

Regional Growth Strategy Interim Update: Possible Work Plans

Work Plan A

Description

Work Plan A is an abbreviated work plan, which focuses on moving forward an amendment to include the Highlands Servicing Area and Electoral Area settlement containment areas within the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area (RUCSPA). The work plan also includes minor amendments to give effect to MOUs signed with Oak Bay and View Royal.

Work Items

The work plan includes items 4, 7, and 8 of Table 1 within the interim update. Consideration of the remaining items in Table 1 is deferred until the statutory five-year review of the RGS, scheduled to begin in 2008.

Deliverables

The work plan will deliver a consultation plan, a draft bylaw amendment for discussion, and a revised bylaw amendment for adoption.

The consultation plan will include a three part consultation program: (1) consultation with the public, (2) consultation with governmental agencies whose concurrence with the bylaw is required prior to its adoption, and (3) consultation with organizations whose concurrence with the bylaw is not required prior to its adoption.

The bylaw amendment will take the form of an addendum to the current RGS bylaw. The addendum will likely include new maps, a statement that gives effect to the MOUs with Oak Bay and View Royal, and additional text where necessary.

Estimated Timeline

The following estimated timeline assumes that meetings of the Board and the Planning & Protective Services Committee (PPSC) will follow the same schedule in 2007 as in 2006. In other words, it assumes that the Board will meet on the second Wednesday of each month, and that PPSC will meet on the fourth Wednesday.

Task	Start Date	End Date	Duration
Preparation of consultation plan	Mon, Nov 27, 2006	Fri, Dec 15, 2006	3 weeks
Board initiates RGS amendment	Wed, Dec 6, 2006		
Preparation of draft bylaw	Mon, Dec 18, 2007	Wed, Jan 10, 2007	2 weeks
PPSC reviews consultation plan and draft bylaw	Wed, Jan 24, 2007		
Board adopts consultation plan	Wed, Feb 14, 2007		
Stakeholder and community consultation	Thu, Feb 15, 2007	Fri, Apr 13, 2007	2 months
Consult with RTE	Mon, Mar 19, 2007		
Consult with DPAC	Late Feb, 2007		
Other stakeholder/community meetings	To be determined in consultation plan		
Preparation of revised bylaw and summary of consultation results	Mon, Apr 16, 2007	Fri, May 4, 2007	3 weeks
PPSC reviews bylaw and results of consultation	Wed, May 23, 2007		
Board gives 1 st and 2 nd reading	Wed, June 13, 2007		
Public hearing*	Week of June 18, 2007		
Municipal councils review bylaw and either accept or reject it	Mon, Jun 25, 2007	Tue, Oct 23, 2007	120 days**
Board gives 3 rd reading***	Wed, Nov 14, 2007		

* The public hearing will not be conducted during the months of July, August, or December; nor will it be conducted during a weekend that includes a statutory holiday.

** Municipal councils have up to 120 days to accept or reject the bylaw. If all councils respond by resolution in less than 120 days, adoption may occur earlier.

*** Adoption by this date assumes that all municipal councils accept the bylaw, and dispute resolution is not required.

Work Plan B

Description

Work Plan B is a more comprehensive work plan, which includes the elements of Work Plan A, as well as a regional transportation vision derived from TravelChoices, a regional housing policy derived from the Regional Housing Affordability Strategy (RHAS), a regional economic sustainability policy, and additional policy to clarify the composition and function of the Renewable Resource Lands Policy Area.

Work Items

Work Plan B includes items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 of Table 1 in the interim update. Consideration of the remaining item in Table 1 for inclusion in the RGS is deferred until the five-year statutory review, set to begin in 2008.

Deliverables

The work plan will deliver a consultation plan, a draft bylaw amendment for discussion, and a revised bylaw amendment for adoption.

The consultation plan will include a three part consultation program: (1) consultation with the public, (2) consultation with governmental agencies whose concurrence with the bylaw is required prior to its adoption, and (3) consultation with organizations whose concurrence with the bylaw is not required prior to its adoption.

