Public Hearing Agenda

November 7 and 9, 2017 – 6:00 p.m.

A Public Hearing will be held in the Chapel Room at the Best Western Plus, Mission City Lodge at 32281 Lougheed Highway, Mission, B.C.

1. CALL TO ORDER (6:00 P.M.)

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. PUBLIC HEARING
   (a) Public Hearing Notice for November 7 and 9, 2017  Page 2
   (b) Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017  --
       A bylaw to provide policy statements on managing the District of Mission’s current and future growth and development
       *Full version of Bylaw has been distributed separately and will be available for viewing at meeting. It is also available online at www.makeityourmission.ca
   (c) Staff Report dated August 14, 2017  Page 3
   (d) Staff Report dated October 16, 2017  Page 15

4. RESOLUTION TO RECESS THE PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL 6:00 P.M. ON NOVEMBER 9, 2017

5. RESOLUTION TO RECONVENE

6. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

7. ADJOURNMENT
Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 464 and 466 of the Local Government Act, a Public Hearing to be held at the Best Western Plus, Mission City Lodge, at 32281 Lougheed Highway, Mission, BC, at 6:00 pm. on Tuesday, November 7, 2017 and Thursday, November 9, 2017 to consider the following proposed bylaw:

DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW 5670-2017


Copies of the proposed bylaw and reports relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, and at the Mission Library, 33247 2nd Avenue, during regular opening hours, from Friday, October 27, 2017 to Thursday, November 9, 2017.

The information is also available on our OCP website at www.makeityourmission.ca. For further information regarding this bylaw, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748.

At the Public Hearing, all persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by this proposed bylaw will have the opportunity to be heard.

Should you have any comments or concerns you wish to convey to Council and you cannot attend the meetings, please submit in writing to the Corporate Officer by 4:00 pm on Friday, November 3, 2017.

You may forward your submission by:

- Mailing or delivering to the Corporate Officer’s Office, P.O. Box 20, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC, V2V 4L9
- Faxing: 604-826-1363 (Attn: Corporate Officer)
- E-mail: info@mission.ca with PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS as the subject line

Please note submissions that are subject of a public hearing, public meeting or other public processes will be included, in their entirety, in the public information package and will form part of the public record. Council shall not receive further information or submissions after the conclusion of the Public Hearing.

Following the Public Hearing portion of the meeting, Council may consider advancing bylaws forward for additional readings.

Michael Younie  
Corporate Officer

Dated at Mission, BC  
this 17th day of October, 2017.
DATE: August 14, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning
SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Bylaw – 1st Reading
ATTACHMENTS: APPENDIX A – District of Mission Official Community Plan
APPENDIX B – Suburban Residential Designation Map
APPENDIX C – Crown Lands at Fraser River Heritage Park Map

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017 be read a first time;
2. That Council confirm it has considered the Official Community Plan in conjunction with the District’s Financial and Waste Management Plans as per section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act and,
3. That the Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017 be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Official Community Plan (OCP) review process began later in 2015 with the preparation of a request for proposals for a consultant. Urban Systems was selected as the successful consultant to develop a new OCP for the District of Mission. In the fall of 2015 work began by compiling background information and land studies. The process involved a number of public consultation activities including community workshops, an online survey and a series of neighbourhood meetings. Among the various stakeholders, First Nations members were consulted and workshops were held with Council and District staff.

Through the consultation process a number of common themes began to emerge. In general community stakeholders expressed an interest in seeing Mission remain as a family-oriented, and safe place to live, where heritage is celebrated and access to outdoor recreation opportunities is easy and there for all to enjoy.

Using the information gathered from this broad community engagement, an overarching vision for the OCP was developed. The OCP’s guiding principles led to preparing the objectives or the next steps that will need to be taken to achieve this vision for the community. Policies throughout the OCP are aimed at guiding decision-making that will help meet those objectives and ultimately realize the vision for Mission.

The OCP is currently a draft bylaw that will follow a legislated process leading to final adoption decision by Council. The first draft of the OCP was reviewed by staff and Council and then presented to the public and First Nations. Comments were received through the online survey community neighbourhood meetings and workshops. The input received was carefully considered from which refinement of the OCP’s policies and development of the various land use maps followed. From this work, the District is now ready to present the OCP Bylaw for first reading.
PURPOSE:
This report was prepared to present the new OCP to Council and the public by:

- providing an overview of the Official Community Plan review process;
- introducing any new policies and directions (including amended and retained sections of the current OCP) with the new OCP and provide information on those changes;
- providing the public with information on the concepts and ideas discussed with Council during the preparation of the OCP;
- provide the public and Council with information acquired through the First Nations consultation process;
- outlining the next steps in the process leading to the adoption of Mission’s new OCP; and
- acquiring a resolution from Council to have the OCP Bylaw formally referred to the Agricultural Land Commission.

BACKGROUND:
The following provides general background information about an OCP and the process undertaken to develop this Bylaw.

a) What is an OCP?

An OCP represents a community’s vision for the future and provides a framework to guide growth and decisions about the use and management of land and resources in the municipality. The OCP describes how and where residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural and other types of development will occur. It guides the provision of necessary road, water, sewer and other infrastructure. An OCP has policies concerning the environmental, economic and health and well-being of a community.

An OCP offers multiple benefits as it helps to identify and address emerging issues and challenges that affect a community’s well-being. These typically involve important matters such as the impacts of development on community character; the changing needs of residents; housing affordability; economic health; public health and safety; heritage conservation; habitat and biodiversity; rising energy costs; community greenhouse gas emission reductions; and climate change adaptation.

The District of Mission completed the current OCP in 2008. During this time, the District has been experiencing increasing demand for single family homes, townhomes, commercial and industrial developments.

One of the fundamental purposes of an OCP is to provide direction to staff, Council, developers, school agencies and the public regarding the District’s physical development. Because of the pace and scale of land use change in the community, the current OCP lacks a clear relationship between land use designations as identified on the land use map and corresponding policies.

b) The OCP Process

The entire OCP process began with initial meetings and the preparation of a communications strategy in November 2015 to an anticipated completion date of December 2017.

The OCP process was divided into four distinct phases. During the first phase of the project, the consultants and District staff gathered the necessary background information to start the

STAFF REPORT TO COUNCIL
OCP review process. The second phase of the project included the public consultation and engagement which consisted of two public open houses, six neighbourhood meetings, four topic specific workshops and an on-line survey. The third phase involved integrating the input received through the community engagement process into various policies; along with revising the land use categories of the current OCP to create more concise and clear land use designations. The final phase of the project consisted of presenting the draft of the OCP to the public and receiving comments.

c) Council Workshops.

