

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA

October 3, 2017

6:00 p.m.

Blaney Room, 1st Floor, City Hall

The purpose of the Council Workshop is to review and discuss policies and other items of interest to Council. Although resolutions may be passed at this meeting, the intent is to make a consensus decision to send an item to Council for debate and vote or refer the item back to staff for more information or clarification. The meeting is live streamed and recorded by the City of Maple Ridge.

REMINDERS

October 10, 2017

Council Meeting

7:00 p.m.

1. ***ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA***

2. ***ADOPTION OF MINUTES***

- Special Council Meeting Minutes – September 5, 2017
- Council Workshop Meeting Minutes – September 5, 2017
- Special Council Meeting Minutes – September 6, 2017
- Council Workshop Minutes – September 19, 2017

3. ***PRESENTATIONS AT THE REQUEST OF COUNCIL***

4. ***MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS' REPORTS***

5. ***UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS***

5.1 **Outdoor Pool at Thomas Haney Construction Options**

Staff report dated October 3, 2017 providing information on an approach to the delivery of an outdoor pool project and providing options to either proceed with development of an outdoor using a condensed process, a typical schedule process or not to proceed at this time.

5.2 Emergency Operations Centre/Emergency Support Services

Presentation by the Emergency Program Coordinator

5.3 Plebiscite Details for Provision of Road-Side Waste Pick-up (garbage and organics)

Staff report dated October 3, 2017 recommending options on conducting a plebiscite to determine elector opinion on the provision of a road-side waste pick-up (garbage and organics) as a municipal service.

Note: Item 5.4 was deferred at the September 19, 2017 Council Workshop Meeting

5.4 2017 Traffic Calming Update

Staff report dated September 19, 2017 recommending that Policy 9.07 – Traffic Calming Policy be adopted.

5.5 Rental Housing Program: Detached Garden Suite Update and Next Steps

Staff report dated October 3, 2017 recommending that the proposed Community Engagement Program for detached garden suites be endorsed.

6. *CORRESPONDENCE*

6.1 Upcoming Events

October 4, 2017 11:30 a.m.	Life After School Transition Annual BBQ – Greg Moore Youth Centre Organizer: Life After School Transition Committee
October 5, 2017 8:30 a.m.	Lower Mainland 2H (Housing + Homelessness) Forum 2017 – The Element, Vancouver Metrotown, 5988 Willingdon Avenue, Burnaby Organizer: Metro Vancouver and Fraser Valley Council of Community Homelessness Tables
October 10, 2017 9:30 a.m.	Fraser Valley Regional Tech Forum – Best Western, 32281 Loughheed Highway, Mission Organizer: Sumas Regional Consortium for High Tech
October 13, 2017 6:00 pm	Golden Harvest Celebration, The ACT Organizer: Maple Ridge Agricultural Advisory Committee
October 14, 2017 5:30 p.m.	Enchanted, 2017 Ridge Meadows Hospital Foundation Gala – Meadow Gardens Golf Club Organizer: Ridge Meadows Hospital Foundation

October 21, 2017 9:00 a.m.	Council of Councils – The View on Lonsdale, 2121 Lonsdale Avenue, North Vancouver Organizer: Metro Vancouver
October 22, 2017 12:00 p.m.	Maple Ridge SPCA's Lock In for Love – BC SPCA, Maple Ridge, BC Organizer: BC SPCA

7. ***BRIEFING ON OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST/QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL***

Links to member associations:

- Union of British Columbia Municipalities ("UBCM") Newsletter *The Compass*
 - <http://www.ubcm.ca/EN/main/resources/past-issues-compass/2016-archive.html>
- Lower Mainland Local Government Association ("LMLGA")
 - <http://www.lmlga.ca/>
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities ("FCM")
 - <https://www.fcm.ca/>

8. ***MATTERS DEEMED EXPEDIENT***

9. ***ADJOURNMENT***

Checked by: _____
Date: _____

2.0 Minutes

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

September 5, 2017

The Minutes of the Special City Council Meeting held on September 5, 2017 at 5:02 p.m. in the Blaney Room of the City Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia for the purpose of transacting regular City business.

PRESENT

Elected Officials

Mayor N. Read
Councillor C. Bell
Councillor Duncan
Councillor B. Masse
Councillor Robson
Councillor Speirs
Councillor Shymkiw

Appointed Staff

E.C. Swabey, Chief Administrative Officer
K. Swift, General Manager of Parks, Recreation & Culture
P. Gill, General Manager Corporate and Financial Services
F. Quinn, General Manager of Public Works and
Development Services
L. Darcus, Manager of Legislative Services
A. Gaunt, Confidential Secretary
Other staff as required
T. Cotroneo, Manager of Community Services

Note: These Minutes are also posted on the City's Web Site at www.mapleridge.ca

1.0 *CALL TO ORDER*

2.0 *APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA*

R/2017-375

It was moved and seconded

That the agenda for the September 5, 2017 Special Council Meeting be approved.

CARRIED

3.0 *NOTICE OF CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING*

R/2017-376

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting following this meeting at 6:00 p.m. be closed to the public pursuant to Sections 90 (1) and 90 (2) of the Community Charter as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:

- Section 90(1)(f) Law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure might reasonably be expected to harm the enforcement of an enactment.
- Section 90(1)(g) Litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality.
- Section 90(1)(i) The receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.

Any other matter that may be brought before the Council that meets the requirements for a meeting closed to the public pursuant to Sections 90 (1) and 90 (2) of the Community Charter or Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

CARRIED

4.0 *ADJOURNMENT* – 6:02 p.m.

N. Read, Mayor

Certified Correct

L. Darcus, Corporate Officer

COUNCIL WORKSHOP MINUTES

September 5, 2017

The Minutes of the City Council Workshop held on September 5, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. in the Blaney Room of City Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia for the purpose of transacting regular City business.

PRESENT

Elected Officials

Mayor N. Read
Councillor C. Bell
Councillor K. Duncan
Councillor B. Masse
Councillor G Robson
Councillor T. Shymkiw
Councillor C. Speirs

Appointed Staff

E.C. Swabey, Chief Administrative Officer
K. Swift, General Manager of Parks, Recreation & Culture
P. Gill, General Manager Corporate and Financial Services
F. Quinn, General Manager Public Works and Development Services
L. Darcus, Manager of Legislative Services
A. Gaunt, Confidential Secretary

Other Staff as Required

D. Boag, Director of Parks and Facilities
C. Carter, Director of Planning
B. Elliott, Manager of Community Planning
L. Zosiak, Planner 2

Note: These Minutes are posted on the City Web Site at www.mapleridge.ca

1. *ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA*

R/2017-377

It was moved and seconded

That the agenda for the September 5, 2017 Council Workshop Meeting be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. *MINUTES*

2.1 Minutes of the July 18, 2017 Council Workshop Meeting and the August 1, 2017 Special Council Meeting

R/2017-378

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the Council Workshop Meeting of July 18, 2017 and the Special Council Workshop Meeting of August 1, 2017 be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ***PRESENTATIONS AT THE REQUEST OF COUNCIL*** – Nil

4 ***MAYOR'S AND COUNCILLORS' REPORTS***

Councillor Bell

Councillor Bell attended an event hosted by the Maple Ridge Library for the presentation of copies of a book written by Dr. Biju Mathew about Anand Kumar, the founder of the 'Super 30' advanced mathematics education program in India. She thanked City Communications staff and the Maple Ridge Library staff for the work done to host the event.

Councillor Robson

Councillor Robson reminded all of an upcoming Recovery Capital Conference.

Councillor Shymkiw

Councillor Shymkiw participated in the Cops for Cancer fundraiser.

Councillor Speirs

Councillor Speirs attended a Housing Forum.

Councillor Masse

Councillor Masse advised he worked on the correlation between increasingly prosperous regions and an increase in homelessness. He attended an anti-racism rally in Vancouver.

Mayor Read

Mayor Read met with Lisa Beare, MLA to deal with local renovations. A meeting was hosted which allowed for information sharing on tenants' rights. She advised that she will be holding a press conference on the new transit services in Silver Valley.

Councillor Masse expressed concern with upcoming changes to Federal tax rules whereby persons taking the West Coast Express will be unable to write off the use of the train service as a tax deduction.

R/2017-379

It was moved and seconded

That Mayor Read communicate with the local Member of Parliament on the issue of tax credits for the use of the West Coast express.

CARRIED

5. *UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS*

5.1 Loan Authorization Bylaws and Alternative Approval Process

Presentation by Laurie Darcus, Manager of Legislative Services

The Manager of Legislative Services gave a PowerPoint presentation on loan authorization bylaws and the alternative approval process which provided the following information:

- A review of projects approved by Council which require borrowing bylaws
- Financial implications of borrowing bylaws
- Bylaws for each project
- Legislative requirements to complete borrowing
- Sample of an alternative approval elector response forms
- Future decisions required by Council and next steps to be taken

5.2 Parks, Recreation & Culture Infrastructure Projects

Update by the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture

The General Manager of Parks, Recreation & Culture and the Director of Parks and Facilities gave an update on the status of Parks, Recreation & Culture infrastructure projects which included the following:

1. Albion Community Centre
2. Fourth Ice Pad
3. Consultation for an Indoor Pool.
4. Establish an Indoor Running Track
5. Youth Wellness Centre
6. Karina LeBlanc Field:
7. Golden Ears Synthetic Field:
8. Telosky Stadium/Thomas Haney
9. Maple Ridge Leisure Centre Renovations
10. Thomas Haney Centre Outdoor Pool
 - a. Tennis and Lawn Bowling Club Comments
 - b. Haney Neptune's, Haney Seahorses, Special Olympics Swim Club Comments
 - c. Public Open House – scheduled for September 12, 2017.

