

THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
CORPORATE REPORT



DATE: May 29, 2017
TO: Land Use and Planning Committee
FROM: Carl Johannsen, Director of Planning and Development Services
SUBJECT: Imagine White Rock 2045: Official Community Plan Bylaw Introduction

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee:

1. Receive for information the corporate report dated May 29, 2017 from the Director of Planning and Development Services, titled “Imagine White Rock 2045: Official Community Plan Bylaw Introduction;”
 2. Recommend that Council consider the consultation outlined in this corporate report dated May 29, 2017, as appropriate for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that will be affected by “White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220,” pursuant to section 475 of the *Local Government Act*;
 3. Recommend that Council consider “White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220” in conjunction with the City’s Financial Plan, and Metro Vancouver’s Integrated Liquid Waste Management Resource and Integrated Solid Waste and Resource Management Plans;
 4. Recommend that Council give first and second readings to “White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220,” with or without amendments as identified by the Land Use and Planning Committee;
 5. Recommend that Council direct staff to schedule the public hearing for “White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220;” and
 6. Subject to Council granting first and second readings to the Bylaw, recommend that Council direct staff to submit to the Metro Vancouver Board for approval, the Regional Context Statement that forms part of the Bylaw as is required under section 448 of the *Local Government Act*.
-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This corporate report introduces “White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220,” which is the result of a comprehensive Official Community Plan (“OCP”) review process initiated in 2015.

Based on directions provided by Council, comments received from the public, external agencies and organizations through the final stage of the consultation process, as well as refinements to

the draft to clarify or improve provisions, changes have been made to the draft OCP since it was presented to the Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) on March 6, 2017 and further discussed on April 24, 2017.

The purpose of this report is to identify refinements to the draft OCP, obtain Council's consent to move the OCP Bylaw forward to public hearing, with or without amendments, and receive authorization for staff to submit the Regional Context Statement to the Metro Vancouver Board.

Notable refinements to the draft OCP include the following, which are discussed in more detail in the Analysis section of this report:

- **Density:** To clearly identify maximum densities, and how they transition from the growth focus area (Town Centre) into surrounding neighbourhoods, the draft OCP was revised by adding a maximum floor area density map for the Town Centre, Lower Town Centre, and Town Centre Transition land use designations, which would require an OCP amendment if exceeded by a new development proposal.
- **Height:** Clarifying that identified maximum heights are included as guidelines, but would not require OCP amendment if exceeded.
 - i. Adding policies in the Everall Neighbourhood Area to allow for consideration of increased height in exchange for mature tree preservation; and
 - ii. Adjusting the maximum height guidelines for the Lower Tower Centre (for properties fronting Johnston Road between Thrift and Roper only).
- **Duplex and Triplex Housing Location Criteria:** Expanding the policy related to the dispersal of duplexes and triplexes throughout the city.
- **Statement on Need for Flexibility:** Adding statement that OCPs are living documents that are intended to evolve over time to address changing conditions in the community.
- **Green Building:** Adding policy regarding energy efficient building, to consider implementing the BC Energy Step Code which was brought into force April 2017.
- **Regional Context Statement:** Revisions to the formatting and level of detail provided in the Regional Context Statement.
- **Affordable and Market Rental Housing:** Addition of definition for what will be considered affordable rental and secured market rental housing, and expanding the areas where additional density and height would be supported for affordable rental housing.
- **Implementation:** Addition of list of actions to Section 20.2, with short term (1-2 years), medium term (3-4 years), long term (5+ years) and ongoing actions identified. An annual review of the OCP to outline implementation progress has also been added.

Additional word changes and map corrections have been made and are itemized in Appendix C. All of the amendments are integrated into Bylaw No. 2220, which is included as Appendix A.