The final stages of the OCP process involved workshops with Council during the spring of this year. Following the workshops District staff and the Consultant reviewed all the input received during the entire OCP review process and made amendments to the draft OCP as appropriate.

d) Refinement

The refined OCP draft was then reviewed extensively by District staff; particularly staff members in the Development Services Department. The OCP was further refined and a draft was prepared into Bylaw form.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The draft OCP presented to the public in the spring was met with a generally favorable response. Interestingly, the topics that most of the public provided comments on were the identical to the main topics of conversation at previous workshops with Council and staff during the OCP review process. Each of those topics will be discussed in the following section of this report. The intent here is to provide a general overview of the topics along with supporting rationale for any subsequent changes made to the OCP as part of the review process.

a) South West Mission

In 2008 much of the Silverdale area was designated for future urban residential development. In order to help guide neighbourhood planning in the area, the Council (of the day) adopted the Silverdale Urban Residential Neighbourhood Plans Terms of Reference (Land Use Policy LAN.48). The Silverdale Neighbourhood One Plan was prepared based on these Terms of Reference and was directly incorporated into the OCP; the area was also rezoned based on the Neighbourhood One Plan.

The Neighbourhood One Plan was based on a comprehensive inventory and analysis of the land and it includes a vision for the area, land use plans, economic studies, transportation networks, and more. Directly outside the Neighbourhood One Plan area, the majority of the remaining lands in Silverdale were designated “Urban”. Despite these planning directions, no development of the area has occurred to date.

This OCP process has determined that the Urban designation and LAN.48 as defined in the current OCP should be revisited in light of new information on servicing, changing land use trends and the overall vision and direction established in this OCP.

During the preparation of this OCP, some residents of Silverdale expressed interest in having their properties designated for single-family development at urban densities. Comments received from other residents of Silverdale included a reluctance to continue with the Urban designation altogether because no infrastructure planning has been completed to date.

The OCP recognizes the urban density development that is comprehensively planned and consistent with the vision, guiding principles, and the broad and specific policies of this OCP. Therefore, the entire area of Silverdale is designated as a Comprehensive Planning Area. While this designation allows for a broad range of development opportunities, it is anticipated
that through the neighbourhood planning processes appropriate residential densities and supporting land uses will be identified.

a) Waterfront Area

Mission’s current OCP designates the industrial lands adjacent to the Fraser River and the commuter rail area south of the railway as Waterfront. The overall intent of the Waterfront designation was to encourage the development of this area as an exceptional, high quality waterfront residential neighbourhood connected with the commuter rail and the downtown. Additional uses to be provided for would include:

- commercial uses that cater to area residents, the community at large and the regional market;
- mixed residential and commercial uses;
- office uses;
- institutional uses;
- parks and open space;
- light industrial/business uses that are compatible with an urban residential neighbourhood; and,
- expanded marina uses and possibly a houseboat community.

Despite considerable interest in the waterfront, no significant development has occurred due to the considerable pre-development work needed to prepare the site, along with environmental challenges, market conditions and fragmented property ownership in the area. The new OCP designates these areas as Mixed Use Commercial / Residential which supports the uses identified above, but notes that in order for development to move forward in a cohesive way, it will be necessary to conduct technical investigations to address anticipated constraints to development. These studies would include:

- Geotechnical
- Flood management
- Soil contamination
- Terrestrial and aquatic resources
- Infrastructure modeling (water, sewer, rainwater and transportation etc.)
- Noise attenuation

b) Future Employment Lands now changed to Special Study Area (ALR adjacent to Fraser River)

During the community input stage of the development of the OCP, many respondents noted that they would like to see more opportunities for local residents to work within the Mission area. Availability of local employment within the community was identified as a challenge for many residents.

As part of the background analysis for the OCP, a Land Demand Study was prepared. One of the key findings of the study was that there are insufficient industrial and employment lands within Mission. At the same time, it was noted that the large tract of land within the Agricultural Land Reserve, adjacent to the Fraser River, was largely underutilized for agricultural purposes and could serve to address local employment needs. As such the area was identified on the draft OCP maps as Future Employment Lands. This designation was to identify the lands as those in need of future planning. The thought was that the planning would help to determine highest and best uses for these lands over the long term.
To ensure transparency within the OCP process and recognize that these lands may be suitable for a range of uses in the future, inclusive of agriculture, the area has now been designated as Agriculture. The area will remain within a Special Study Area.

A new section has been added to the draft OCP which speaks to economic objectives as they relate to these lands and new policies have also been added to guide future planning processes as follows:

- Conduct further planning and analysis to determine potential support for industrial/employment uses in the Special Study Area, including a city-wide industrial inventory and capacity analysis, local/regional industrial market analysis, servicing/infrastructure capacity assessment, and a traffic impact analysis;
- Conduct an Industrial Lands Assessment of all land within the District to determine the potential for future industrial operations;
- Conduct an Agricultural Suitability Assessment of the lands within the Special Study Area, including a site description, soils and agricultural capability, agricultural capability classification, management inputs, and agricultural suitability; and
- Continue communicating with the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission regarding the opportunities of these lands.

c) Density Transition Areas

During OCP workshops with Council there was considerable discussion with respect to future densities of the lands abutting the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). These discussions included:

i) Within the UGB there are few areas designated as Suburban Residential. These areas are identified on APPENDIX B – Suburban Designation Map. The current designation of these lands as Suburban Residential would support lot sizes of 0.36 ha (0.88 acre) when serviced with municipal water. In some areas these lands are adjacent to higher density areas. As these lands are within the UGB consideration could be given to increasing densities within this designation. For example:

- 2000m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ½ acre) when serviced with municipal water and an approved on-site septic disposal system; or
- 1000m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ¼ acre) with water & municipal sewer.

The above noted range of densities would result in areas of transitioning densities between adjacent higher density development areas and the rural areas north of the UGB. As noted on the Suburban Designation Map there are a limited number of areas where this policy would apply.

ii) Areas of Mission north of the UGB are currently experiencing significant pressure for development, due in part, to the new water line being installed along Ferndale Avenue. Discussions on future possible densities in the area ranged from lots of 1000m² (approximately ¼ acre) to 0.36 ha (0.88 acre) with municipal water (as in the Suburban Residential designation noted above). There are a number of characteristics that should be taken into consideration when looking at higher densities in this area, for example:

- steeper slopes in some areas could pose challenges with on-site septic disposal;
• there has been no planning for future road networks or municipal servicing;
• there has been no planning for schools, parks, recreation or other community amenities in the area;
• a change to higher densities for this area would be a significant departure from what was presented at the community meetings; or
• developments of smaller lot sizes in the area could reduce demand for development within the Urban Growth Boundary.

The issues identified above are typically addressed through the neighbourhood or local area planning process. The Ferndale neighbourhood (as shown on Map 4 of the OCP) would benefit from further planning.