Details on the status of each project were provided. A written summary was distributed to Council.

5.3 **Review of Estate Suburban Residential and Suburban Residential Land Use Designations**

Staff report dated September 5, 2017 recommending that no changes be made to the current policies in the Official Community Plan for Estate Suburban Residential and Suburban Residential land use designations.

The Director of Planning introduced the topic and reviewed the staff report.

L. Zosiak, Planner 2 gave a PowerPoint presentation providing the following information:

- Recap of previous Council resolutions
- Concerns of Council pertaining to subdivisions outside the Urban Area Boundary
- Changes since resolution passed
- Estate Suburban recommendation
- Suburban Residential recommendation
- Staff recommendation
- Density Bonus OCP Policy
- Tree Protection and Management Bylaw

R/2017-380

It was moved and seconded

That no changes be made to the current policies in the Official Community Plan for Estate Suburban Residential and Suburban Residential land use designations, as discussed in the Council report dated September 5, 2017.

CARRIED

Councillor Speirs - OPPOSED

6. ***CORRESPONDENCE***

6.1 **Fraser Valley Regional Library (FVRL) – Termination of Member Service Agreements (MSA)**

Letter dated August 16, 2017 from Councillor Chuck Stam, Fraser Valley Regional Library Board Chair advising Mayor and Council and Chief Administrative Officers of FVRL Member Local Governments that the FVRL will not be renewing individual Member Service Agreements.

R/2017-381

It was moved and seconded

That representatives of the Fraser Valley Regional Library be invited to attend a meeting of Council.

CARRIED

6.2 Discussion Paper: Special Events Permits – Liquor Control and Licensing Branch

Discussion paper dated August 2017 from the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch seeking input on changes to the special events permits policy.

The Manager of Legislative Services reviewed the discussion paper.

7. *BRIEFING ON OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST/QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL*

Council congratulated Paul Gill in his new position as Chief Administrative Officer.

8. *MATTERS DEEMED EXPEDIENT* – Nil

9. *ADJOURNMENT* – 7:20 p.m.

N. Read, Mayor

Certified Correct

L. Darcus, Corporate Officer

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

September 6, 2017

The Minutes of the Special City Council Meeting held on September 6, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. in the Blaney Room of the City Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia for the purpose of transacting regular City business.

PRESENT

Elected Officials

Mayor N. Read
Councillor C. Bell
Councillor Duncan
Councillor B. Masse
Councillor Robson
Councillor Speirs

Appointed Staff

P. Gill, Chief Administrative Officer
K. Swift, General Manager of Parks, Recreation & Culture
F. Quinn, General Manager of Public Works and
Development Services
A. Gaunt, Confidential Secretary
Other staff as required
S. Matthewson, Social Planning Analyst

Absent

Councillor Shymkiw

Note: These Minutes are also posted on the City's Web Site at www.mapleridge.ca

Note: Guests in attendance are as follows:

- Honorable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Honourable Shane Simpson, Minister of Social Development and Poverty Reduction
- Jacquie Dawes, Deputy Minister
- Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister, Office of Housing and Construction Standards
- Lisa Beare, MLA
- Bob D'Eith, MLA
- Khalida Ali, Executive Assistant, Office of Dan Ruimy, MP
- Jane Hurtig, Ministerial Assistant to the Honourable Selina Robinson
- Leah Squance, Ministerial Assistant to the Honourable Shane Simpson
- Shayne Ramsey, Chief Executive Officer, BC Housing
- Dominic Flanagan, Executive Director, Supportive Housing, BC Housing

1.0 ***CALL TO ORDER***

2.0 ***APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA***

R/2017-382

It was moved and seconded

That the agenda for the September 6, 2017 Special Council Meeting be approved.

CARRIED

3.0 ***NOTICE OF CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING***

R/2017-383

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting following this meeting at 6:00 p.m. be closed to the public pursuant to Sections 90 (1) and 90 (2) of the Community Charter as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:

Section 90(2)(b) The consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government.

Any other matter that may be brought before the Council that meets the requirements for a meeting closed to the public pursuant to Sections 90 (1) and 90 (2) of the Community Charter or Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

CARRIED

4.0 ***ADJOURNMENT*** – 6:32 p.m.

N. Read, Mayor

Certified Correct

L. Darcus, Corporate Officer

City of Maple Ridge

COUNCIL WORKSHOP MINUTES

September 19, 2017

The Minutes of the City Council Workshop held on September 19, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. in the Blaney Room of City Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia for the purpose of transacting regular City business.

PRESENT

Elected Officials

Mayor N. Read
Councillor C. Bell
Councillor K. Duncan
Councillor B. Masse
Councillor G Robson
Councillor T. Shymkiw
Councillor C. Speirs

Appointed Staff

P. Gill, Chief Administrative Officer
W. McCormick, Acting General Manager of Parks,
Recreation & Culture
F. Quinn, General Manager Public Works and Development
Services
L. Darcus, Manager of Legislative Services
A. Gaunt, Confidential Secretary

Other Staff as Required

R. MacNair, Manager of Bylaw & Licensing Services
C. Carter, Director of Planning
B. Elliott, Manager of Community Planning
D. Pollock, Municipal Engineer

Note: These Minutes are posted on the City Web Site at www.mapleridge.ca

1. ***ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA***

R/2017-405

It was moved and seconded

That the agenda for the September 19, 2017 Council Workshop Meeting be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

2. ***MINUTES*** – Nil

3. ***PRESENTATIONS AT THE REQUEST OF COUNCIL*** – Nil

4 ***MAYOR'S AND COUNCILLORS' REPORTS***

Councillor Bell

Councillor Bell commented on Maple Ridge Home Show presentations related to the initiative on backyard chickens and Tiny Houses. She attended a meeting of the Arts Council.

Councillor Shymkiw

Councillor Shymkiw attended a meeting of the Economic Development Committee.

Councillor Robson

Councillor Robson attended numerous events including a retirement event for a conservation officer volunteer.

Councillor Masse

Councillor Masse attended a meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee. He advised on a future research study on the fish return and viability at the Alouette Dam.

Councillor Speirs

Councillor Speirs attended a presentation on the Community Court system.

5. ***UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS***

5.1 **Community Charter - Section 57 Notice on Title**

The Manager of Bylaw & Licensing Services provided information on the application of Community Charter Section 57 Notices on Title as a compliance and information tool.

5.2 **Sign Control Bylaw Update**

The Manager of Bylaw & Licensing Services provided history and information on the development of a new sign control bylaw. She advised that three readings of a sign control bylaw brought to Council previously will require rescinding and that a new bylaw is being developed to allow inclusion of changes in the Building Code and will be brought forward for first reading.

5.3 **Rental Housing Program: Secondary Suite Update and Next Steps**

The Director of Planning introduced the topic. The Manager of Community Planning reviewed the items of the staff report through a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- Background
 - Previous Council direction and upcoming staff reports;
 - Possible secondary suite expansion areas.
- Analysis: number of suites, mapping locations, complaints, comparisons with other communities.
- Next steps: community open house; stakeholder workshops; survey and social media input (combine with Detached Garden Suites)

R/2017-406

It was moved and seconded

That the “Proposed Community Engagement Program” section of the report titled “Rental Housing Program: Secondary Suite Update and Next Steps”, dated September 19, 2017 be endorsed.

CARRIED

Councillor Shymkiw - OPPOSED

5.4 2017 Traffic Calming Update

Staff report dated September 19, 2017 recommending that Policy 9.07 – Traffic Calming Policy be adopted.

R/2017-407

It was moved and seconded

That Item 5.4 2017 Traffic Calming Update be deferred to the next Council Meeting Workshop.

CARRIED

5.5 Municipal Solid Waste Curbside Collection – Request for Proposal

The Municipal Engineer gave a PowerPoint presentation on the process for proceeding with a Request for Proposal to determine costs for a plebiscite (referendum) question on municipal solid waste curbside collection.

Note: The meeting was recessed at 6:54 p.m. and reconvened at 9:18 p.m.

Discussion on the presentation by the Municipal Engineer on municipal solid waste curbside collection continued.

Note: Councillor Shymkiw left the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

Note: Mayor Read left the meeting at 9:28 p.m. Councillor Robson chaired the meeting. Mayor Read returned to the meeting at 9:30 p.m. and resumed as Chair.

R/2017-408

It was moved and seconded

That Item 5.5 Municipal Solid Waste Curbside Collection – Request for Proposal be deferred to the next Council Meeting Workshop pending a staff report on the details for a plebiscite for provision of road-side waste pick-up.

CARRIED

6. ***CORRESPONDENCE***

6.1 **Metro Vancouver – Metro Vancouver 2040: Bylaw No. 1246, 2017**

Letter dated August 1, 2017 from Greg Moore, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board providing notification of an amendment to proposed Metro 2040 incorporating Metro 2040 regional land use designation and overlay map revisions for the Township of Langley, City of North Vancouver and City of Surrey and inviting written comments on the proposed amendment.

R/2017-409

It was moved and seconded

That the letter dated August 1, 2017 from Greg Moore, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board, be received into the record.

CARRIED

7. ***BRIEFING ON OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST/QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL*** – Nil

8. ***MATTERS DEEMED EXPEDIENT*** – Nil

9. *NOTICE OF CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING* - Nil

10. *ADJOURNMENT* - 9:39 p.m.