Based on the feedback received to date, and pending further feedback from the LUPC, staff recommend to the LUPC that Council give the OCP Bylaw first and second readings and authorize staff to schedule the public hearing. Additional resolutions included in the set of recommendations are related to meeting OCP approval process requirements of the *Local*

Government Act (consideration of consultation strategy, consistency with other plans, and submitting the Regional Context Statement to the Metro Vancouver Board).

PAST PRACTICE / POLICY/ LEGISLATION

Part 14, Division 4 of the *Local Government Act* provides the authority for Council to prepare an OCP. The current OCP, Bylaw No. 1837, was adopted in September 2008, and has been amended seventeen (17) times since adoption.

The purpose of an OCP is to guide local government decisions on planning and land use management within the area covered by the plan, and to work toward the goals of the regional growth strategy. It contains high level guiding policies on areas such as housing needs, economic development, environmental protection, and provision of public facilities.

Sections 446 to 449 of the *Local Government Act* provide the framework for identifying the relationship between a local government's OCP and the regional district's Regional Growth Strategy (RGS). This relationship is realized through the inclusion of a "regional context statement" within the OCP that describes how the OCP policies contribute to the goals of the RGS, which is then submitted to the board of the regional district for review and acceptance.

Council Policy 512: Official Community Plan Consultation sets out Council's consultation policies for implementing the consultation requirements of the *Local Government Act*.

ANALYSIS

The process to create the new OCP has included two years of consultation with the public, external agencies, and a wide range of stakeholders. The OCP has also been formed by background research and data gathering by staff and consultants throughout the process. The first draft of the OCP was presented to LUPC on March 6, 2017, and a summary of public engagement responses to the draft OCP was presented to the LUPC on April 24, 2017. The OCP has now been further refined based on LUPC feedback and through additional consultation.

The consultation on the draft OCP has yielded a large amount of varied feedback from the community. Within this context, the development climate in White Rock is quickly evolving towards higher densities, particularly in the Town Centre and adjacent areas, and there are varying opinions on the appropriate amount and type of growth, and how this growth should integrate with established lower density areas. Based on this, it is important that the OCP provides solid land use and policy direction on how to guide and shape new growth and investment, and presents this direction in a clear and understandable manner.

The proposed and recently refined density and height concepts in the OCP have been prepared to meet this need, and provide more certainty for the community as to the expected scale and form of new development, especially in the 'uptown' areas (Town Centre, Lower Town Centre, and Town Centre Transition areas). These concepts reflect consultation feedback, technical analysis, and market interest, and will provide clear guidance regarding potential building densities and heights, amidst a significant increase in redevelopment activity and high density applications.

The draft OCP also includes key policies that seek to strengthen White Rock's 'Waterfront Village'. This includes parking, public realm, recreational, and other improvements that serve residents and enhance White Rock's attractiveness as a key tourist destination.

Looking ahead, it is also important to note that while the OCP is intended to provide land use certainty in a time of change, it is also a 'living document' that will evolve over time, through amendments to the Plan. This being said, it is important that the consideration of amendments is guided by a combination of solid land use policy in the OCP and a process that allows for full

review and consideration of potential amendments. Based on this, the draft OCP also contains language regarding the consideration of OCP amendments, and this is detailed later in this report.

The draft OCP is now at a point that it can provide solid land use guidance for the City and staff recommend moving forward with the document, pending feedback from the LUPC on the refinements noted, particularly on the proposed density and height approaches identified in this report.

Major Components of the OCP

A general description of the structure and contents of the OCP was provided in the corporate report on the draft OCP dated March 6, 2017 which is attached as Appendix “B.”

The overall structure of the OCP has not changed, with five major parts: Purpose and Scope, Policies, Implementation, Development Permit Area Guidelines, and the Appendices (maps and schedules). Within the Policies section, there are thirteen topic areas with distinct goal statements and related policies. These topic areas are:

1. Community Character;
2. Growth Management;
3. Land Use;
4. Town Centre;
5. Waterfront;
6. Housing;
7. Environmental Management;
8. Transportation and Mobility;
9. Economic Development;
10. Parks and Recreation;
11. Infrastructure;
12. Arts, Culture and Heritage; and
13. Quality of Life.

