. Previously rezonings and subdivisions were processed by different staff. The application processing has now been combined and the one Planner will handle rezoning/subdivisions applications concurrently.
10. Develop procedural protocol with Department of Fisheries and Ocean and Ministry of Environment to implement Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan.	Procedural protocol implemented to remove requirement for individual referral with Department of Fisheries and Oceans through Memorandum of Understanding. Ministry of Environment did not wish to be a party to the Memorandum of Understanding for Cedar Valley as it was considered beyond their mandate. Referrals are no longer made to Ministry of Environment for majority of land use applications.
11. Consider holding Public Information Meetings immediately prior to Public Hearings to avoid unnecessary adjournments to Public Hearings.	District of Mission staff currently recommend that Public Information meetings be held as a first step in the community consultation process where applications are significant or may be considered controversial in the neighbourhood context. These meetings have been useful to provide information to area residents and clarify points of issue outside of the more formal Public Hearing format.
12. Retain a translation service.	At this time a translation service is not available. Opportunities may arise in the future by actively pursuing employees from varied ethnic backgrounds.

13. Compile minimum standard requirements from external agencies to be applied to certain developments.	This is a potential item for discussion at the Fraser Valley Utilities Liaison Committee.
14. Engaging “Community Review Groups (CRG)” in application process. CRGs are structured groups for whom the approval must be acceptable for the approval to stand unchallenged. These various CRGs represent all aspects of the approval process, i.e. Council, external agencies and resident groups are all considered CRGs.	CRGs are engaged throughout the land use approval process. In particular DFO have been heavily engaged through the implementation of the Cedar Valley Memorandum of Understanding. Local resident CRG, The Cedar Valley Ratepayers’ Association, have not been active in recent years. Council and other external agencies are engaged at various stages in the approval process.
15. Compile service evaluation data.	Staff compile service evaluation data through a survey comment sheet which is sent to all applicants after completion of any land use application. Areas of concern are addressed by separate process review. The comments are sought on an anonymous basis so feedback is honest and forthright.
16. Do not implement the Cedar Valley Memorandum of Understanding. Instead, adopt as technical appendix to Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan.	The Cedar Valley Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the District of Mission and Department of Fisheries and Oceans in June 2005 as a preferred option and a necessary component of Council’s Streamside Protection approach in Cedar Valley.
17. Establish a fast track approval process for a higher fee.	The Planning Department does not have the resources or capacity to create this type of process without significant impact on processing times for other applications and project related work.

Council Endorsement

District of Mission Council received and endorsed the final “Cedar Valley Approval Process Review” report prepared by Jon Ellis and Associates at its Regular Council Meeting on February 6, 2006, where they resolved to endorse the report.

Furthermore Council also endorsed the implementation strategy and summary as contained in an associated report.

Final Approval

Application approval types that were identified, studied and changed included rezonings, subdivisions and development variance permits. Associated processes related thereto that were also subject to review are listed in the implementation summary above. These included but were not limited to referral process, information availability, staff structure and industry feedback.

Whilst not quantified through this process time and cost savings are evident as in a recent National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP) Development Cost Survey (2005), the District of Mission was awarded an ‘A’ rating for reducing approval times by 25% from the last survey (2003). It is noted that land use application numbers have been steadily increasing in Mission over the past 5 years resulting in a threefold increase over this period. Moreover, land use application numbers for the year 2006 to date, whilst relatively early in the year, are almost double the level for the same time last year.

Without the recent changes implemented in the District's land use application procedures, many as a result of the Cedar Valley Approval Process Review, it would be fair to say that application turnaround times and associated development costs would be elevated to a level above what they are today.

Concluding Comments

Overall the Cedar Valley Approval Process Review was a worthwhile exercise to identify and implement processes that could potentially reduce the amount of time and cost in the land use approvals process in Cedar Valley. Recommendations have been implemented where practical and possible. Further to this, many of the process amendments will apply to the general land use assessment process, not just for applications in Cedar Valley. Subsequently time savings are achievable for land use applications in all areas of Mission.

Brett Dwyer
Deputy Director of Planning
March 2, 2006.