It is anticipated that Council will wish to have a discussion with respect to the two items [(i) and (ii)] noted above at first reading of the OCP. Consideration may be given to a minor amendment at 2nd reading to include the transitioning densities inside the UGB for properties designated Suburban. This would also require an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

A resolution to add neighbourhood planning to the list of action items in the OCP for the Ferndale Neighbourhood would also be considered a minor amendment.

d) Crown Lands at Fraser River Heritage Park

The District of Mission along with three First Nations Bands (Leq’a:mel, Matsqui, and Sumas) have been in discussions with the Province on the future use of Crown Land adjacent to Fraser River Heritage Park. The three Bands have now formed a Society (the LMS Society).

During these discussions consideration was given to the future potential of some of these lands to provide for economic development for the three First Nations Bands. This opportunity was also discussed as part of the OCP consultation process. Two areas of Crown Land adjacent to Fraser River Heritage Park have been identified for potential development. These areas are identified on Appendix C – Crown Land at Fraser River Heritage Park. The OCP map now reflects the proposal put forward by the Society.

The Society will continue to work with the Province on a process for acquisition of these lands. Further referrals and discussions with the Province are anticipated. The intent for the larger Crown Land parcels immediately to the east of Fraser River Heritage Park is to retain these areas as parkland under a long term lease to the District.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The OCP review process fulfills Council’s objective to complete a full OCP review during the current term in office.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Generally, an OCP does not commit a municipality to spending funds; however, as growth occurs there will be capital costs of infrastructure and parks and ongoing operational costs for maintenance. As part of the adoption process for an OCP, Council must consider the impact of the OCP on the District’s Financial and Waste Management Plans as per section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act. Staff have reviewed the OCP in conjunction with the Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan and found no inconsistencies.

It is recognized that some OCP policies or recommended actions, such as an update to the zoning bylaw, will require funding that is not currently in the Financial Plan, however, these actions will come
forward to Council in the future with recommended funding sources and the Financial Plan will be adjusted at that time (provided Council decides to proceed with the recommended action).

Staff recommends that Council confirm, through resolution, that it has considered section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act and a statement to that effect has been included in the OCP Bylaw.

Prior to Council considering second reading, staff will be including a financial impact analysis (OCP Options Assessment and Growth Projections for DCCs/Infrastructure Planning) that will help Council decide whether or not to pursue one or both of the transitional density strategies set out in this report. Although the section 477 consideration is done at first reading, this will serve as an additional opportunity for Council to evaluate the financial impacts of any amendments it might make at second reading.

COMMUNICATION:

This report provides an update to Council and the public on the Official Community Plan review process. The new OCP has been posted on the District of Mission website and on the www.makeityourmission.ca website. It is anticipated that comments may be received from the public following first reading of the bylaw; however, any and all comments received will be brought forward to Council at the time of public hearing. The Public Hearing will need to be advertised in accordance with the Local Government Act.

Any questions received after first reading will be answered by staff.

NEXT STEPS:

Should Council grant first reading of Bylaw 5670-2017 the OCP will be formally referred to the ALC. The Bylaw will also be referred, as a courtesy, to the City of Abbotsford, the Fraser Valley Regional District, the City of Maple Ridge, the District of Kent, the District of Agassiz, and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. In addition the OCP will be referred to the Sto:lo Nation Bands, the LMS Society and the Kwantlen First Nation. The growth scenario and financial impact analysis work will be completed by staff.

The OCP Bylaw is set to be read a 2nd time on October 16, 2017. Minor amendments to the Bylaw may be made at that time. The Public Hearing dates for the OCP will also be set at 2nd reading of the Bylaw.

The Public Hearing dates are tentatively set for November 7th and 9th; which could include 3rd reading of the Bylaw. Prior to final adoption the Bylaw must be forwarded to the Province for approval.

The anticipated timeline to adopt the OCP is in early 2018. Major amendments to the Bylaw after the Public Hearing would necessitate that the Bylaw be re-read for a first time and a new Public Hearing would take place.

SIGN-OFFS:

Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning  Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed
APPENDIX A

DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW

See separate document
APPENDIX B (1)

SUBURBAN DESIGNATION AREAS

West side of Mission
OCP DESIGNATIONS LEGEND

Legend

- Agriculture
- Attached Multi-unit Residential
- Commercial
- Natural Areas
- Future Employment Lands
- Historic Site Comprehensive Development Area
- First Nation
- Industrial
- Institutional
- Mid Rise Multi-unit Residential
- Mission City Downtown
- Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential
- Municipal Forest
- Neighbourhood Centre
- Parks and Open Space
- Resource Industrial
- Rural
- Rural Residential
- Special Study Area
- Suburban Residential
- Urban Compact
- Urban Residential
- SilverdaleSpecialPlanningArea
- CedarValleyAreaBoundary
- Urban Growth Boundary
APPENDIX C

Crown Lands at Fraser River Heritage Park

Area 1 – OCP Designation: Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential - 3.1 ha (7.8 acres)

Area 2 – OCP Designation: Attached Multi-unit Residential – 1.3 ha (3.2 acres)

Area 3 – OCP Designation: Park and Open Space – Long term parkland under lease - 56 ha (138.8 acres)
DATE: October 16, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning
SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Bylaw – 2nd Reading
ATTACHMENTS: APPENDIX A – Report to Council August 14th, 2017 (Official Community Plan Bylaw – 1st Reading)
APPENDIX B – Comments from the Agricultural Land Commission
APPENDIX C – Comments from Ministry of Agriculture
APPENDIX D – Comments from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
APPENDIX E – Proposed updates to Section 4.3 Agriculture
APPENDIX F – Proposed updates to general text sections
APPENDIX G – Proposed updates to Section 9.6 DP Area E: Natural Environment Development Area
APPENDIX H – Proposed updates to Appendix C: Maps

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the amendments to Bylaw 5670-2017 as set out in the report dated October 16, 2017 from the Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects be approved; and
2. That Bylaw 5670-2017 be read a second time as amended; and
3. That following such reading, the Bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on November 7, 2017 and November 9, 2017.

PURPOSE:
This report has been prepared to provide Council with a number of updates to be considered at second reading of the OCP Bylaw. Council, may, by resolution propose additional amendments to the OCP Bylaw prior to granting second reading of the Bylaw.

BACKGROUND:
The OCP process is outlined in a previous staff report dated August 14, 2017 (attached as Appendix A - Official Community Plan Bylaw – 1st Reading Report). Following first reading, the OCP Bylaw was referred to relevant stakeholders and requisite referring provincial agencies.

Since the time the OCP Bylaw was granted first reading, staff have continued their review of the draft Bylaw’s policies and accompanying maps and schedules. The updates listed in Appendices E through H are made to ensure that pertinent comments and clarifications, which were provided by
external agencies, Council and internal departmental staff, are captured within the amended Bylaw prior to second reading and Public Hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:**

The following outlines the proposed updates to the OCP and provides rationale for the recommended updates. Further detail is provided in the corresponding Appendices.