The Development Permit Area (DPA) Guidelines provide detailed guidance for the form, character and environmental sustainability of new development in the City, as well as guidance for environmental (watercourse, floodplains, and ravine lands and significant trees). The maps and schedules included in the Appendix establish the land use designations and DPA boundaries.

Consultation Strategy

Council has been provided with a corporate report at the end of the phase of consultation that summarized the public and stakeholder consultation activities and feedback that occurred in that phase. These included the following reports:

Phase	Report Date	Report Title
1	July 25, 2015	Imagine 2045 – Official Community Plan Review Progress Report 2
2	November 23, 2015	Imagine 2045 – Official Community Plan Review Progress Report 3
3	December 12, 2016	Imagine 2045 – Official Community Plan Review Progress Report 5
4	April 24, 2017	Imagine 2045 – Official Community Plan Review Progress Report 6

Section 2.1 “An Inclusive Public Process” in the OCP (page 3) notes that consultation activities with the public throughout the development of the OCP have included a variety of methods to

obtain input, including: public open houses, surveys, community workshops, and interactive pop-up booths at community events and City facilities. Further, City staff have conducted stakeholder meetings with a variety of City committees and stakeholder groups, including the Economic Investment Committee, Cultural Advisory Committee, Advisory Design Panel, and Environmental Advisory Committee, and an Official Community Plan Working Group.

A Phase 4 public open house was held on March 9, 2017 at the Centennial Arena Hall. Key components of the draft OCP were presented on poster boards, and complete copies of the draft OCP were available for review. Approximately 65 people attended the event.

Opportunities for input in the OCP review and on the draft Plan have been provided to other organizations and authorities, including Metro Vancouver, City of Surrey, School District No. 36, Semiahmoo First Nation, Fraser Health Authority, TransLink, White Rock RCMP, the provincial Ministry of Environment, the Provincial Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, the Provincial Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, and Transport Canada.

Over the course of the process, over 1,500 interactions with participants occurred, indicating that there has been extensive public input in all phases of the Imagine White Rock 2045 planning process. Per section 475 of the *Local Government Act* and in alignment with Council Policy 512: Official Community Plan Consultation Policy, Council is required to consider and provide a resolution as to whether the consultation that has occurred is appropriate for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that may be affected by the OCP Bylaw.

Staff recommend that Council (Recommendation #2) consider the consultation outlined in this corporate report (including by reference the Phase 1-4 reports noted above) as appropriate for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that will be affected by the OCP bylaw.

Consultation with School District 36

Section 476 of the *Local Government Act* requires that a local government that proposes to adopt or amend an OCP must consult with the School District for that area. During the preparation of the OCP, City staff met with School District staff (the Manager of Facilities and Demographics Planning) in Phase 3, and also referred the draft Plan to School District staff for comment.

In their comments, the School District affirmed their agreement with Policy 18.1.3:

“Schools – Work cooperatively with School District 36 to ensure school facilities meet the needs of White Rock residents, to coordinate parks and recreation programs, to provide safe access to schools, and to partner for resource sharing where feasible.”

The School District suggested minor revisions to the wording of policies regarding joint use opportunities at public schools. It was also noted that while there are only two elementary schools (White Rock and Peace Arch) physically within the City of White Rock, the City includes neighbourhoods within the catchment boundaries of five elementary schools (Ray Shepherd, Bayridge, H.T. Thrift, White Rock and Peace Arch) and two secondary schools (Earl Marriott and Semiahmoo), and all of these schools have potential partnership opportunities to explore with local governments for enhancing open space and recreation.

Further, the School District consults with the City on an annual basis regarding their Eligible School Sites Proposal for their Five Year Capital Plan, which outlines the actual and anticipated needs for school facilities and support services in the school district, based on 10 year new housing projections provided by the municipality.