N. Read, Mayor

Certified Correct

L. Darcus, Corporate Officer

TO: Her Worship Mayor Nicole Read
and Members of Council
FROM: Chief Administrative Officer
SUBJECT: Outdoor Pool at Thomas Haney Construction Options

MEETING DATE: October 3, 2017
FILE NO:
MEETING: Workshop

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Council directed staff to continue planning for a new outdoor pool at the Thomas Haney site following a report on this project at the September 19, 2017 Council meeting.

Staff have secured the services of Titanium Projects Ltd., who have experience in the construction of both indoor and outdoor aquatic facilities and in the development of expedited project management processes to prepare and analyze options to achieve an outdoor pool in the most timely manner.

Alan Nicholson, Principal of Titanium will attend the October 3, 2017 Council meeting to review the construction model options, along with associated costs, timelines and risks.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That staff be directed to proceed with schematic design, earthworks and schematic budget for an outdoor pool at the Thomas Haney site per the condensed process outlined in the September 28, 2017 report prepared by Titanium Projects Ltd.

Or;
2. That staff be directed to proceed with development of an outdoor pool at the Thomas Haney site following the typical schedule process outlined in the September 28, 2017 report prepared by Titanium Projects Ltd.

Or;
3. That staff be directed to not proceed with the development of an outdoor pool at this time.

DISCUSSION:

a) **Background Context:**

A conceptual plan for a new Outdoor Pool at the Thomas Haney site was presented to Council on September 19, 2017 by HCMA Architecture + Design. The presentation included feedback from stakeholders and the larger community, a basic and an enhanced design option, along with the estimated cost and timeline for each concept. Following this presentation, Council directed staff to proceed with planning for the enhanced concept design, at an estimated cost of \$11.5 million.

As the next step in advancing this project, staff secured the services of a project management firm to review the costs and timelines presented by HCMA, to develop options to achieve the enhanced concept design by approximately May 1, 2018. To this end, the firm was asked to consider any and all options that might reduce the project timeline while maintaining the project quality required for a long-term community amenity.

b) Desired Outcome:

To provide Council with expert advice on the best approach, plus associated costs, timelines and any risks associated with the installation of a new outdoor pool at the Thomas Haney site in a timely manner.

c) Strategic Alignment:

Growing demand for aquatic services was anticipated in the Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan. Back in 2010, the plan recommended a new indoor aquatic complex be installed next to the Pitt Meadows Family Recreation Centre when the combined population of Maple Ridge and Pitt Meadows nears 100,000. The City of Pitt Meadows has since determined that they will not proceed with an indoor aquatic facility. The provision of a new outdoor pool would alleviate some of the growing pressure for aquatic opportunities, as would planning for a second indoor pool as a future amenity.

Regarding indoor aquatic planning, Council has asked staff to bring back a report on an engagement process for the design of a future indoor pool. This report will be brought to Council in the coming weeks. If this engagement process proceeds, the community will have an opportunity to input to such a facility. Planning for a major facility such as this typically occurs up to five years in advance of the project opening.

d) Citizen/Customer Implications:

A second outdoor pool would provide additional opportunities for Swim Club training during the operating season, as well as the opportunity for additional swim lesson programming, public length swimming, leisure swimming and aquatic fitness programs.

e) Business Plan/Financial Implications:

HCMA Architecture + Design estimated the cost of the enhanced outdoor pool project to be \$11.5 million +/- 25%. Prior to entering into debt for this and other Parks, Recreation and Culture infrastructure projects, approval of the electors is required. Staff have submitted documentation related to this approval process to the Inspector of Municipalities based on the previous direction of Council. Staff are in discussion with this office regarding appropriate steps should any changes be made to the submission to ensure that the requirements of the Inspector are met.

f) Policy Implications:

Under the City's Purchasing Policy and in accordance with trade agreements that the City is obliged to follow, the City is required to publicly bid contracts at varied thresholds. In other words, the selection of specific suppliers outside of a public bidding process is restricted. Should Council elect to proceed outside of the parameters of the Trade Agreements, the City could be at risk of a supplier challenge through formal dispute mechanisms outlined in those agreements. Supplier challenges could lead to administrative or judicial review, rapid interim measures, and the possibility of orders for corrective action or compensation. Staff recommend that the City continue to operate in accordance with City policy and the abovementioned trade agreements which would add an additional 2.5 to 3 months to the timelines described in the attached report.

CONCLUSION:

The attached report describes an approach to the delivery of an outdoor pool project in the most timely manner along with an analysis of associated risks. A representative from Titanium Projects Ltd. will be in attendance at the October 3, 2017 Council meeting to describe their findings and answer any questions that Council may have.

"Original signed by Kelly Swift"

Approved by: Kelly Swift, General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture

"Original signed by Paul Gill"

Concurrence: **Paul Gill**
Chief Administrative Officer

cc: Maple Ridge Outdoor Pool – Feasibility of Implementation, dated September 28, 2017, prepared by Titanium Projects Ltd.



September 29, 2017

City of Maple Ridge
11995 Haney Place
Maple Ridge, BC V2X 6A9

Attention: Kelly Swift, General Manager: Parks, Recreation & Culture

Dear Ms. Swift,

Reference: Maple Ridge Outdoor Pool – Feasibility of Implementation

As requested, we have prepared a preliminary implementation plan, and corresponding feasibility analysis, for the design and construction of the Maple Ridge Outdoor Pool. The details of this are enclosed in the following report.

Our analysis is objective and reflects our opinions and experience from similar projects. A list of this experience is provided at the end of this report.

Please contact us should you have questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

TITANIUM PROJECTS LTD.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Alan Nicholson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Alan Nicholson, P.Eng., PMP, GSC
Principal

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1

The proposed workplan outlines how to open the new pool by May 11, 2018 (Myrtha option) or June 13, 2018 (concrete option). The workplan is optimistic and has little capacity to absorb delays. Refer to section 4 of this report for workplan details.

This plan has a high risk profile, as there are many real risks that the project will face. Some of these risks include:

- Rushed design that results in a long-term facility that does not properly serve the needs of all stakeholders and users.
- Rushed design that has a higher level of errors and omissions (which typically has schedule and cost implications).
- Geotechnical/structural design development generates a requirement for ground improvement (e.g. piles) which impacts schedule and budget.
- Proceeding with design and earthworks prior to receiving and approving a more accurate project budget.
- Poor winter weather conditions delay the construction schedule.
- Not adhering to City procurement policies, possibly resulting in higher costs and public complaint.
- Delays due to other Authorities Having Jurisdiction (BC Hydro, Fortis, Fraser Health) that are reluctant/unable to conform to a fast-track schedule.

Though many of these risks can be mitigated, it is likely that some will occur and will impact the project. Refer to section 5 for more details regarding project risk.

We understand that HCMA has provided a total 'Class D' budget of \$11.5M +/- 25%. From our preliminary review, we believe this budget is achievable. Note that a Class D budget carries an accuracy range of +/- 25%, which means the total budget is likely to fall between \$8.6M and \$14.4M. We do note some exclusions in the budget that have yet to be accounted for; however, the project can generate offsetting savings, by reducing scope, to ensure the costs remain within the budget range noted above.

BACKGROUND | 2

Below is a summary of events as we understand them:

- A retrofit of the Maple Ridge Leisure Centre pool tanks, HVAC and mechanical systems, change room and lobby areas will necessitate a closure of the aquatic facility for approximately one year beginning in early 2018. During this closure aquatic programs will be relocated where possible or discontinued which will result in a significant gap in aquatic services in the community for this period of time.
- The concept of a new outdoor pool was introduced as an option to alleviate the impact of this closure and to provide a new aquatic amenity for long-term community use.
- HCMA Architecture + Design has prepared a concept design and budget for this new facility, and has gathered feedback on that concept from stakeholders and the community.
- A key question that has been posed is whether or not an outdoor pool can be installed at the Thomas Haney site within a timeframe that will align with the MRLC retrofit project to alleviate the impact of that closure.
- Staff have requested Titanium prepare a work program and assess the feasibility of achieving the project objectives noted in this section.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES | 3

The workplan has been developed to achieve the following project objectives, in order of priority:

1. Pool to be open in May/June of 2018.
2. Project to be delivered within a budget of \$11.5M +/- 25%.
3. Design/construct a new outdoor aquatic facility that will serve the long-term needs of the community and stakeholders,

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN | 4

This section outlines the proposed workplan to best achieve the project objectives.

October 3, 2017 Council Approval

Design work is to begin immediately. To do this, we recommend that council authorize staff to award contracts to the design team immediately. We further recommend that HCMA and their sub-consulting team be engaged as they have intimate knowledge of the project and the user requirements. Engaging new consultants would generate a 3-4 week delay as they familiarize their staff with the project.

Additionally, we recommend that council authorize staff to award an earthworks contract in early November, 2017. This will allow sufficient time for earthworks to be completed over the winter months and not delay the start of the pool construction.

Design Overview

Overall, we have scheduled the following durations for design: 1 month for schematic design, 2 months for pool design, and 3 months to complete the ancillary building design. We have reviewed this with HCMA, who have confirmed that this schedule is achievable, although highly aggressive.

The plan proposes to include City planning, engineering, and building permit departments in the design process as part of an integrated team. Their feedback would be immediately incorporated into the design, thereby eliminating any waiting time for permit reviews. The permit review process would still occur; however, construction would begin concurrently with the permit reviews.

Procurement Overview

We recommend using a Construction Manager model for construction delivery. This model was selected because it allows the design work to begin immediately, while the Owner retains the design control. It also allows construction work to overlap with the design, which accelerates the overall schedule. A Design/Build model was also considered; however, a pool project requires a comprehensive and binding Owner's Statement of Requirements to control the design and quality of the final product and for the D/B contractors to provide competitive pricing. We estimate it would delay the schedule by 3 months to create a complete OSR and procure a D/B contractor. Further, in today's busy construction market, we believe this level of risk will not attract competitive pricing.