**A. Section 4.3 Agriculture**

The comments received from the MA and the ALC suggest that the OCP include policies and language that support the overall mandate of both the MA and the ALC, which is to preserve and protect farmland. As outlined in the correspondence attached to this report (Appendix B – Comments from the Agricultural Land Commission and Appendix C – Comments from Ministry of Agriculture), both the MA and the ALC would prefer that the OCP more clearly reflects their agencies policies.

In response to these provincial agencies’ requests, staff have included a number of proposed amendments to Agriculture section of the OCP. The recommended updates (Appendix E – Proposed updates to Section 4.3, Agriculture) for the most part, provide additional clarity around current agricultural practices in the District and do not change the intent of this section, which is to protect productive farmland and encourage food production in Mission. Appendix E would replace the current Section 4.3 Agriculture in the OCP.

**B. Special Study Area**

In addition to providing comments on Section 4.3 Agriculture, ALC staff provided comments on the Special Study Area section of the OCP. The ALC does not support the inclusion of lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) within a Special Study Area as it may signal to investors or land owners that the ALC supports potential changes to land use activities in the ALR. In response to these comments Council may wish to consider the following text updates to the OCP Bylaw:

i) Adding the following in a text box at beginning of Special Study Area section and add the same text in Figure 5.1 (to be renumbered 8.1).

The use of ALR land is subject to the Agricultural Land Commission Act (ALCA) and Regulation and any Orders of the Commission. The Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) has not endorsed the inclusion of ALR lands within the Special Study Area nor does the establishment of the Special Study Area denote ALC support for commercial or industrial use of these lands either at present or in future. The identification of ALR land for non-agricultural purposes without endorsement of the ALC is inconsistent with the ALCA and Regulation and would be, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect as per s. 46(4) of the ALCA.

**C. Proposed updates to general text sections**

The majority of proposed updates listed in Appendix F - Updates to General Text Sections are to help guide staff in the preparation of reports to Council by providing clarity.

The text section update also includes modifications to the Suburban Designation section which reflects Council’s desire to explore increased density in these areas of Mission. The designation of these lands as Suburban Residential currently support lot sizes of 0.36 ha (0.88 acres) when serviced with municipal water. As some suburban designated lands are adjacent to higher density areas, the
text update would increase the allowable density to include a range of lot sizes as follows:

- 2000 m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ½ acre) when serviced with municipal water and an approved on-site septic disposal system; or
- 1000 m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ¼ acre) with water and municipal sewer.

The increase in densities in the suburban areas would result in areas of transitioning densities between adjacent higher density development areas and the rural areas north of the urban growth boundary (UGB). It is worth noting here that there are a limited number of areas where this policy would apply and the Zoning Bylaw would require updating in order to implement this policy.

D. Proposed updates to Section 9.6 DP Area E: Natural Environment Development Area

District of Mission staff have reviewed Section 9.6 of the OCP and have made suggestions to update the text portion of this section in order to help guide the processing of development permit applications. It is suggested that the Section 9.6 be replaced by the text provided in the attached Appendix G – Proposed updates to Section 9.6 DP Area E: Natural Environment Development Area.

E. Proposed updates to Appendix C: Maps

District staff are also recommending updates to various Maps in the OCP. These updates are listed in Appendix H – Proposed updates to Appendix C: Maps. The updates are predominantly housekeeping in nature and if approved by Council would not change the general intent of the maps or amend the designations of any specific properties.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The OCP review process fulfills Council’s objective to complete a full OCP review during their current term in office.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Generally, an OCP does not commit a municipality to spending funds; however, as growth occurs there will be capital costs to increased infrastructure and parks needs including ongoing operational costs for maintenance. Prior to the adoption of an OCP, Council must consider the impact of the OCP on the District’s Financial and Waste Management Plans as per section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act. Staff have reviewed the OCP in conjunction with the Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan and found no inconsistencies.

While it is recognized that some OCP policies or recommended actions, such as an update to the District’s Zoning Bylaw, will require implementation funding that is not currently in the Financial Plan, these initiatives will come forward to Council in the future with recommended funding sources and the Financial Plan will be adjusted at that time (provided that Council decides to proceed with the recommended action).

A presentation on growth projections and infrastructure planning will be made to Council at the October 16th, 2017 meeting. Although the Section 477 consideration was done at first reading, this presentation may serve as an additional opportunity for Council to consider the potential financial impacts that any amendments to the OCP Bylaw might have at time of second reading.

COMMUNICATION:

A link to the new OCP has been posted on the District of Mission website and on the www.makeityourmission.ca webpage. District staff have received a number of comments from the community regarding the proposed update to Section 9.6. These comments have been reviewed and will be considered in the development of the proposed amendments.

477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act
public. These comments, along with any others received will be brought forward to Council at the time of the Public Hearing. The Public Hearing will be advertised in accordance with the Local Government Act.

Any questions received after this date will continue to be answered by staff.

**NEXT STEPS:**

Should Council grant second reading to OCP Bylaw 5670-2017, and set the public hearing dates as outlined in this report, staff will proceed with advertising of the Public Hearing.

The Public Hearing dates are tentatively set for November 7 and 9, 2017 which could include third reading to the Bylaw.

The anticipated timeline to adopt the OCP is in early 2018. Major amendments to the Bylaw after the Public Hearing would necessitate a new Public Hearing.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning  
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
DATE: August 14, 2017  
TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning  
SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Bylaw – 1st Reading  
ATTACHMENTS: APPENDIX A – District of Mission Official Community Plan  
APPENDIX B – Suburban Residential Designation Map  
APPENDIX C – Crown Lands at Fraser River Heritage Park Map  

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017 be read a first time;
2. That Council confirm it has considered the Official Community Plan in conjunction with the District’s Financial and Waste Management Plans as per section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act and,
3. That the Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017 be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Official Community Plan (OCP) review process began later in 2015 with the preparation of a request for proposals for a consultant. Urban Systems was selected as the successful consultant to develop a new OCP for the District of Mission. In the fall of 2015 work began by compiling background information and land studies. The process involved a number of public consultation activities including community workshops, an online survey and a series of neighbourhood meetings. Among the various stakeholders, First Nations members were consulted and workshops were held with Council and District staff.

Through the consultation process a number of common themes began to emerge. In general community stakeholders expressed an interest in seeing Mission remain as a family-oriented, and safe place to live, where heritage is celebrated and access to outdoor recreation opportunities is easy and there for all to enjoy.

Using the information gathered from this broad community engagement, an overarching vision for the OCP was developed. The OCP’s guiding principles led to preparing the objectives or the next steps that will need to be taken to achieve this vision for the community. Policies throughout the OCP are aimed at guiding decision-making that will help meet those objectives and ultimately realize the vision for Mission.