The predominant types of new housing units expected in the City of White Rock in the OCP are low rise apartments and high rise apartments. School District staff have commented that high rise

and low rise units typically have a low student yield; based on their research, the school district estimates that there is an average ratio of 0.09 students with each new low rise apartment unit (i.e. 9 students per 100 low-rise units), and 0.025 students with each new high rise apartment unit (i.e. 25 students per 1000 high-rise units).

School District staff have noted that Semiahmoo and Earl Marriot are significantly over capacity and will have relief in 2020 when the new 1,500 student secondary school opens in Grandview. There are currently no proposed additions to any elementary schools with catchment boundaries in White Rock, but that this will continued to be reviewed on an annual basis.

Financial Plan and Waste Management Plans

Section 477(3)(a) of the *Local Government Act* requires that a local government must consider the OCP in conjunction with its financial plan and any waste management plan.

The OCP projects a modest increase in population and dwelling units in the City over the 30 year time horizon of the plan, with an annual population growth rate between 0.6% and 1.0%. The majority of this growth is expected occur through infill and redevelopment.

Based on this, staff recommend that Council (per Recommendation # 3) consider the proposed OCP consistent with the City's financial plan and Metro Vancouver's waste management plans, as the moderate growth projected in the Plan is consistent with recent trends, and that the OCP policies do not conflict with the financial plan or the strategies in the waste management plans.

Notable Refinements to the Draft OCP

The following sections identify notable changes that have been made to the draft OCP, organized under issue headings. A more complete list of changes is provided in Appendix C to this report, which lists the changes in the order as they appear in the OCP.

Density

The most significant change on this issue is the addition of a maximum floor area density ('FAR' or Floor Area Ratio) map for the Town Centre, Lower Town Centre, and Town Centre Transition land use designations, which would require OCP amendment if exceeded. The purpose of this is to clearly identify maximum densities and how they transition from the growth focus area (Town Centre) into surrounding neighbourhoods. Other changes include:

- Moving the Conceptual Urban Form illustrations (Figure 7 and 8) from Section 8.0 (Land Use) to Section 7.0 (Growth Management; see page 28). Adding the following related statement in the overview paragraph of Section 7.0 "The highest heights and densities are to be concentrated at the intersection of Johnston and North Bluff Roads, with heights and densities generally transitioning down to the south, east, and west. The Conceptual Urban Form for the City is highlighted in Figures 7 and 8." As these figures relate primarily to built form and not the use of land, they are more appropriately located in the Growth Management section.
- Revised overview of Section 8 (Land Use), to improve clarity. Addition of a graphic (Figure 9) which specifies maximum FAR for new development in the Town Centre, Town Centre Transition Area, and Lower Town Centre land use designations.

The draft OCP provided maximum FAR for these land use designations, and indicated that densities are to generally decrease away from the Town Centre. The Figure 9 graphic specifies density tiers within each land use designation to provide certainty around anticipated maximum densities. Note that in the Town Centre Transition Area, the maximum FAR may be increased by 40% with the provision of

affordable rental or secured market rental housing (e.g. 2.5 FAR may be increased by 1.0 FAR to 3.5 FAR).

A brief summary of the FAR graphic, and how densities transition down along Johnston Road and Pacific Avenue (between North Bluff and Fir Street), is as follows:

- a) In the Town Centre, and reflecting its role as White Rock’s ‘growth focus area’, the FAR is highest at 5.4 between North Bluff Road and Russell Avenue, and transitions to 4.0 FAR along Johnston Road, between Russell and Thrift, and 3.0 in the southwest corner as it interfaces a lower density, lower-rise area;
- b) West and east of the Town Centre, FARs also decrease as one moves away from the Town Centre and towards established single family home areas;
- c) In the Lower Town Centre, there are two distinct FAR areas proposed:
 - i. Between Thrift Avenue and Roper Avenue, and for properties fronting Johnston Road, a maximum 3.5 FAR is possible. This continues the downward density transition from the Town Centre, but also allows for significant redevelopments along the entire Johnston Road segment (between North Bluff and Roper) that is part of the planned Johnston Road Streetscape Revitalization project. The proposed 3.5 FAR area also ends at White Rock Elementary, which is a large open space that acts as a buffer between higher and lower density areas.
 - ii. The remainder of the Lower Town Centre area has a maximum 2.0 FAR, which will result in redevelopments that reflect the lower-rise character of this area.

- Revision to the format of Land Use Designations throughout Section 8, to group Uses with Building Types together in a single policy, as these characteristics relate more to the general use of a property, and also combine Density with Height in a single policy, as these parameters establish the built form of a property.

The draft OCP originally had separate policies for density and height.

- Addition of maximum FARs for all land use designations throughout Section 8 with the exception of Institutional and Open Space, as summarized in the table below.

Land Use Designation	Maximum Gross Floor Area Ratio
Town Centre	5.4; refer to Figure 9 for details
Town Centre Transition	2.5, plus 40% with provision of affordable/rental housing; refer to Figure 9 for details
Lower Town Centre – Johnston Road between Thrift and Roper	3.5
Lower Town Centre – remaining properties	2.0
Waterfront Village	2.0
Urban Neighbourhood	1.5
North Bluff East	1.0
East Side Large Lot Infill	Per zoning bylaw; see policy 8.7.2 for details
Mature Neighbourhood	Per zoning bylaw for duplexes, triplexes, and single family homes
Neighbourhood Commercial	1.0

These additions provide additional clarity to the public and land owners regarding maximum densities, and serve to indicate when an Official Community Plan amendment would be required in each of the land use designations.

- Addition of transit investment policy that recognizes the Town Centre as a Growth Focus Area to align increased density with the need for further frequent transit investment.

Height

The most significant change on this issue is that identified maximum heights as guidelines for application review, and not requiring OCP amendment if exceeded. Other changes include:

- Adding policies regarding the Everall Neighbourhood Area to allow for increased height in exchange for mature tree preservation.
- Addition of Objective 7.2 (page 29) and Policies 7.2.1 and 7.2.2. These policies reinforce the Conceptual Urban Form, while noting that some variation in building heights within the general transition is encouraged.
- Revision to height transition diagram (Figure 10) in Section 8.0 to only include the Town Centre, Town Centre Transition, and Lower Town Centre Areas. Limiting the scope of the height concept diagram focuses it on areas where the majority of redevelopment is anticipated to occur over the next 30 years and where clear guidance is required for transitions into surrounding areas. The concept has also been simplified and two key updates have been made to the Lower Town Centre area, in accordance with the maximum FAR diagram, and in response to feedback received, further analysis and development applications submitted to the City:
 - i. Increased heights for Thrift Avenue to Roper Avenue block (properties on Johnston Road) from 5-8 storeys to 10-12 storeys. This reflects comments from several Council members at the April 24, 2017 LUPC meeting, regarding heights in the Lower Town Centre, and relates to the proposed 3.5 FAR for this area. Considering consultation feedback regarding views in the Lower Town Centre, it is important to note that the previously proposed 5 to 8 storey range will likely result in new buildings blocking southwest views from street-level (Johnston Road), and taller building will have this same effect. However, in both cases views to south down Johnston Road, from street-level and potential new buildings, will remain open as redevelopment occurs. The OCP also requires buildings to step back from the street which, along with the Johnston Road reconstruction and lower heights south of Roper, will help to maintain this view corridor. Taller buildings, with smaller upper-floors, will also help to reduce street shadowing and potentially create ocean view cones to the southwest, relative to bulkier lower-rise buildings. Staff also note there are two OCP Amendment applications in this block, with proposed heights of 20 storeys (1350 Johnston Road) and 15 storeys (1310 Johnston Road). These heights are beyond the proposed 10-12 storey range, and well above the originally proposed 5-8 storey range. However, considering this with OCP feedback and further analysis, the proposed 10-12 storey range respects the OCP height transition, yet recognizes there is redevelopment interest, which if encouraged through appropriate policy, will help to revitalize this area.