Note that the plan assumes that the City will suspend procurement policies in key instances. The appointment of the key project team, including the design consultants and construction manager, are recommended to be sole-sourced, negotiated appointments. The CM appointment is recommended to be a CCDC 5A or 5B contract with custom supplementary general conditions. Finally, the appointment of the trade contractors is recommended to be done through a pre-qualified tender process, resulting in a series of stipulated sum CCDC 17 contracts (also with custom SGCs) with the trades. It is unlikely that the schedule can accommodate a full legal development of these contracts by the City's procurement

department; instead we recommend that the City rely on contract templates previously developed for other municipalities.

Budgeting Overview

A concept budget has already been presented by HCMA for \$11.5M +/- 25%. Presuming this target is acceptable, we recommend that schematic design efforts work towards this target.

At the completion of schematic design, we propose to produce a detailed schematic budget, near the end of November, for the City's review. This budget would include a more comprehensive review of all costs, including construction costs, soft costs, and contingency. Further, it will have a more refined level of accuracy.


We anticipate Council would use this budget, along with the developed schematic design, to make a "go / no go" decision for the full project scope.

If the project proceeds, the schematic design budget would become the project baseline, against which all costs and commitments would be compared.

Schedule Overview


This section presents the proposed timelines for the workplan. Timeline A demonstrates a typical project schedule. Timelines B and C represent highly accelerate project schedules, one contemplating a concrete pool option and one contemplating the pre-owned Myrtha pool option.

Draft Project Timeline A – Typical Schedule Baseline




Note - this schedule is for reference only – it represents a typical project sequence. It does not represent the proposed accelerated workplan.

Draft Project Timeline B – Condensed Procurement & Phasing



Draft Project Timeline C – Condensed/Phased with Myrtha



These schedules are optimistic and do not incorporate schedule contingency to accommodate unforeseen delays.

Limitations

Note that the following elements are not able to be completed within the current workplan. Estimated impacts are listed with a +/- 25% level of accuracy.

Limitation	Description	Cost Impact if Required	Time Impact if Required
No Winter Use by Swim Clubs	We anticipate that use by the swim club in the winter will require radiant heating throughout the apron slab, a pool cover (FF&E), and substantially higher capacity water heating system.	Capital - +\$800,000 for radiant heating system, pool cover FF&E, and larger mechanical system Operating – tbd *	+2 weeks for pool cover shell structure + radiant piping
No Winter Use by the Public	If the intent is for the public to use this facility, additional hot tubs and steam rooms may be desired. Additionally, walkway canopies to/from the pools may be desired.	Capital - +\$500,000 per body of water and +\$200,000 for canopy. Operating – tbd *	+6-10 weeks for additional bodies of water and canopies. Could be constructed after summer 2018.
No Future Pool Canopy	The plan does not include for a pool canopy, or provisions for a future canopy. If a canopy is envisioned in the future, footings are recommended to be designed and installed with the pool structure.	Capital - +\$350,000 to \$800,000 depending on if piles are required. Operating – n/a	+0-8 weeks , depending on if piles are required.
Change Rooms & Concessions Are Not Open in Summer 2018	The workplan separates the design/construction of the change rooms, concession and other ancillary buildings to focus the project team on pool work. The ancillary buildings will be completed the Fall of 2018.	n/a	It is not feasible to include this in the work package that is required by Spring of 2018.
New Parking Is Not Open in Summer 2018	The parking is recommended to be completed in the Fall of 2018. Public will be required to use the adjacent school parking and tennis court parking during the Summer of 2018.	n/a	While it is possible to include this in the Spring 2018 work package, it increases risk by distracting the project team.

**Life-cycle cost assessments cannot be completed without further design information. However, the energy consumption for heating a 25m x 25m outdoor pool over the winter is substantial.*

FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION | 5

This section is intended to highlight the feasibility and risk associated with the implementation plan.

Budget

There appears to be sufficient budget allocated for construction cost. The current budget does note some costs that are excluded, which we expect will be required. These include:

- off-site infrastructure (intersection upgrades)
- utility charges (BC Hydro, Fortis, municipal fees)
- FF&E (lane ropes and other pool equipment)
- permitting fees (if required).

Additional due diligence is needed to fully confirm the budget. For example, a single line item has been assumed for the project soft costs (estimated at 30% of the hard costs). Soft costs are comprised of numerous fees and costs from design consultants, insurance brokers, FF&E suppliers and permitting fees.

Overall, the current project budget of \$11.5M +/- 25% provided by HCMA appears achievable. For the reasons noted above, however, it is likely that the final budget would be on the higher side of the budget range.

Should the excluded costs, or the soft costs, exceed what is currently allowed, we believe that the project could reduce construction scope to generate offsetting savings, without substantially sacrificing the functionality of the pool facility.

Risk

This workplan carries a high risk profile. A substantial amount of highly technical design and construction work takes place within a compressed timeframe. This requires unconventional and rushed approaches to the design, procurement, permitting, construction and operational start-up. Some of the major project risks include:

- Rushed design that results in a long-term facility that does not properly serve the needs of all stakeholders and users.
- Rushed design has a higher level of errors (which typically has schedule and cost implications).
- Geotechnical/structural design development generates a requirement for ground improvement (e.g. piles) which impact schedule and budget.
- Proceeding with design and earthworks prior to receiving and approving the overall project budget.
- Rushed procurement does not allow sufficient time to cost saving exercises to help with budget control.
- Poor winter weather conditions delay the construction schedule.
- Deviation from standard City procurement policies.

- Delays due to other Authorities Having Jurisdiction (BC Hydro, Fortis, Fraser Health) that are reluctant/unable to conform to a fast-track schedule.

A preliminary risk register is appended, which includes a more detailed list of the various project risks. Should the project proceed, we recommend that the project team develop mitigation plans for each of these risks.

Schedule

The schedule and work plan presented in this document should be considered optimistic. It can be achieved, but only if most activities proceed as planned.

Most construction projects involve a few significant risks that become real. Due to the short timeline involved in this schedule, there is limited ability to absorb delays should any of the risks be realized.

Should the project involve purchasing a pre-used pool, as per the proposal submitted by NC Aquatics, we anticipate that the pool construction schedule could be accelerated by 4-5 weeks. This could help provide some relief to the aggressive schedule.

Prior to confirming the use of a pre-used pool, however, additional analysis is required, including:

- Confirm the current condition of the equipment and tank
- Confirm the delivery and installation timelines (the above savings is based on verbal discussions)
- Confirm that the pool meets the requirements of the City for all programming, including any modifications that may be required (e.g. accessible access) that their time and cost impact.

The following table illustrates the impact of three common risks on the proposed schedule:

Risk 1 – Schematic design is overbudget. The design is revised to fit within budget constraints and the budget is re-confirmed. This would likely result in an 8 week delay.

Risk 2 – Sitework scope increases due to geotechnical/structural design determining onerous requirements, including piles and/or ground densification. This would likely result in an 8 week delay.

Risk 3 – Inclement winter weather delays earthworks and structural construction. This could delay the schedule between 2 to 6 weeks. 4 weeks of delay is assumed for this exercise.

Timeline	Planned Occupancy	Risk 1 Impact (budget)	Risk 2 Impact (sitework)	Risk 3 Impact (weather)	Actual Occupancy (if all 3 risk events occur)
Timeline A Typical Schedule	Pool – Feb 2019	+4 weeks	+4 weeks	+0 (mitigated)	Pool – April 2019
	Overall – Feb 2019	+4 weeks	+4 weeks	+0 (mitigated)	Overall – April 2019
Timeline B Condensed and Phased	Pool – Jun 13 2018	+8 weeks	+8 weeks	+4 weeks	Pool – Nov 2018
	Overall – Nov 2018	+4 weeks	+4 weeks	+0 (mitigated)	Overall – Jan 2019
Timeline C Condensed with Myrtha	Pool – May 11 2018	+8 weeks	+8 weeks	+0 (mitigated)	Pool – Sept 2018
	Overall – Nov 2018	+4 weeks	+4 weeks	+0 (mitigated)	Overall – Jan 2019

Note that Timeline A has a longer duration and has the earthworks/structure schedule for the summer months which typically have better weather conditions. As a result, Timeline A is better able to absorb the impact of these risk events and the overall delay impact is reduced.

CONCLUSION | 6

Using the workplan proposed in this report, it is possible to have a new pool open by May 11, 2018. However, there are significant risks that the project will face that have the potential to delay the end date into the summer months.

At a high-level it appears the budget is achievable within a range of +/-25% from the proposed \$11.5M value. It is likely that the highly accelerated schedule will result in some cost inefficiencies, although these can be accommodated within the proposed budget.