The bylaw amendment will take the form of a standalone document that is intended to replace the current RGS bylaw. Given that the amendment is to be an update of the RGS (and not a complete rewrite), the new bylaw will be created by revising the text and maps of the current RGS bylaw, minimizing change where possible. To aid in the consultation process, the new bylaw may be accompanied by a document that summarizes the changes made.

Estimated Timeline

The following estimated timeline assumes that meetings of the Board and the Planning & Protective Services Committee (PPSC) will follow the same schedule in 2007/2008 as in 2006. In other words, it assumes that the Board will meet on the second Wednesday of each month, and that PPSC will meet on the fourth Wednesday.

Task	Start Date	End Date	Duration
Preparation of consultation plan	Mon, Nov 27, 2006	Fri, Dec 22, 2006	4 weeks
Board initiates RGS amendment	Wed, Dec 6, 2006		
Preparation of draft bylaw	Wed Jan 3, 2007	Wed, Mar 14, 2007	10 weeks†
PPSC reviews consultation plan	Wed, Jan 24, 2007		
Board adopts consultation plan	Wed, Feb 14, 2007		
PPSC reviews draft bylaw	Wed, Mar 28, 2007		
Stakeholder and community consultation	Thu, Mar 29, 2007	Thu, May 31, 2007	2 months
Consult with RTE	Tue, May 22, 2007		
Consult with DPAC	April, 2007		
Other stakeholder/community meetings	To be determined in consultation plan		
Preparation of revised bylaw and summary of consultation results	Mon, Jun 4, 2007	Fri, Jun 29, 2007	4 weeks
PPSC reviews bylaw	Wed, Jul 25, 2007		
Board gives 1 st and 2 nd reading	Wed, Aug 8, 2007		
Public hearing*	Week of September 10, 2007		
Municipal councils review bylaw and either accept or reject it	Mon, Sep 17, 2007	Tue, Jan 15, 2008	120 days**
Board gives 3 rd reading***	Wed, Feb 13, 2008		

† The timeline for the preparation of the draft bylaw takes into account the probable January/February 2007 completion and adoption dates for the TravelChoices Implementation and Investment Plan and the Regional Housing Affordability Strategy.

* The public hearing will not be conducted during the months of July, August, or December; nor will it be conducted during a weekend that includes a statutory holiday.

** Municipal councils have up to 120 days to accept or reject the bylaw. If all councils respond by resolution in less than 120 days, adoption may occur earlier.

*** Adoption by this date assumes that all municipal councils accept the bylaw, and dispute resolution is not required.

Table 1: Work Items to Consider Including in the Interim Update

Plan	Work Item	Mandate for Inclusion	Considerations	Time Required
B	1. A regional transportation vision and policy derived from TravelChoices, including revised transportation targets.	Implementation Item I-6 of the RGS, which requires that the Board undertake an interim update of the RGS within three years of its adoption “to define the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area in the District of Sooke, and incorporate revisions that arise from the Regional Transportation Strategy, the Regional Housing Affordability Strategy, and the Regional Economic Development Strategy.”	<p>The TravelChoices Strategy was adopted by the Board on April 13, 2005. The strategy contains actions and targets which build upon Strategic Initiative 4.1 of the RGS (Increase Transportation Choice).</p> <p>It will eventually be necessary to update the RGS to reflect the new targets and policies contained in TravelChoices. However, it would probably be prudent to wait until two other transportation-related initiatives have been completed: (1) the TravelChoices Implementation and Investment Plan (scheduled for completion in January/February, 2007), and (2) the CRD/Ministry of Transportation implementation agreement (currently on hold). These initiatives may include policy commitments or targets that affect the transportation vision in the RGS.</p>	2 weeks
B	2. A regional housing policy derived from the RHAS, including establishment of housing affordability targets.	Implementation Initiative I-6 of the RGS (see above).	A revised draft of the Regional Housing Affordability Strategy (RHAS) was completed in June 2006. The RHAS is currently undergoing further review, and will likely be adopted by the Board in January/February, 2007.	2 weeks
B	3. A regional economic sustainability policy.	Implementation Initiative I-6 of the RGS (see above), and Board direction of March 8, 2006 to “prepare a policy, as part of the Regional Growth Strategy interim update, focused on local government’s roles and responsibilities for regional economic sustainability, including the provision of high quality public infrastructure, enhancing amenities and public services, providing information and analysis, engaging and seeking funding from senior government, and delivering a fair and effective development and business regulatory framework.”	The revised “Economic Development Opportunities Blueprint” was completed and reviewed by member municipalities in 2005. The blueprint identifies opportunities and challenges for improving the economic environment within the region, and makes a number of recommendations. Although not a regional economic strategy (as originally envisioned in RGS Implementation Initiative I-6), the blueprint is a starting point. Additional research by staff is required in order to draft a meaningful regional economic sustainability policy for inclusion in the RGS.	2 weeks