- ii. Reduced height guideline for south end of Lower Town Centre Area (Star of the Sea Church and Community Centre) from six storeys to four storeys. The decrease to the height guideline at the south end of the Lower Town Centre is in response to concerns raised during the public consultation on the draft OCP on the perceived unfairness of identifying a specific property for additional height; while staff continue to support a landmark ‘gateway’ feature in this area to give prominence to the entry to the commercial main street, it could be achieved by other architectural and public realm features rather than overall building height.

Considering Density and Height Together

- Addition of Objective 8.13 and related policies, to clarify how development applications will be reviewed and processed. The section notes that exceeding the densities (FARs) or proposing a use that is not permitted in the Land Use Designations are changes that would require an amendment to the OCP, but that indicated heights would be considered as guidelines as part of the height and transition concept in the application review process, and exceeding the indicated height would not trigger an amendment to the OCP. Additional policies under this Objective provide direction on how maximum allowable FARs are to be calculated (i.e. when a proposal straddles FAR boundaries, or when road dedications are required). The section also notes that the maximum FARs indicated in the OCP are only applicable to new development applications and not to developments with valid approvals in place or existing buildings. Policy 8.13.5 encourages lot consolidation for smaller properties in recognition that an allowable FAR on a particular small site may not be reasonable or functional (e.g. due to dimensions required for functional underground parking, etc.)

This new section provides clarification on matters that may otherwise be considered open to interpretation during the development application review process. The policy (8.13.4) of not requiring an OCP amendment to exceed the height guidelines, is in response to Council’s request that the OCP allow for flexibility in this matter.

Duplex and Triplex Housing Location Criteria

- Expansion of policy related to the dispersal of triplexes and duplexes throughout the City (page 29). Four criteria provide direction for the location of duplexes and triplexes, including limiting duplexes and triplexes along a single block frontage to 20% of the total number of properties, discouraging duplexes and triplexes that are adjacent to one another, encouraging duplexes on corner lots and lots with lane access, and limiting triplexes to lots with lane access.

These enhanced policies are provided partly in response to Council’s recent direction for establishing criteria for locating/separating duplexes in the City, following the recent Third Reading of a zoning amendment bylaw for a duplex at 15541 Oxenham Avenue.

Statement on Need for Flexibility

- Addition of statement in Section 1.1 (Purpose and Relationship to Other Plans; see page 1) that “OCPs are living documents that are flexible and fluid by nature, and are intended to evolve over time to address changing conditions in the community.”

This statement highlights that policies within the OCP are not ‘set in stone’ and it is occasionally necessary to amend the OCP to reflect changing circumstances in order

to achieve the vision and goals of the community. It is important in a period of new growth and change to provide a high level direction, but also recognize that the OCP is a guiding document that will evolve as well. Staff have also added new policy regarding initial consideration of OCP amendments, as noted later in this report.

Green Building

- Addition of Policy 12.5.4 (page 53), to implement the BC Energy Step Code, a new section in the BC Building Code brought into force in April 2017 to standardize municipal approaches to improve energy efficiency in buildings.

This addition enhances the City's commitment to green building. As the new provincial *Building Act* limits the scope of permitted municipal variations to the BC Building Code, City bylaws cannot specify standards which exceed code requirements (e.g. LEED, BuiltGreen, or other standards). The Energy Step Code is incorporated within the BC Building Code and provides multiple 'steps' of energy efficiency above code minimums that the City can require and/or incentivize, with the lower 'steps' becoming new minimums over time as the industry adapts. A Best Practices Guide for Implementing the Energy Step Code is being prepared and staff will bring forward a report to Council to provide detailed options on how the City could implement the Energy Step Code.