APPENDIX 1 - PRELIMINARY RISK REGISTER

DESIGN AND APPROVALS RISK	
1	Overall design objectives change during the project (e.g. programming for pool, hours/dates of operation), because of insufficient time to conduct program development and stakeholder engagement.
2	Design schedule is delayed due to insufficient design resources.
3	Design is delayed due to unforeseen requirements (e.g. new structural/geotechnical findings)
4	Soft costs are higher than the current budget due to highly accelerated schedule creating inefficiencies.
5	Design scope creep adds additional program not originally captured in initial budget or schedule.
6	Owner approvals delay the schedule when challenging decisions required (over budget, new scope, etc.)
7	Design and approvals from non-municipal Authorities Having Jurisdiction (BC Hydro, Fortis, Fraser Health) that are reluctant/unable to conform to a fast-track design and construction schedule.
CONSTRUCTION RISK	
7	Delays to construction start as a result of procurement.
8	Budget overrun due to insufficient time to complete design prior to procurement, resulting in substantial 'risk allowances' in tender numbers.
9	Current market conditions cause inflated procurement results that generate budget overrun.
10	Incompletely defined Construction Contracts leading to extra contractor demands and cost claims
11	Contractor and consultant insolvency leads to withdrawal of contractor services
12	Government policy changes (e.g. trade agreements, taxation), leading to procurement process changes. (i.e. HST repealed)
13	Geotechnical risk - additional work required to address seismic stability (Site Class E), actual in-ground conditions or groundwater pressures from slope. Additional schedule and cost implications.
14	Delays to construction start as a result of permitting.
15	Schedule overrun due to inflexibility and tight timelines. Inability to absorb risks that are realized.
16	Schedule overrun due to delayed manufacturing/shipping of materials
17	Adverse weather (rain, snow) leading to shortened construction season
18	Delays in delivery of specialty construction equipment or materials leading to surcharges for fast delivery
19	Theft / vandalism at construction sites leading to requirements for replacement
20	Inability to obtain subcontractor crews / labor. Slows progress
21	Contractor inefficiencies lead to delays
22	Labor disputes leading to delays in construction
23	Delays in supply of utility services to buildings causes hand-over delays (Hydro, Fortis)
24	Hazard loss – fire / earthquake / flood, leading to financial implications and delay in project.
25	Delays to opening because of Health Operating Permit from Fraser Health.
26	Neighbour / public concerns and expectations leading to project delays. (i.e. Aquatics/Alumni)
27	Project not completed on time/on budget, scope or quality not met according to media/public expectations, leading to negative publicity.
28	Perception from public of a project that does not follow standard policy on procurement or permitting.
29	Defective material / poor workmanship leading to performance failure
30	Workplace mishaps damage areas of construction leading to re-do, and causing personal injuries (site shutdown, schedule delays)
31	Design and construction decisions that have a negative impact on building operating costs.
32	Capital investments made without sufficient operating funding in place, leading to deferred maintenance problems.
OPPORTUNITIES	
33	Pre-order pool tank and mechanical equipment. Improve schedule by 4-5 weeks by avoiding cure time.

APPENDIX II - EXPERIENCE

This document reflects our opinions that are derived from our career experience with similar type projects, as outlined on the following table.

Project Name	Fast-Track Schedule	Budget Constraint	Rec./ Pool Project	Municipal Project
Aldergrove Community Centre & Outdoor Waterpark (Township of Langley)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ladner Leisure Centre Envelope & Rink Upgrades (Corp. of Delta)	✓	✓	✓	✓
North Surrey Arenas (City of Surrey)		✓	✓	✓
Timms Community Centre (City of Langley)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Richmond Olympic Oval (City of Richmond)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Powell River Pool Upgrades (City of Powell River)		✓	✓	✓
UBC Aquatic Centre	✓	✓	✓	
UBC Student Union Building	✓	✓		
St. George's Jr. School Renovation	✓	✓		
Chilliwack Secondary School	✓	✓		
Revelstoke Secondary/Elementary School	✓	✓		

City of Maple Ridge

TO: Her Worship Mayor Nicole Read
and Members of Council
FROM: Chief Administrative Officer
SUBJECT: Plebiscite Details for Provision of Road-Side Waste Pick-up (garbage and organics)

MEETING DATE: October 3, 2017
FILE NO: 09-4200-01
MEETING: Council Workshop

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the November 15, 2016 Council Workshop Meeting, staff were directed to provide a detailed report on the options for conducting a plebiscite to determine elector opinion on the provision of road-side waste pick-up (garbage and organics) as a municipal service.

This report details a range of options that Council can use to gauge public opinion on this issue. Options include a broad community ballot as part of the next Municipal Election or as a standalone process. Electors may be limited and directed specifically to the households that will be impacted by a move to a mandatory solid waste program. The report weighs the pros and cons of each option available to Council.

The decision of how to poll the public needs to be aligned with the release of the Solid Waste Request for Proposals to ensure that the utility rate that is presented to the public as part of the plebiscite process is accurate.

The report notes that any plebiscite is just a 'poll' of the public, and does not grant legal authority for the City to proceed with the implementation of a Solid Waste Utility Bylaw. Regardless of the plebiscite results, if Council wishes to proceed with provision of road-side pick-up, the second step would be the enactment of a Solid Waste Utility Bylaw. This bylaw requires that the legal process of 'assent of electors' be obtained, or there is an option for opposing the bylaw through petition. The report notes that while the plebiscite might indicate support for a solid waste system, that citizens could reject the proposed bylaw as part of the assent of electors/petition process.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. That staff be directed to:

Conduct a plebiscite for the provision of road-side waste pick-up (garbage and organics) as a municipal service under the following conditions:

- a. The plebiscite is open to:
 - i) the complete list of electors for Maple Ridge; OR
 - ii) the list of electors for Maple Ridge within the local service area; OR
 - iii) the registered homeowner(s) within the local service area.

And

- b. The plebiscite will take place:
 - i) as a stand-alone, independent process; OR
 - ii) at the same time as the next local government election.

And

- c. That the RFP be issued to coincide with the timelines required for information to be relevant for plebiscite.

OR

2. That staff be directed to:

Not conduct a plebiscite for the provision of road-side waste pick-up (garbage and organics) as a municipal service.

DISCUSSION:

a) Background Context:

At the July 25, 2016 Council Workshop, staff were directed to bring back a report on conducting a plebiscite for the provision of road-side waste pick-up. A non-binding plebiscite allows the electorate to provide input into Council decision making. Also at the July 25th meeting, Council determined the preferred service area and level of service to be provided. The service area was identified as the area of the City currently served by the Ridge Meadows Recycling Society (RMRS). Council determined that road-side garbage and organic waste pick up would be provided to single family and townhomes.

On November 15th, 2016 staff presented a follow up report defining the pros and cons of plebiscites, the options for conducting a plebiscite and the cost implications. This report is included as Attachment 2 for reference.

At the November 15, 2016 Council Meeting the following resolution was passed:

"That staff be directed to proceed to gather the information required to prepare a plebiscite (Request for Proposal to determine costs) and prepare a report for Council consideration on the plebiscite process."

Engineering has prepared a Request for Proposal (RFP) which was presented to Council at a Council Meeting Workshop on September 19, 2017 and Council requested additional

information related to the plebiscite process. An RFP is required to ensure that the public has the information about costs which is needed to make an informed decision.

Electorate Area

Council has selected a specific service area for road-side garbage and organics waste pick up. Because this is a specific area of the City and not the entire area a local service area would need to be established by bylaw to enable a parcel tax. Should Council decide to move forward with this service post-plebiscite results, this bylaw would require assent of the electors or be subject to a petition against the local service area.

One decision that is required to conduct a plebiscite is who would be invited to participate. There are three basic choices:

- i) the complete list of electors for Maple Ridge; OR
- ii) the list of electors for Maple Ridge within the local service area; OR
- iii) the registered homeowners within the local service area.

Table 1 below outlines some of the pros and cons for each choice.

For all scenarios, it should be noted that a plebiscite is an opinion poll only. If a plebiscite shows favourably for road side pick-up, Council may move forward with a bylaw. The electorate from the local service area who chose not to respond to vote in the plebiscite because it was an opinion poll only, may decide they are opposed to a tax increase. They could then come out to vote against the subsequent bylaw through assent of the electors or a petition and defeat the local service area (costly process with outcome contrary to Council's decision to move forward with the service).

Table 1.

Plebiscite for entire Maple Ridge electorate

Pros	Cons
Will provide Council with opinion of the full electorate City Wide, and inform any future expansion of the service.	There will be no way to discern those opinions of the local service area from those outside the local service area.
List of electors easily accessible and inexpensive through the Provincial list of electors.	Perception of the full city wide electorate that they will have a voice in the decision, however should Council move forward with a bylaw to establish services for the local service area, only the local service area electorate would have ability to vote on or petition against the final bylaw.

Plebiscite for proposed Local Service Area electorate only

Pros	Cons
Target specific electorate that falls within the local service area which would be taxed for service. Their opinion would be the one that informed Council.	Anyone living within the local service area could vote (including tenants, eligible children of age within a household – therefore some households may have more votes than others). If households are sharing the increased costs with tenants, the service may be more attractive.
Smaller focused target area than full City electorate.	If it was ever determined to expand the service beyond the initial service area, Council would not be aware of the opinions of the other areas of the City.
Would require fewer polling stations (lower cost).	Staff would be required to develop a list of voters based on address (location within the local service area). Voters would need to prove residency in the local service area.

Plebiscite for proposed Local Service Area Registered Homeowners as electorate only

Pros	Cons
Target specific electorate – homeowners, who would be taxed for service. Their opinion would be the one that informed Council. AND The electorate that would be able to vote in the plebiscite would mirror the electorate who would vote for or petition against the local service area bylaw should one be approved by Council for elector assent.	Staff would be required to develop a list of voters based on assessment rolls. Voters would need to prove residency and home ownership in the local service area. This will require a significant amount of staff hours. Option would be to send out ballots to home owners, the mail costs would equal or exceed the staff costs noted above.
Smaller target area than full City electorate	If it was ever determined to expand the service beyond the initial service area, Council would not be aware of the opinions of the other areas of the City.
Would require fewer polling stations (lower cost).	

Plebiscite Timing

An opinion poll plebiscite can occur at any time. This issue has been a concern for Council for some time, and Council may wish to proceed to ensure a decision is made before the end of this Councils' term.