The OCP is currently a draft bylaw that will follow a legislated process leading to final adoption decision by Council. The first draft of the OCP was reviewed by staff and Council and then presented to the public and First Nations. Comments were received through the online survey community neighbourhood meetings and workshops. The input received was carefully considered from which refinement of the OCP’s policies and development of the various land use maps followed. From this work, the District is now ready to present the OCP Bylaw for first reading.
PURPOSE:
This report was prepared to present the new OCP to Council and the public by:

- providing an overview of the Official Community Plan review process;
- introducing any new policies and directions (including amended and retained sections of the current OCP) with the new OCP and provide information on those changes;
- providing the public with information on the concepts and ideas discussed with Council during the preparation of the OCP;
- provide the public and Council with information acquired through the First Nations consultation process;
- outlining the next steps in the process leading to the adoption of Mission’s new OCP; and
- acquiring a resolution from Council to have the OCP Bylaw formally referred to the Agricultural Land Commission.

BACKGROUND:
The following provides general background information about an OCP and the process undertaken to develop this Bylaw.

a) What is an OCP?

An OCP represents a community’s vision for the future and provides a framework to guide growth and decisions about the use and management of land and resources in the municipality. The OCP describes how and where residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural and other types of development will occur. It guides the provision of necessary road, water, sewer and other infrastructure. An OCP has policies concerning the environmental, economic and health and well-being of a community.

An OCP offers multiple benefits as it helps to identify and address emerging issues and challenges that affect a community’s well-being. These typically involve important matters such as the impacts of development on community character; the changing needs of residents; housing affordability; economic health; public health and safety; heritage conservation; habitat and biodiversity; rising energy costs; community greenhouse gas emission reductions; and climate change adaptation.

The District of Mission completed the current OCP in 2008. During this time, the District has been experiencing increasing demand for single family homes, townhomes, commercial and industrial developments.

One of the fundamental purposes of an OCP is to provide direction to staff, Council, developers, school agencies and the public regarding the District’s physical development. Because of the pace and scale of land use change in the community, the current OCP lacks a clear relationship between land use designations as identified on the land use map and corresponding policies.

b) The OCP Process

The entire OCP process began with initial meetings and the preparation of a communications strategy in November 2015 to an anticipated completion date of December 2017.

The OCP process was divided into four distinct phases. During the first phase of the project, the consultants and District staff gathered the necessary background information to start the
OCP review process. The second phase of the project included the public consultation and engagement which consisted of two public open houses, six neighbourhood meetings, four topic specific workshops and an on-line survey. The third phase involved integrating the input received through the community engagement process into various policies; along with revising the land use categories of the current OCP to create more concise and clear land use designations. The final phase of the project consisted of presenting the draft of the OCP to the public and receiving comments.

c) Council Workshops.

The final stages of the OCP process involved workshops with Council during the spring of this year. Following the workshops District staff and the Consultant reviewed all the input received during the entire OCP review process and made amendments to the draft OCP as appropriate.

d) Refinement

The refined OCP draft was then reviewed extensively by District staff; particularly staff members in the Development Services Department. The OCP was further refined and a draft was prepared into Bylaw form.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The draft OCP presented to the public in the spring was met with a generally favorable response. Interestingly, the topics that most of the public provided comments on were the identical to the main topics of conversation at previous workshops with Council and staff during the OCP review process. Each of those topics will be discussed in the following section of this report. The intent here is to provide a general overview of the topics along with supporting rationale for any subsequent changes made to the OCP as part of the review process.

a) South West Mission

In 2008 much of the Silverdale area was designated for future urban residential development. In order to help guide neighbourhood planning in the area, the Council (of the day) adopted the Silverdale Urban Residential Neighbourhood Plans Terms of Reference (Land Use Policy LAN.48). The Silverdale Neighbourhood One Plan was prepared based on these Terms of Reference and was directly incorporated into the OCP; the area was also rezoned based on the Neighbourhood One Plan.

The Neighbourhood One Plan was based on a comprehensive inventory and analysis of the land and it includes a vision for the area, land use plans, economic studies, transportation networks, and more. Directly outside the Neighbourhood One Plan area, the majority of the remaining lands in Silverdale were designated “Urban”. Despite these planning directions, no development of the area has occurred to date.

This OCP process has determined that the Urban designation and LAN.48 as defined in the current OCP should be revisited in light of new information on servicing, changing land use trends and the overall vision and direction established in this OCP.

During the preparation of this OCP, some residents of Silverdale expressed interest in having their properties designated for single-family development at urban densities. Comments received from other residents of Silverdale included a reluctance to continue with the Urban designation altogether because no infrastructure planning has been completed to date.

The OCP recognizes the urban density development that is comprehensively planned and consistent with the vision, guiding principles, and the broad and specific policies of this OCP. Therefore, the entire area of Silverdale is designated as a Comprehensive Planning Area. While this designation allows for a broad range of development opportunities, it is anticipated
that through the neighbourhood planning processes appropriate residential densities and supporting land uses will be identified.

a) Waterfront Area
Mission’s current OCP designates the industrial lands adjacent to the Fraser River and the commuter rail area south of the railway as Waterfront. The overall intent of the Waterfront designation was to encourage the development of this area as an exceptional, high quality waterfront residential neighbourhood connected with the commuter rail and the downtown. Additional uses to be provided for would include:

- commercial uses that cater to area residents, the community at large and the regional market;
- mixed residential and commercial uses;
- office uses;
- institutional uses;
- parks and open space;
- light industrial/business uses that are compatible with an urban residential neighbourhood; and,
- expanded marina uses and possibly a houseboat community.

Despite considerable interest in the waterfront, no significant development has occurred due to the considerable pre-development work needed to prepare the site, along with environmental challenges, market conditions and fragmented property ownership in the area. The new OCP designates these areas as Mixed Use Commercial / Residential which supports the uses identified above, but notes that in order for development to move forward in a cohesive way, it will be necessary to conduct technical investigations to address anticipated constraints to development. These studies would include:

- Geotechnical
- Flood management
- Soil contamination
- Terrestrial and aquatic resources
- Infrastructure modeling (water, sewer, rainwater and transportation etc.)
- Noise attenuation

b) Future Employment Lands now changed to Special Study Area (ALR adjacent to Fraser River)
During the community input stage of the development of the OCP, many respondents noted that they would like to see more opportunities for local residents to work within the Mission area. Availability of local employment within the community was identified as a challenge for many residents.

As part of the background analysis for the OCP, a Land Demand Study was prepared. One of the key findings of the study was that there are insufficient industrial and employment lands within Mission. At the same time, it was noted that the large tract of land within the Agricultural Land Reserve, adjacent to the Fraser River, was largely underutilized for agricultural purposes and could serve to address local employment needs. As such the area was identified on the draft OCP maps as Future Employment Lands. This designation was to identify the lands as those in need of future planning. The thought was that the planning would help to determine highest and best uses for these lands over the long term.
To ensure transparency within the OCP process and recognize that these lands may be suitable for a range of uses in the future, inclusive of agriculture, the area has now been designated as Agriculture. The area will remain within a Special Study Area.