Regional Context Statement

- Revision to structure and content of Regional Context Statement in Section 5.0, in response to consultation with Metro Vancouver staff.

The changes to the RCS provide additional specific references to OCP policies that align with RGS goals, and includes a regional land use designation map for White Rock.

Affordable and Market Rental Housing

- Addition of text in the overview for Section 11.0 (Housing; pages 46-49), to better define what will be considered affordable rental housing and secured market rental housing, in order to qualify for potential incentive policies. Affordable rental will be owned by a non-profit organization and have a minimum number of below-market rental units (30%), but may include market rental units in order to cross-subsidize the below-market units and make the development more feasible. Secured market rental must have legal agreements in place to ensure that the units will remain rental for the life of the building.

Including these definitions will provide guidance to applicants and landowners in considering their options for redevelopment, and help to ensure that when the City supports proposals for affordable housing through incentives, that these projects are contributing to the long-term affordability of housing in the community.

- Revision to Policy 11.2.1(a) to note that the establishment of an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund, funded through a portion of cash-in-lieu community amenity contributions is a policy that Council may consider in the future.

This clarifies that the policy in the OCP does not automatically result in the creation of the Fund, as establishing the Fund with a set proportion of community amenity contributions would require an amendment to the City's Financial Plan.

- Grouping of Policies 11.2.1(b) and (c), both of which relate to the waiver and reduction of community amenity contributions where rental housing is provided. Developments of entirely affordable rental housing would still not be expected to provide a community amenity contribution, but where developments include secured market rental housing, the text has been revised to state that Council may consider lower contributions rather than specifying that the amount would be reduced by 50%.

As community amenity contributions are negotiated in the development process, specifying the reduction amount is not practical. Also, development projects that mix strata and rental units will have varying proportions of rental units, and it would not be reasonable to set a level that would apply to all situations.

- Revision to policy supporting increased height and density for affordable rental housing in specified areas (now Policy 11.2.1(c)), including to increase the maximum supported density to 2.5 FAR, and add that where an affordable housing site abuts land that is designated for single family development (i.e. Mature Neighbourhood), the maximum supported density would be 2.0 FAR with a height of four storeys. The addition of the area between Lee Street and Maccaud Park to the policy is a response to significant public input during consultation on the draft OCP and indication from Council members that additional height in this area would be supportable. Staff added the qualification that where these sites are immediately adjacent to Mature Neighbourhood designated property, a lower height (four storeys) and density (2.0 FAR) to provide a better transition and reduce impact on low density (typically single family) neighbourhoods.

The map that identifies areas subject to this policy has been updated to include properties on North Bluff Road between Lee Street and Maccaud Park, and to remove properties within the Town Centre and Town Centre Transition Areas. The removal of the Town Centre and Town Centre Transition site reflects the fact that those sites are already designated for height and/or density in excess of what this policy would support.

- Revision to policy requiring one-to-one replacement of existing rental dwelling units (now Policy 11.2.1(f)) to direct that the average size of the replacement units must be at least 80% of the units being replaced.

This revision provides guidance to ensure that large rental units are not replaced only with small rental units, depleting the supply of affordable family-sized units.

- Revision to Policy 11.2.2 on retaining low-rise rental stock in the Urban Neighbourhood areas south of Thrift Avenue, changing the wording from “Permit...” to “Support...” redevelopment of rental projects with an additional 0.3 FAR and 20 units per acre beyond the maximums allowed under current zoning.

This policy would allow for moderate redevelopments on existing rental properties south of Thrift Avenue to facilitate building improvements where buildings are aging to close or beyond their life, while keeping the units within the long-term rental supply. Using the word “Support” instead of “Permit” indicates that the additional density would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis rather than permitted outright.