The alternative is to complete the plebiscite at the same time as a local government election, to reduce some of the costs that would be incurred to complete a standalone plebiscite process. Conducting a plebiscite at the same time as the local government election can have its challenges, and some of those are listed below:

- The topic of the plebiscite becomes a major election issue
- If the choice is to only allow residents, or homeowners, in the local service area to vote in the plebiscite, it will be a challenge for poll workers to determine which voters can or cannot vote, based on address, or a separate voters list. This will cause delays for voters and may frustrate some voters enough to have them abandon the opportunity to vote. One solution could be to have a separate area in the polling station for the plebiscite; however this would add costs for extra poll workers.
- If the choice is to only allow residents, or homeowners, in the local service area to vote in the plebiscite, those who do not have the right to vote may object. It may require additional polling staff time to explain the reasons and to diffuse those frustrated that they will not have a say.
- Council may decide to further define the voters list, e.g. only one vote per household or only homeowners living at the address, which will make the process more complicated and would require voters to make solemn declarations of their right to vote.
- On a positive note, the plebiscite may draw additional voters.

The Plebiscite Ballot

Any plebiscite needs to provide the electorate with enough information to make an informed decision. In this particular case what should be communicated are the service area, the level of service expected and the total anticipated cost to each household. Council has determined the first two items.

It is recommended that the format of the plebiscite entail a targeted awareness campaign. In the voting place, maps should be posted and descriptions of the level of service and anticipated costs provided. If the choice is to only allow residents, or homeowners, in the local service area to vote in the plebiscite, it would be recommended that a direct mail out to those electors be prepared with information about how to vote, and the details of the proposed service so that these individuals can be prepared when they show up at the polling station to cast their vote.

b) Desired Outcome:

That this report will provide Council with the information required to make an informed decision on whether or not to direct staff to conduct the above noted plebiscite, which individuals should have a vote in the plebiscite, and whether to conduct the plebiscite as a standalone process or combined with a local government election.

c) Strategic Alignment:

The plebiscite process reflects a facet of open government that values public input into government decision making.

d) Citizen/Customer Implications:

This report identifies options for which citizens would be invited to participate. Although the plebiscite result is non-binding and therefore carries no taxpayer cost implications related to the outcome, there would be costs for affected tax payers if a bylaw was passed to implement the service, and the cost of the plebiscite process does have a financial impact overall and was discussed in the report of November 15 and repeated below.

e) Interdepartmental Implications:

Engineering was involved in developing a Request for Proposal for the provision of road-side waste pick-up based on the level of service options chosen by Council. Moving forward, any plebiscite, local service area bylaw or elector assent would be handled through Legislative Services. Should a service be implemented, Engineering would be the project managers.

f) Business Plan/Financial Implications:

Costs to run a stand alone plebiscite are estimated to be	\$35,000
- (includes basic advertising and 5 polling stations)	
Additional Costs to include a direct mail out	\$30,000

If Council decides to proceed with a local service area bylaw:

Cost for assent of the electors/petition	\$55,000
Total potential cost of two processes	\$120,000

Estimated Costs to include a plebiscite with a local election	
On the same ballot	\$15,650
Separate ballot	\$35,000

*Please note, these costs do not include staff time to create voters' lists other than the standard provincial list. The cost is not easy to estimate as this has not been done before at Maple Ridge, so the time required is unknown.

g) Policy Implications:

A Bylaw would need to be established for any local service area defined for Road-Side Garbage and Organics Waste Pick-up.

h) Alternatives:

1. Not proceed with a plebiscite. Council makes the decision without this additional direct input from the electorate.
2. Use an alternative approach to gather public input such as described in the Council Workshop report from July 25, 2016 (e.g. telephone poll, survey).

CONCLUSIONS:

There are various ways in which a plebiscite may be conducted as described in this report. Staff is requesting direction from Council on who would be invited to participate, whether to proceed as a standalone process or combine with a local government election, or to not proceed at this time.

"Original signed by L. Darcus"

Prepared by: L. Darcus
Manager of Legislative Services and Emergency Program

"Original signed by Paul Gill"

Approved by: **Paul Gill**
Chief Administrative Officer

City of Maple Ridge

TO: Her Worship Mayor Nicole Read
and Members of Council

MEETING DATE: October 3, 2017

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer

MEETING: Council Workshop

SUBJECT: Rental Housing Program: Detached Garden Suite Update and Next Steps

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to update Council on staff's initial findings and seek endorsement to engage the community regarding the current review of the City's Detached Garden Suites (DGS) program as part of an ongoing series of efforts intended to encourage greater rental housing in the City. The pursuit of rental housing stems from the 2014 endorsed Housing Action Plan and was reaffirmed through the endorsement of the Housing Action Plan Implementation Framework in September, 2015. Subsequently, staff brought forward a report dated August 29, 2016 which included recommendations to review and expand the DGS Program as one strategy to encourage rental housing in Maple Ridge.

Introduced in 2008, the existing DGS program has resulted in 40 garden suites in the City. From the first steps of the DGS review process, a set of proposed zoning, construction and processing options have been identified. Informed by industry discussions and in collaboration with other departmental staff and non-profit organisations such as Small Housing BC and the BC Tiny House Collective, such early findings point to possible opportunities that may remove unintended regulatory and financial challenges to the development of a DGS, and in turn lead to greater housing choice and rental options in the City.

While much discussion has been held, Council endorsement of a wider conversation with the community is sought by staff. The proposed engagement process is envisioned to be multi-faceted with many opportunities to gain greater insight into the community's interests related to Detached Garden Suites. A component of the proposed engagement process is a design competition to help produce a standard set of DGS designs, as one possible means to lower the cost and time involved in developing a DGS. The results of the engagement process and the design completion will be the subject of future Council reports and will help shape a culminating pilot project proposed for 2018, to heighten community awareness of the updated DGS program.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the "Proposed Community Engagement Program" section of the report titled "Rental Housing Program: Detached Garden Suite Update and Next Steps", dated October 3, 2017 be endorsed.

BACKGROUND:

On November 4, 2008, Council approved bylaw amendments to accommodate detached garden suites, or small, accessory and ground-oriented dwelling units. The approved bylaw amendments were the result of an extensive community discussion and were based upon the considerable interest expressed by local residents in accommodating this form of housing in our community.

In 2012/2013, the City undertook a review of its Secondary Suites program, which was originally approved in 1999. Through the community dialogue that took place, residents expressed support for secondary suites as a means of providing household mortgage assistance, facilitating aging in place, as well as a measure of affordable rental housing.

On September 14, 2015 Council endorsed the Housing Action Plan (HAP) Implementation Framework. The HAP Implementation Framework builds from the key strategies recommended in the Housing Action Plan and established short, medium and long-term actions to facilitate and preserve affordable housing in Maple Ridge. Strategy Four of the HAP is to Create New Rental Housing Opportunities.

On August 29, 2016, Council prioritised a list of available measures to facilitate the development of greater rental opportunities in the City, and directed staff to prepare detailed reports and amending bylaw packages for the following actions:

1. Review and expand the Detached Garden Suites Program;
2. Review and expand the Secondary Suites Program;
3. Permit duplexes in Single Family zones without rezoning, on minimum, lot sizes of 557 m² in the town Centre and 750 m² within the Urban Area Boundary; and
4. Develop a policy to support rental units above commercial.

On September 19, 2017, Council directed staff to initiate a community engagement process to gain feedback on a number of possible options to expand the City's Secondary Suites program, and to report back the results for next step directions.

DISCUSSION:

Following Council's prioritisation of the above noted areas that could foster greater rental opportunities in the City, staff undertook a regulatory and policy review of the City's existing Detached Garden Suites program as well as conducted a number of discussions with industry stakeholders. This report brings forward staff's initial findings and recommends wider community discussion as a next step.

Staff note that the remaining items stemming from the August 29, 2016 Council directions will be addressed through separate reports over the remainder of 2017 and early 2018, the first of which related to a Secondary Suite program review and was presented to Council on September 19, 2017.

a) Detached Garden Suites Program Review:

The City of Maple Ridge established a DGS program on November 4, 2008. Since that time, Detached Garden Suites (or laneway homes, coach houses, or carriage homes as they are called elsewhere in the Metro and Fraser Valley regions) have become more commonplace in the Lower Mainland. Several benefits from such accessory dwelling units include:

- Supporting neighbourhood character;
- Making efficient use of existing infrastructure;
- Contributing to greater housing diversity;
- Increasing ground-oriented rental stock;
- Providing additional income to owners;
- Supporting ageing in-place;
- Encouraging multi-generational living.

Despite these positives, in Maple Ridge there has been relatively low uptake of the DGS program since its inception. As of Spring this year, there are currently 40 DGS units in Maple Ridge, including both those that are completed as well as in process. From staff's assessment and our early industry discussions related to our existing DGS program, a number of factors have been identified as possibly contributing to this relatively low level of uptake:

- A lack of awareness of the DGS program;
- There is a limited laneway system in the City (noting that laneways are not a requirement), which may create challenges for access;
- A property with a DGS cannot be stratified or subdivided, which increases the length of time for a return on investment;
- There are siting, massing, and building requirements that may be considered too limiting; and
- Land values in Maple Ridge have historically been fairly low compared to other municipalities in the Lower Mainland, making the cost of constructing a DGS relatively high in comparison to the value of the overall subject property.

Staff acknowledges the limited lane network and the intent of preventing stratification in order to ensure the DGS units remain available for rental; and thereby note that these matters are considered beyond the scope of current review effort. Further, staff recognises the opportunity that the current review and proposed community engagement process provide to address matters related to awareness of the DGS program.