Plan	Work Item	Mandate for Inclusion	Considerations	Time Required
A B	4. Map revisions to the RUCSPA arising from electoral area OCP updates and municipal context statements including the Highlands Servicing Area.	<p>Board direction on May 25, 2005 that “proposed changes to the Regional Urban Containment and Service Policy Area (RUCSPA) in the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area be dealt with as part of the interim update of the RGS.”</p> <p>Board approval of the Highlands regional context statement on March 8, 2006 and direction to “include an amendment to the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy Area to coincide with the proposed Highlands Servicing Boundary in the Regional Growth Strategy bylaw interim update.”</p>	<p>In its letter of September 20, 2006, the District of Highlands requested that the RUCSPA boundary component of the amendment move forward at the earliest possible opportunity. Given the contentious nature of RUCPSA boundary alterations, it is possible that an amendment bylaw that includes an expanded RUCSPA could be rejected by one of the member municipalities. Such a rejection would lead to dispute resolution and likely delay the final decision on amendment adoption. For the benefit of Highlands, it would be best to move the amendment process along as quickly as possible to provide certainty on whether the expanded RUCSPA will be accepted or not. A shorter process would be more likely with Work Plan A, which does not include substantive changes to the RGS.</p> <p>On June 10, 2004, the City of Langford expanded its municipal boundary to include a 21 ha parcel of land to the west of Humpback Road. This parcel is outside of the RUCSPA, resulting in an inconsistency between the RGS and the Langford context statement (which was accepted by the Board on October 26, 2005). The context statement states that “the City is entirely within the Regional Urban Containment and Servicing Policy area identified on Map 3 of the RGS”. This is not strictly true. It is suggested that if Langford would like this area to be included in the RUCSPA, it submit a revised context statement to the Board that identifies the inconsistency and proposes a RUCSPA boundary amendment as the solution. Without further direction from the Board, the parcel will not be included in the revised RUCSPA for the interim update.</p>	1 week (pending receipt of GIS data from Highlands and the Electoral Area)

Plan	Work Item	Mandate for Inclusion	Considerations	Time Required
B	5. Map revisions to the Renewable Resource Lands Policy Area designations stemming from the elimination of the Forest Land Reserve, electoral OCP updates and municipal context statements.	Project Charter	<p>On August 3, 2004, the Province repealed the Forest Land Reserve Act (FLRA), replacing it with the Private Managed Forest Land Act (PMFLA). There are substantive differences between the two Acts. Unlike the land use designation approach of the Forest Land Reserve Act, the land base subject to the Private Managed Forest Land Act is the Managed Forest property assessment class. Land owners are able to voluntarily enter and exit from the Managed Forest class (although there is an exit fee).</p> <p>The Renewable Resource Lands Policy Area is the largest of the policy areas in the RGS. It is currently defined to include “lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve, the Forest Land Reserve, and Crown Forest Lands identified in the Regional Green/Blue Spaces Strategy”. Initiative 2.1 of the RGS proposes the long-term use of these lands as renewable resource working landscapes.</p> <p>Given the substantive differences between the old and new Acts, it may be necessary to incorporate additional policy in the RGS to maintain the same level of forest land protection that was present at RGS adoption. At a minimum, a review of these issues should be conducted before the relevant RGS maps are updated.</p> <p>The area of the Agricultural Land Reserve has also changed in recent years due to the exclusion of a number of properties. This should be reflected in any update to the Renewable Resource Lands Policy Area.</p>	2 weeks