- Addition to Policy 11.2.3 to confirm that within a tenant relocation policy, the developer of the property will be responsible for the efforts to relocate existing residents.

Implementation (Sections 19-21, pages 76-78)

- Addition to Section 19.3 regarding future OCP amendments giving Council an information report on development proposals early on in the process with the option to refuse the application or direct staff to continue processing the application.
- Addition of list of actions to Section 20.2, with short term (1-2 years), medium term (3-4 years), long term (5+ years) and ongoing actions. Further addition that an annual review of the OCP will outline the progress that has been made in plan implementation.
- Additions to Section 21.2 on potential application submission requirements (development approval information), to add the potential requirements for a Health Impact Assessment, as well as the building plans of rental buildings that are proposed for redevelopment.
- Revision to Section 21.2 noting that reports submitted for development applications, where required, are to be provided by a “qualified registered professional” instead of “qualified professional,” to ensure the accountability of professionals to their industry’s associations and standards.

Processing Current ‘In-stream’ Development Applications

Regarding ‘in-stream’ combined OCP/zoning amendment or zoning amendment applications that have not obtained final Council approvals prior to the date of this report, staff intend to process these applications according to these categories, unless otherwise directed by Council:

Category 1

Those applications that have received bylaw readings from Council (1st, 2nd, 3rd Readings) will be processed according to the in-force current OCP bylaw. At the time of adoption of the zoning amendment bylaw it must be consistent with the then-applicable adopted OCP, which means that the zoning must not be in an ‘absolute and direct collision’ with the OCP. Although the proposed land uses in these applications are somewhat consistent with the new OCP, staff have developed policy 8.13.1 (page 39 in new OCP) to accommodate the FARs of these applications expressly, if they are approved by Council. If these applications do not obtain their zoning adoption before the adoption of the new OCP, these applications will need to be processed through a new/modified application and according to the newly adopted OCP.

Category 2

Those applications that have not received any bylaw readings will be recommended to be deferred until after the new OCP is adopted. Alternatively, if Council directs staff to move these applications forward before new OCP adoption, then these applications will be processed according to the approach in Category 1 above.

OPTIONS

The Land Use and Planning Committee can recommend that Council:

1. Give first and second readings to “White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220,” with or without amendments as identified by the Land Use and Planning Committee, consider the statutory requirements for approval of the Bylaw, authorize staff to schedule the required public hearings, and send the Regional Context Statement to the Metro Vancouver Board for approval; or

2. Defer consideration of the proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw, and instruct staff to provide further information or revisions; or
3. Decline to give first and second readings of the proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw.

Based on the above commentary and analysis, staff recommend that the draft OCP as attached, and pending feedback from LUPC, be given first and second readings and moved to public hearing. This is Option 1, which is incorporated into the recommendations of this corporate report.

CONCLUSION

The revised draft OCP provides the key foundation for the City's plan for its development over the 30 year horizon of the OCP, and has been prepared based on Council direction, consultation feedback, and technical analysis. Once adopted, the new OCP bylaw will replace the existing 2008 OCP bylaw when it is adopted.

Based on the feedback received to date, and pending further feedback from the LUPC, staff recommend to the LUPC that Council give the OCP Bylaw first and second readings and authorize staff to schedule the public hearing. Additional resolutions included in the set of recommendations are related to meeting OCP approval process requirements of the *Local Government Act* (consideration of consultation strategy, consistency with other plans, and submitting the Regional Context Statement to the Metro Vancouver Board).

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Johannsen, MCIP, RPP
Director of Planning and Development Services

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer:

I concur with the recommendations of this corporate report.



Dan Bottrill
Chief Administrative Officer

Appendix A: White Rock Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220

Appendix B: Corporate Report dated March 6, 2017 on Draft Official Community Plan

Appendix C: Detailed List of Refinements to the Draft OCP