A new section has been added to the draft OCP which speaks to economic objectives as they relate to these lands and new policies have also been added to guide future planning processes as follows:

- Conduct further planning and analysis to determine potential support for industrial/employment uses in the Special Study Area, including a city-wide industrial inventory and capacity analysis, local/regional industrial market analysis, servicing/infrastructure capacity assessment, and a traffic impact analysis;
- Conduct an Industrial Lands Assessment of all land within the District to determine the potential for future industrial operations;
- Conduct an Agricultural Suitability Assessment of the lands within the Special Study Area, including a site description, soils and agricultural capability, agricultural capability classification, management inputs, and agricultural suitability; and
- Continue communicating with the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission regarding the opportunities of these lands.

c) Density Transition Areas

During OCP workshops with Council there was considerable discussion with respect to future densities of the lands abutting the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). These discussions included:

i) Within the UGB there are few areas designated as Suburban Residential. These areas are identified on APPENDIX B – Suburban Designation Map. The current designation of these lands as Suburban Residential would support lot sizes of 0.36 ha (0.88 acre) when serviced with municipal water. In some areas these lands are adjacent to higher density areas. As these lands are within the UGB consideration could be given to increasing densities within this designation. For example:

- 2000m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ½ acre) when serviced with municipal water and an approved on-site septic disposal system; or
- 1000m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ¼ acre) with water & municipal sewer.

The above noted range of densities would result in areas of transitioning densities between adjacent higher density development areas and the rural areas north of the UGB. As noted on the Suburban Designation Map there are a limited number of areas where this policy would apply.

ii) Areas of Mission north of the UGB are currently experiencing significant pressure for development, due in part, to the new water line being installed along Ferndale Avenue.

Discussions on future possible densities in the area ranged from lots of 1000m² (approximately ¼ acre) to 0.36 ha (0.88 acre) with municipal water (as in the Suburban Residential designation noted above). There are a number of characteristics that should be taken into consideration when looking at higher densities in this area, for example:

- steeper slopes in some areas could pose challenges with on-site septic disposal;
• there has been no planning for future road networks or municipal servicing;
• there has been no planning for schools, parks, recreation or other community amenities in the area;
• a change to higher densities for this area would be a significant departure from what was presented at the community meetings; or
• developments of smaller lot sizes in the area could reduce demand for development within the Urban Growth Boundary.

The issues identified above are typically addressed through the neighbourhood or local area planning process. The Ferndale neighbourhood (as shown on Map 4 of the OCP) would benefit from further planning.

It is anticipated that Council will wish to have a discussion with respect to the two items [(i) and (ii)] noted above at first reading of the OCP. Consideration may be given to a minor amendment at 2nd reading to include the transitioning densities inside the UGB for properties designated Suburban. This would also require an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw. A resolution to add neighbourhood planning to the list of action items in the OCP for the Ferndale Neighbourhood would also be considered a minor amendment.

d) Crown Lands at Fraser River Heritage Park

The District of Mission along with three First Nations Bands (Leq’a:mel, Matsqui, and Sumas) have been in discussions with the Province on the future use of Crown Land adjacent to Fraser River Heritage Park. The three Bands have now formed a Society (the LMS Society).

During these discussions consideration was given to the future potential of some of these lands to provide for economic development for the three First Nations Bands. This opportunity was also discussed as part of the OCP consultation process. Two areas of Crown Land adjacent to Fraser River Heritage Park have been identified for potential development. These areas are identified on Appendix C – Crown Land at Fraser River Heritage Park. The OCP map now reflects the proposal put forward by the Society.

The Society will continue to work with the Province on a process for acquisition of these lands. Further referrals and discussions with the Province are anticipated. The intent for the larger Crown Land parcels immediately to the east of Fraser River Heritage Park is to retain these areas as parkland under a long term lease to the District.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
The OCP review process fulfills Council’s objective to complete a full OCP review during the current term in office.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Generally, an OCP does not commit a municipality to spending funds; however, as growth occurs there will be capital costs of infrastructure and parks and ongoing operational costs for maintenance. As part of the adoption process for an OCP, Council must consider the impact of the OCP on the District’s Financial and Waste Management Plans as per section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act. Staff have reviewed the OCP in conjunction with the Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan and found no inconsistencies.

It is recognized that some OCP policies or recommended actions, such as an update to the zoning bylaw, will require funding that is not currently in the Financial Plan, however, these actions will come
forward to Council in the future with recommended funding sources and the Financial Plan will be adjusted at that time (provided Council decides to proceed with the recommended action).

Staff recommends that Council confirm, through resolution, that it has considered section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act and a statement to that effect has been included in the OCP Bylaw.

Prior to Council considering second reading, staff will be including a financial impact analysis (OCP Options Assessment and Growth Projections for DCCs/Infrastructure Planning) that will help Council decide whether or not to pursue one or both of the transitional density strategies set out in this report. Although the section 477 consideration is done at first reading, this will serve as an additional opportunity for Council to evaluate the financial impacts of any amendments it might make at second reading.

COMMUNICATION:

This report provides an update to Council and the public on the Official Community Plan review process. The new OCP has been posted on the District of Mission website and on the www.makeityourmission.ca website. It is anticipated that comments may be received from the public following first reading of the bylaw; however, any and all comments received will be brought forward to Council at the time of public hearing. The Public Hearing will need to be advertised in accordance with the Local Government Act.

Any questions received after first reading will be answered by staff.

NEXT STEPS:

Should Council grant first reading of Bylaw 5670-2017 the OCP will be formally referred to the ALC. The Bylaw will also be referred, as a courtesy, to the City of Abbotsford, the Fraser Valley Regional District, the City of Maple Ridge, the District of Kent, the District of Agassiz, and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. In addition the OCP will be referred to the Sto:lo Nation Bands, the LMS Society and the Kwantlen First Nation. The growth scenario and financial impact analysis work will be completed by staff.

The OCP Bylaw is set to be read a 2nd time on October 16, 2017. Minor amendments to the Bylaw may be made at that time. The Public Hearing dates for the OCP will also be set at 2nd reading of the Bylaw.

The Public Hearing dates are tentatively set for November 7th and 9th; which could include 3rd reading of the Bylaw. Prior to final adoption the Bylaw must be forwarded to the Province for approval.

The anticipated timeline to adopt the OCP is in early 2018. Major amendments to the Bylaw after the Public Hearing would necessitate that the Bylaw be re-read for a first time and a new Public Hearing would take place.