Plan	Work Item	Mandate for Inclusion	Considerations	Time Required
-	<p>6. Inclusion of a policy regarding the maintenance, amendment and periodic update of the RGS including the management of the RUCSPA to replace in part, the master implementation agreement proposed in RGS implementation initiative I-2.</p>	Project Charter	<p>RGS Implementation Initiative I-2 requires the CRD to prepare and adopt, within two years of the adoption of the RGS, a Master Implementation Agreement to give effect to key RGS actions and establish procedures for the maintenance, amendment, and periodic update of the RGS. Although a RUCSPA implementation agreement was prepared for consideration in 2005, it was not adopted.</p> <p>Section 853(4) of the <i>Local Government Act</i> states that the sections of the Act that apply to the initiation, development and adoption of a regional growth strategy also apply to its amendment. Although the Act defines the steps of the amendment process from 1st reading onward, considerable flexibility is provided in the area of amendment preparation. Consequently, the absence of an implementation agreement or a similarly-intentioned policy in the RGS results in uncertainty, especially with respect to amending the RUCSPA.</p> <p>The preparation of a policy regarding the maintenance, amendment and periodic update of the RGS is a major work item. The inclusion of this work item in the RGS interim update would extend the timeline significantly. However, it would be valuable to draft such a policy prior to the initiation of the statutory five-year RGS update. If signed as an implementation agreement, this policy could be used to direct the five year-update, and then be included in the RGS.</p>	4 weeks (plus additional time in the consultation phase to consult with municipalities)

Plan	Work Item	Mandate for Inclusion	Considerations	Time Required
A B	7. Text changes to give effect to the Oak Bay and View Royal MOUs.	MOUs signed in September 2002, between the CRD and District of Oak Bay, and the CRD and Town of View Royal.	<p>The MOU for View Royal requires that the CRD revise the RGS “as part of the CRD’s first update (interim update)... such that the Town is removed from the ‘Western Communities’ classification and included within the ‘Core Municipalities’ classification.”</p> <p>The MOU for Oak Bay identifies four actions for the CRD to undertake. Action 6.1 requires that the CRD revise the RGS “as part of the CRD’s first update (interim update)” to grant the District the ability to achieve its housing allocation objectives through a variety of housing types.</p> <p>Action 6.2, which concerns the preparation of Oak Bay’s context statement, has already been completed.</p> <p>Action 6.3 requires the CRD to revise and clarify the population, dwelling unit, and employment forecasts in Table 1 of the RGS, to ensure their accuracy. There is no requirement in the MOU that these revisions occur as part of the interim update. Thus they will be deferred to the statutory five-year update, at which point new forecasts will be calculated for all municipalities.</p> <p>Action 6.4, which concerns the consulting process used to develop TravelChoices and the RHAS, has already been completed.</p>	1 day
A B	8. Other minor text and map corrections where necessary.	Project Charter	<p>The municipal boundaries for Sooke and Langford have changed since RGS adoption, and should be updated on Maps 1, 3, and 4.</p> <p>Recent major park additions should be included in the Capital Green Lands Policy Area on Maps 3 and 4.</p> <p>Any typographical errors should be fixed.</p> <p>Other corrections may be necessary, following a detailed review of the text.</p>	1 week