Staff therefore concentrated their initial assessment on the remaining issues tied to the existing zoning and the land economics or financials that surround a DGS.

i) Zoning Assessment:

In terms of the regulatory issues, staff compared the City's DGS zoning provisions against those of other communities in the Metro and Fraser Valley regions that permit accessory dwelling units. The summary results of our comparison are presented in Table 1 in Appendix A.

In parallel, staff connected with Small Housing BC (<http://www.smallhousingbc.org/>), towards gaining research and insights related to small forms of housing. Small Housing BC is a non-profit society that has worked to support and promote small housing as a sustainable housing form since 2012.

Staff also reached out to two prominent single-family home developers that expressed interest in incorporating DGS as part of future developments/subdivisions as well as four modular/manufactured home representatives that had expressed an interest in developing a DGS in Maple Ridge. The intent was to discuss the existing DGS regulations and policies towards identifying possible issues that may unintentionally be hindering wider-spread development of DGS in the City.

Based on the research gathered and staff's recent conversations, our regulatory assessment as summarised in Appendix A indicates that the City is generally consistent with other similar accessory dwelling unit programs in the Lower Mainland.

From the current more detailed assessment along with the earlier presented staff report from August 2016, staff have outlined in the following Section (see Detached Garden Suites Program - Next Steps) a set of regulatory options that may benefit our existing DGS program.

ii) Land Economic and Financial Assessment:

The local housing landscape has changed considerably over the last 2-5 years, especially in terms of land values which have increased significantly. As noted above, through staff's research and initial industry outreach, it has been raised that with rising land values there is an associated rise in construction costs. From an assessment of Building Permit applications for DGS recently submitted to the City, staff observed that typical construction costs in Maple Ridge are approximately \$130 per square foot, which equate to \$125,000 for the largest sized DGS. In addition to presenting a possible cost burden to any homeowner interested in creating a detached accessory rental suite, the relatively high cost associated with constructing a DGS could begin to foster an unintended barrier when compared to costs of creating a secondary suite.

In comparison, through a similar assessment of Building Permit applications for secondary suites in the City, it was learned that the costs associated with renovating and converting an existing basement into a secondary suite is approximate \$38 per square foot. Such lower construction costs make secondary suites a more economically attractive option over a DGS should a land owner wish to develop a rental option on their property.

In addition to the direct costs, staff also note the indirect costs associated with the processing and construction time of a framed DGS. Combined with the earlier identified regulatory issues, these cost related factors start to raise questions about how different program requirements and/or alternative methods of constructing such accessory dwelling units might start to make the DGS program more attractive to land owners.

DETACHED GARDEN SUITES PROGRAM NEXT STEPS:

Working from the opportunities initially outlined in the earlier August 2016 staff report, and along with the above analysis, staff from the Planning and Licences, Permits & Bylaws Departments has identified a number of proposed technical solutions for Council's consideration that could expand the City's current Detached Garden Suite program.

a) Explore more regulatory flexibility;

From the comparison of our program with those of other communities, certain zoning requirements inherent to our DGS program may be limiting the wider implementation of DGS in our community. Possible measures warranting further discussion include:

- *Allowing smaller and/or larger DGS unit sizes*– currently, DGS may not be smaller than 37m² (398ft²) or greater than 90m² (968ft²), or 10% of the lot area, whichever is greater. While the size of the DGS unit, both in terms of minimum and maximum floor areas, is reflective of what is permitted by other municipalities, the costs of constructing a DGS may underlie the comments received regarding how the size limitations (specifically, the minimum size restrictions) inherent in our DGS program may be challenging the delivery of some smaller housing forms. In particular, the issue of accommodating Tiny Homes (see below for more Tiny Home discussion) is directly limited by these regulations.
- *Allowing wider spread development of two-storey DGS* – currently, DGS must not exceed 4.5 m or one story, except properties that are 0.4 hectares (1 acre) or greater zoned RS-2 and RS-3 (with rear lane access) or zoned A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4, in which case the height may be increased to 6.0 m and 7.5 m respectively. In such instances, DGS are allowed to be constructed above a garage. Opportunities for 1 ½ to 2 storeys are more common place elsewhere in the region.
- *Allowing a DGS and a Secondary Suite* – Currently, a landowner must choose between a DGS and a secondary suite. This is consistent with most of the communities identified in Table 1 (Appendix A), noting that only the Cities of Vancouver, North Vancouver, New Westminster and

Port Coquitlam have zoning that permits both types of accessory dwelling units on the same lot along with the principal dwelling. From a construction cost perspective, and as identified earlier, this limitation may unintentionally favour the delivery of one type of suite over another. Based on discussions with Small Housing BC, it has been raised that the combination of both a secondary suite and a DGS on the same lot removes any sense of comparative cost advantage of one form over another. Instead, it is suggested that there exist economic synergies when both types of units are permitted on a lot, reducing the period it takes to pay back the financial outlay required to develop a secondary suite and a DGS, offering a potential incentive to landowners to invest in creating more rental units in the City.

- *Allowing reduced or varied rear and side setbacks*– currently a DGS must be 2.4 m from the rear property line and at least 1.5 m from a side lot line or 3.0 m from an exterior side lot line. Specifically the setback of the DGS from the rear property line appears higher than those from the other communities reviewed, with the other setbacks also seemingly having more flexibility than those permitted locally.
- *Revisiting the owner occupancy requirement* – currently the DGS program requires that the owner either reside in the DGS or the principal dwelling unit. As identified through the recent review of the City's Secondary Suites program, owner occupancy is viewed positively by many residents, citing that it adds a measure of control over the tenant and landlord to ensure accountability and responsibility of both parties; ensures proper maintenance of the property and the neighbourhood character; and prevents any illegal activity on the property on which the suite is located. From the comparison with other communities in the Metro and Fraser Valley regions, there appears to be an even split between those municipalities surveyed that require and do not require owner occupancy. It is also noted that the City has other bylaws through which some of the identified concerns (i.e. unsightly premises) may also be addressed.

b) Exploring alternative construction methods (i.e. modular, manufactured) to improve costs:

The benefit of modular and manufactured homes is that they are generally constructed off-site and shipped upon completion. What is required at the site location is the foundation must be provided, the building permits approved, and services connected. Construction is not affected by weather, and because such homes are a standardized product and use the same materials, the marginal cost per unit can be reduced significantly. This approach can also greatly reduce construction time.

Through staff research, connections were made with one example of a modular designer and manufacturer of accessory dwelling units. Nomad Micro Homes is a Metro-based business that delivers unassembled modular micro homes to be assembled by the home owner (<http://www.nomadmicrohomes.com/>). Such homes can be ordered/assembled as individual modules or combined to tailor the accessory dwelling unit according to the land owner's needs and lot area available. Their modular "cubes" cost about \$32,000 and provide about 14.5 m² (155 ft²) of floor area. With foundation, servicing and permitting costs falling to the land owner, a completed and approved unit can be achieved for approximately \$45,000 for a small studio (equating to 1 cube) and about \$85-90,000 for a 1 bedroom unit (equating to 2 cubes).

Another similar group, Honomobo (<http://www.honomobo.com/>), refurbishes shipping containers that are built to a Canadian Standards Association (CSA) A277 (factory built buildings) standard. Their units range in size from 209 ft² to 1,380 ft² and can be connected to water, sewer and electrical. Three standard foundation types are provided or customers can design their own custom foundation. These units can be solar powered as well. A 240 ft² one bedroom unit is quoted as \$55,931 CAD. Units can be completed in 10 weeks, according to the website. As of March 1, 2017 Lanefab (<http://www.lanefab.com/>), a design/build firm that specializes in Laneway homes located in Vancouver, will assist clients with permits, sewer and water connections, foundations and landscapes to install a modular residential structure.

Staff also included two manufactured home representatives, Brookwood Homes (<http://brookwoodhomes.com/>) and Glenbrook Homes (<https://www.glenbrookhomes.net/>), both of which identified existing floor plans that could be considered as a DGS. The Brookwood model is approximately 600 sq. ft and costs roughly \$80,000. A larger Glenbrook option was identified at 960 sq. ft. and is estimated at \$106,900. Manufactured homes are assembled off-site according to the CSA Z240 standard and delivered to the homeowner, with the need for a foundation and servicing representing an additional cost.

At such investment levels, a modular or manufactured DGS begins to be comparable to the costs associated with a typical secondary suite renovation/installation. However, it is acknowledged that such a DGS is smaller than a typical secondary suite. Nevertheless, from our discussions with such modular and manufactured home providers, it does appear that such options can improve the land economics inherent in pursuing a DGS, potentially improving the attractiveness of the DGS option. In light of the changing land economics which, when compared to past land values, may now create more equity for existing property owners, the value of these alternative DGS forms is heightened further.

Staff anticipates ongoing conversation and research with these and other providers, as well as the community, in order to better evaluate this approach and the possible savings it could present.



Top Row L-R: Nomad Cube exterior illustration, and interior kitchen and living photos.

Middle Row L-R: Honomobo HO1 and HO1+ interior, front exterior and plan views.

Bottom Row L-R: Illustrative examples of Brookwood Homes and Glenbrook Homes units.

c) Exploring options to accelerate the development process

One possible option to further accelerate processing time is to create a set of pre-approved “off the shelf” building plan templates for various DGS forms, be they frame-built or modular in construction. Such plans would need to be pre-reviewed by the City’s Licences, Permits & Bylaws Department and could be made available to homeowners for a small fee. The time savings combined with the convenience of not having to prepare and pay for an expensive set of customized plans could offer local residents a truly unique incentive to developing a DGS in Maple Ridge.