SIGN-OFFS:

Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning       Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed
APPENDIX A

DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW

See separate document
APPENDIX B (1)

SUBURBAN DESIGNATION AREAS

West side of Mission
APPENDIX B (2)

SUBURBAN DESIGNATION AREAS

East side of Mission
APPENDIX B (3)

OCP DESIGNATIONS LEGEND
APPENDIX C

Crown Lands at Fraser River Heritage Park

Area 1 – OCP Designation: Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential - 3.1 ha (7.8 acres)

Area 2 – OCP Designation: Attached Multi-unit Residential – 1.3 ha (3.2 acres)

Area 3 – OCP Designation: Park and Open Space – Long term parkland under lease - 56 ha (138.8 acres)
Hello Gina,

Thank you for referring Mission’s draft OCP to the Ministry of Agriculture. Ministry staff have reviewed the document and offer the following comments:

Section 4.3 – The tone of the introduction seems to be suggesting that there is little potential for agriculture in Mission. While Mission may not have the same level of agricultural land base as many other communities in the Fraser Valley, agriculture is still present and there appears to be significant opportunity for expansion of the industry. The Ministry of Agriculture is very interested in increasing agricultural production and in assisting young and new entrants to be able to access land and get into farming. The ALUI found that 575ha in the ALR is not currently being used for agriculture in Mission. The fact that land is not currently being used for agriculture does not automatically mean that it is unsuitable. The ALUI found that 229ha of this land is available and has potential for farming in Mission. In addition, the ALUI found an additional 528ha outside of the ALR which is available and has potential for farming, bringing the total opportunity for expansion of agriculture in Mission to 757ha, or nearly double what is currently under production. We would therefore ask that this introductory section be re-written to provide a more accurate depiction of the opportunity for agriculture in Mission. The focus on food security is fine, but there should be greater focus on how expansion and intensification of agriculture in Mission could be economically beneficial for the community as well. The focus on community gardens is good, but more from an educational and appreciation of local food perspective rather than a food security perspective. The best way of promoting food security from an agriculture perspective is to ensure there is a viable land base for producing food. While valuable to communities, community gardens simply do not produce the required volume for a secure food supply. The reference to “employment lands” should also be re-written to clarify what is meant. Agricultural lands are “employment lands”. It could be more clear in the introduction that the priority use for the ALR is agriculture (only really mentioned in the What is the ALR box). Ministry staff are in agreement with ALC staff on the suggested re-write of the What is the ALR? box.

Objectives:
- Objective 1 – this is good and supports the Ministry goal of getting more land into production.
- Objective 2 – not clear on what this means. Ministry staff would not want this objective to contribute to erosion of agricultural land or activity in Mission.
- Objective 3 – no issues with this.
- Objective 4 – Perhaps add, “...and support agriculture in becoming a stronger economic driver in the community.”
- Additional Objectives that could be included – “preserve agricultural land”; “enhance food security”

Policies:
- 4.3.1 – change “ALR” to “ALC and Ministry of Agriculture”.
- 4.3.2 – change ALR to ALC; consider adding “and expansion” after “improvement”
- 4.3.3 – this is good, but could be improved by having disclosure statements on title of all properties within 300m of the urban/ALR boundary as outlined in the Ministry’s Guide to Edge Planning. Is there a reason why vegetative buffers are not mentioned here?
- 4.3.6-4.3.8 – Ministry staff support these, with the wording change recommendation by the ALC for policy 4.3.7.
- 4.3.9 – It is not clear if this policy is trying to prohibit greenhouses in areas of the ALR with good capability. If this is the intent, please note that s.555 of the *Local Government Act* states that greenhouses are a permitted use in...
the ALR despite a zoning bylaw to the contrary. If this is not the case, then this policy could use some re-working to ensure that it is only greenhouses outside the ALR that are being directed to lower class soils.

- 4.3.10 – Missing, or a numbering issue.
- 4.3.11 - Unclear if this is referring to subdivisions in the ALR. Subdivisions in the ALR should be discouraged unless beneficial to a farm operation.
- 4.3.12 – Ministry staff supports minimizing stormwater impacts on agricultural land.
- 4.3.13 – Ministry staff supports minimizing stormwater impacts on agricultural land.
- 4.3.14 – Ministry staff supports minimizing stormwater impacts on agricultural land.
- 4.3.15 – Ministry staff supports minimizing stormwater impacts on agricultural land.
- 4.3.16 – Ministry staff supports minimizing stormwater impacts on agricultural land.

In addition to the above, Ministry staff are not supportive of the designation of ALR lands as “Special Study Areas” for urban growth as this will likely increase speculation on ALR lands, making them less affordable for farmers and new entrants.

If you have any questions about our comments, please feel free to contact me. Ministry staff look forward to working with the District of Mission to enhance agriculture within the District.

Sincerely,

Alison Fox, P.Ag.
Land Use Agrologist
Strengthening Farming Program
BC Ministry of Agriculture
604 556-3106
Alison.Fox@gov.bc.ca

Ministry Mission: World leading stewardship of land, farm and food systems for the health and prosperity of British Columbians
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September 27, 2017

Reply to the attention of Kamelli Mark
ALC File: 46620
Local Government File: 09-3900-20

District of Mission
P.O. Box 20
8645 Stave Lake Street
Mission, BC V2V 4L9

Attn: Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning & Special Projects

Re: District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5760-2017

Thank you for forwarding a draft copy of the District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5760-2017 (the “Bylaw”) for the Agricultural Land Commission’s (the “ALC”) review. The following comments are provided to help ensure that the Bylaw is consistent with the purposes of the Agricultural Land Commission Act (the “ALCA”) and Regulation, and any decisions of the ALC.

The ALC has the following recommendations for the District of Mission (the “District”) with regards to the content and wording of the draft Bylaw:

Bylaw Maps

Disclaimer: the ALC wishes to advise the District that any discrepancy between the Agricultural Land Reserve (the “ALR”) boundary depicted in Appendix C, Map 2 of the Bylaw and the actual ALR boundary does not denote ALC endorsement unless specifically supported by a previous Order of the ALC.

Section 4.3: Agriculture and Food Security

The ALC requests that the following wording in paragraph 1 be amended:

- A 2011 report from the BC Ministry of Agriculture stated that 1,539 hectares (ha) of land in Mission lie within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). As of July 2017, 1,202.9 hectares (ha) of land in Mission lie within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). XYZ ha of Mission’s ALR is comprised of lowland area adjacent to Highway #7 and the remaining XYZ ha is comprised of upland area.

The ALC has concerns with some of the statements in paragraphs 1 and 2 and requests clarification on the following:

- “…and more than 1,133 ha are not used for farming.”
  - Please clarify where this statistic originated from. It is currently unclear whether this originated in the 2011 AGRI report or if it originated elsewhere. The ALC recommends that the District clarify this statistic with Ministry staff.
“The Ministry evaluated the condition of two-thirds of this area, with the remaining third deemed unsuitable for agriculture.”