Staff will continue reaching out to industry stakeholders and firms specialising in modular/ manufactured homes and other forms of pre-fabricated homes to continue to explore if a set of DGS plan options can be organised into a pre-approved package for local residents. Further, staff along with Small Housing BC will work towards preparing a design competition as a possible cost-effective means of generating a set of frame-built DGS plans, for Permits & Bylaws Department to review and possibly pre-approve.

d) Explore option of accommodating Tiny Homes as a DGS

Earlier this year, following a presentation to Council by Tiny House representatives, staff were directed to include Tiny Houses in their regulatory and policy review towards potentially accommodating such dwellings as a further form of affordable housing in the City. Staff have had discussions with the non-profit BC Tiny House Collective <http://bctinyhousecollective.com/gotiny/>, which has embarked on a first phase of coordinating and conducting *Go Tiny*, a project on tiny houses with a research, piloting and engagement focus. Such discussions focused on possible code and zoning challenges to accommodating such homes in the City.

Key questions identified to-date include: whether such units could be accommodated as fixed structures or on wheels?; would they be owned and brought to/from a fixed rented location?; would the Tiny Home and its location be offered as a unit for rent, similar to a DGS?; and how would BC Assessment interpret such units?

As a possible next step in the Tiny House conversation, staff raise for further exploration (in addition to the above questions) the City’s prior practice of permitting temporary accommodation in recreation vehicles (similar under CSA standards to Tiny Homes), albeit it was for tourism purposes at the time of Expo ’86.

e) Explore the creation of a pilot project to showcase the City’s updated DGS program

In culmination of the above exploration areas and to ensure that awareness of the DGS program, however it might be expanded, is widely shared, staff are proposing to host a pilot project in early 2018 to showcase the result of the review process. This could entail sharing any proposed regulatory revisions, having the community identify their preferred frame-built DGS designs stemming from the proposed design competition and the making available of built examples of modular DGS and Tiny House options.


A key role of the pilot project will be to educate and heighten community understanding of the DGS program and the potential to introduce greater housing choice and rental options into our built form.

PROPOSED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

As much of the conversations held to-date regarding the review and expansion of the DGS program have been held with industry representatives and stakeholders, a wider community discussion is needed to gain insight into resident interests related to the DGS program. Such engagement is anticipated to be multi-faceted, offering a variety of opportunities for input.

Staff are seeking Council's endorsement of the proposed community engagement process to discuss further the options to expand the City's DGS program towards fostering greater rental opportunities in Maple Ridge. The proposed community outreach is anticipated over the course of October through to early December 2017 and is outlined generally below:

- Host stakeholder workshops – to further explore in small group sessions the regulatory, process and construction options identified through the initial steps of the DGS program review. Such stakeholder sessions may include discussions with our Builder's Forum, the Development Liaison Group as well as local real estate professionals.
- Host community open houses – as opportunities for the community to gather and review the options presented and to identify community interests and comments.
- Host a design competition – to provide an opportunity for design professionals to contribute to the evolution of a DGS. The results of the design competition will be shared with Council and could be brought forward to a community pilot project for further prioritization.
- Informal coffee chats – Following the initial community workshops and open houses, staff will host a series of short one-on-one coffee chats with any residents interested in developing a DGS.
- Survey and social media input – online and in-person surveys along with social media opportunities will be made available to augment the input received.



DGS Program Review Process Diagram

As well, further industry outreach is anticipated, as is our continued workings with Small Housing BC and the BC Tiny House Collective. As noted above, such efforts once reported back to Council and used to inform the next steps, are proposed to culminate in a further community-oriented pilot project in 2018.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Planning staff have worked closely during the initial stage of the DGS review process with staff from Licences, Permits & Bylaws. Specifically, the Chief Building Official has been involved, reviewing construction drawings and plans for possible alternative modular and manufactured DGS examples, reviewing a built Tiny House example, and providing input on BC Building Code and municipal building permit requirements.

Over the course of the pending stages of the DGS review process, Planning will also involve other departments such as the Engineering and Fire departments to ensure that respective interests are identified.

CONCLUSION:

Staff has completed an initial review of the City's DGS program and have identified further opportunities related to flexible zoning, construction methods and permit processing that may encourage wider implementation of such housing forms. Facilitating the development of a range of innovative Detached Garden Suite options creates opportunities for both homeowners and renters in Maple Ridge. Further, a wider range of rental housing options fosters in turn more housing choice and contributes to a more complete community. Acknowledging that the initial findings outlined in this report would benefit from a wider conversation, staff are seeking Council endorsement to undertake a community engagement process over October and into early December, the results of which will be reported back and will help shape the updated DGS program and a culminating pilot project proposed for 2018.

"Original signed by Brent Elliott"

Prepared by: Brent Elliott, MCIP, RPP,
Manager of Community Planning

"Original signed by Stephen Cote-Rolvink"

Concurrence by: Stephen Cote-Rolvink, RBO, CRBO
Chief Building Official
Permits & Inspection Services

"Original signed by Christine Carter"

Approved by: Christine Carter, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Director of Planning

"Original signed by Frank Quinn"

Approved by: Frank Quinn, MBA, P. Eng.
General Manager, Public Works and
Development Services

"Original signed by Paul Gill"

Approved by: Paul Gill, CPA, CGA
Chief Administrative Officer

APPENDIX A

Table 1.0: Municipal Comparison of Accessory Dwelling Unit (DGS) Regulations

Municipality	Min Area	Max Area	Max Height	Setbacks			Permit DGS and Sec Suite	Require Owner Occupy	Required Parking Spaces
				Rear	Side	Ex. Side			
Abbotsford	-	Lesser of total GFA of the detached garage, or 55 m ² (592 ft ²)	7.5 m (25 ft)	2.5 to 7.5 m (8-25 ft)	0.6 to 7.5 m (2-25 ft)	3.0 to 7.5 m (10-25 ft)	N	N	1
Coquitlam	-	50 m ² (538 ft ²)	7.0 m (23 ft) (sloped roof)	1.2 m (4 ft)	1.2 m (4 ft)	3.0 m (10 ft)	N	N	1
Maple Ridge	37 m ² (398 ft ²)	Lesser of 90 m ² (968 ft ²) or 10% of lot area	4.5 m to 7.5 m (15-25 ft)	2.4 m (8 ft)	1.5 m (5 ft)	3.0 m (10 ft)	N	Y	1
Mission	-	Lesser of 75 to 110 m ² (807-1184 ft ²) or 50% of principal dwelling GFA	Lesser of max height of the principal dwelling or 8.0 m (26 ft)	1.3 m (4.3 ft)	1.5 m (5.0 ft)	3.0 m (10 ft)	N	Y	1
New Westminster*	-	Lesser 89 m ² (958 ft ²) or 10% of lot area	7 m (23 ft)	6.71 m (22 ft), less the width of any lane	Lesser of 10% of lot width or 1.2 to 1.5 m (4-5 ft)	Lesser of 10% of lot width or 1.2 to 1.5 m (4-5 ft)	Y	N	1
North Vancouver City	-	92.9 m ² (1,000 ft ²)	6.7 m (22 ft)	1.52 m (5 ft)	1.52 m (5 ft)	3.05 m (10 ft)	Y	Y	1

Table 1.0: Municipal Comparison of Accessory Dwelling Unit (DGS) Regulations (Continued)

North Vancouver District	-	68 to 90 m ² (736 - 968 ft ²)	4.5 m to 6.7 m (15-22 ft)	1.52 m (5 ft)	1.2 m to 2.4 m (4 - 8 ft)	1.2 m to 2.4 m (4 - 8 ft)	N	Y	1
Pitt Meadows	33 m ² (355 ft ²)	90 m ² (968 ft ²)	4.0 m to 6.0 m (13-20 ft)	2.4 m to 4.5 m (8-15 ft)	1.5 m (5 ft)	3.0 m to 4.5 m (10-15 ft)	N	Y	1
Port Coquitlam	-	70 m ² (753 ft ²)	8.5 m (27.9 ft) (sloped roof)	1.2 m (4 ft)	Lesser of 10% lot width or 1.2 to 1.8 m (4-6 ft)	Lesser of 20% lot width or 2.4 to 3.5 m (8-11 ft)	Y**	N	1
Richmond	33 m ² (355 ft ²)	60 m ² (645 ft ²)	6.4 to 7.0 m (21-23 ft)	1.2 m (4 ft)	0.6 to 1.8 m (2 - 6 ft)	3.0 m (10 ft)	N	N	1
Surrey	37 m ² (400 ft ²)	65 m ² (700 ft ²)	7.0 m (23 ft) (sloped roof)	0.2 m to 1.5 m (0.5 - 5 ft)	0 m to 1.2 m (0 - 4 ft)	1.2 m to 1.8 m (4 - 6 ft)	N	Y	1
West Vancouver District	-	Lesser of 115 m ² or 10% or lot area	4.5 m to 6.4 m (15-21 ft)	1.2 m (4 ft)	1.5 m (5 ft) or 10% site width, to max 3 m (10 ft)	1.5 m (5 ft) or 10% site width, to max 3 m (10 ft)	N	Y (or Prop. Manager)	1
White Rock		90 m ² (968 ft ²) or 40% of GFA	7.0 m (23 ft) (sloped roof)	1.5 m (5 ft)	1.5 to 2.4 m (5-8 ft)	3.8 to 7.5 m (12-25 ft)	N	N	1
Vancouver	26 m ² (280 ft ²)	84 m ² (900 ft ²)	4.6 m to 6.1 m (15-20 ft)	0.6 m to 0.9 m (2 - 3 ft)	10% of lot width (min 0.6 m - 2 ft)	Varied – same as setbacks for main house	Y	N	1

* New Westminster Council gave zone amendments to permit Coach Houses third reading on September 18, 2017.

** Port Coquitlam Council approved new Coach House regulations in April 2017.