- Clarification is needed as to whether the “two-thirds” refers to the total amount of ALR land in Mission, or to the 1,333 ha not currently farmed. The ALC recommends that the District clarify this statistic with Ministry staff.

- Clarification is needed as to why the remaining third is “unsuitable” for agriculture. Is this information included in the 2011 AGRI report? The ALC recommends that the District clarify this statistic with Ministry staff.

The ALC requests that the wording of the inset text “What is the Agricultural Land Reserve” on page 35 be amended as follows to ensure consistency with the ALC’s legislation:

- The Agricultural Land Reserve was established in 1973 to control preserve lands with agricultural capability.

- Farming is encouraged and non-agricultural uses are regulated. The Agricultural Land Commission must approve subdivision and non-farm use prior to municipal review. It renders decisions on applications for subdivision, non-farm use, exclusion, inclusion, and transportation/utility corridors.

The ALC is supportive of the District’s statement that agriculture in the community can occur on lands not within the ALR; however, the ALC has concerns with some of the other wording used, particularly the statement that ALR lands are the most suitable land for employment (the ALC is commenting on the assumption is that “employment” refers to non-agricultural employment). Given these concerns, the ALC does not support the draft wording and requests that the wording in paragraph 5 be amended as follows:

- One principle of this OCP is to retain and enhance agriculture in the community for food security. The priority is to encourage. This includes agricultural uses on lands not within the ALR because these lands have the greatest potential for soil-bounded agriculture and a history of agricultural development. There are challenges determining the appropriate form of future agriculture, because of the equally important principles of expanding businesses and employment opportunities. The larger parcels of agricultural land in southwest Mission, south of the Lougheed Highway, are the most suitable land for employment, and farming on these parcels has been minimal in recent years.

The ALC requests that the wording in paragraph 6 be amended as follows:

- Agriculture is protected by several significant pieces of provincial legislation including the Agricultural Land Commission Act (ALCA), the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation and the Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act. The former ALCA sets the legislative framework for the establishment and administration of the ALR. Mission has worked cooperatively with the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) to maintain the farming integrity of the ALR lands in Mission.
Although the ALC regulations have changed in order to accommodate some additional agri-tourism uses, this does not necessarily denote encouragement. As such, the ALC does not support the draft wording in paragraph 11 and requests that the wording be amended as follows:

- **In locations with large rural acreages, agri-tourism and agri-recreation are seen as potential opportunities. Many Lower Mainland communities have recently begun to develop their agri-tourism sectors. Due to some recent changes to legislation, the ALC is encouraging this type of diversification. Agri-tourism and agri-recreation uses are regulated by the Agricultural Land Commission.**

The ALC is supportive of Objective 1 and the District’s commitment to protect and enhance opportunities for agriculture on both ALR and non-ALR lands. In order to clearly differentiate between ALR and non-ALR lands, the ALC requests that the wording of Objective 2 be amended as follows:

- **Balance the importance of agriculture on non-ALR lands with other goals and needs, while recognizing agriculture as the priority use for ALR lands.**

The ALC requests the following wording changes to the proposed policies as follows:

- **Policy 4.3.1 – change “ALR” to “ALC and Ministry of Agriculture”**

- **Policy 4.3.2 – change “ALR” to “ALC”**

- **Policy 4.2.7 – Encourage the provision of a full range of agricultural and complementary uses in the ALR and encourage value-added activities that can improve agricultural viability in compliance with the ALCA and Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation.**

- **Policy 4.3.13 – Design proper buffers, located on the non-ALR land, between agricultural uses and urban development to minimize reciprocal impacts, with consideration for in accordance with landscape buffer specifications provided through the Ministry of Agriculture’s Guide to Edge Planning: Promoting Compatibility Along Agricultural-Urban Edges.**

- **Policy 4.3.16 – Pursue better more intensive agricultural use of vacant and underutilized ALR lands by promoting the integration of farming with other supportive ancillary environmental, heritage and economic community activities, e.g., agri-tourism, agriculture heritage preservation, local processing of agricultural products, as allowed by legislation and regulations the ALCA and Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation.**

The ALC requests that the wording of the inset text “What is Agri-Tourism” be amended as follows:

- **Agri-tourism is “travel that combines agricultural or rural settings and products within a tourism experience”**
• **Agri-tourism provides visitors with a range of agriculturally-based experiences such as fruit and vegetable stand shopping (direct farm marketing), winery, orchard, garden and alpaca tours, farm-based harvest festivals, farmer’s markets and cattle drives.**

• **Agri-tourism in the ALR is defined by and regulated under the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation.**

8.1 Urban Structure, Growth and Land Use – Figure 5.1

The ALC is concerned with the proposed “Special Study Area” affecting the ALR included in Figure 5.1: Land Use Designations.

It is the ALC’s experience that the inclusion of an unqualified “Special Study Area” designation raises expectations of land use change and signals to investors and landowners that the ALC supports potential changes to land use activities in the ALR, even if the ALC has explicitly expressed its non-support of the designation. Changes in landowner expectations may result in a decrease in agricultural investments, an increase in non-farm investment, and an increase in ALC applications for exclusion, subdivision and non-farm uses. The ALC’s mandate is to preserve farmland and to encourage farming and it does not find the proposed “Special Study Area” to be supportive of these goals as the ALC does not have any evidence that finds the ALR lands identified are unsuitable for agriculture.

Further comments with respect to the proposed “Special Study Area” will be addressed in a separate section of this response.

8.1 Urban Structure, Growth and Land Use – Employment Lands – Agriculture

The ALC finds the following statement to be problematic:

• “Mission has several pockets of agricultural land on the periphery of the urban area.”

As currently worded, the ALC finds that this statement could be perceived as both dismissive towards ALR land and also suggestive of ALR land being of little importance or merit. The ALC does not support the draft wording and suggests that the District revise the wording as follows:

• *Mission has XYZ# of ha of ALR land adjacent to an urban area located in XYZ area/neighbourhood/adjacent to XYZ road etc.*

Further clarification is also needed as to whether these “pockets of agricultural land” are within the ALR, whether they are included within the proposed “Special Study Area”, and whether the BC Agri-food Venture Acceleration Program is operating on these pockets of agricultural land, or whether they are encouraging other agricultural operations on these lands.
**8.1 Urban Structure, Growth and Land Use – Special Study Area**

As previously noted, the ALC has serious concerns with the inclusion of ALR lands within the proposed “Special Study Area” for the purpose of further planning and analysis related to potential industrial or commercial uses. While the ALC is supportive of the District’s desire to do further planning and analysis related to potential agricultural uses of ALR lands, it finds that this can be accomplished without identifying ALR lands as part of a “Special Study Area”.

It is noted that the District’s rationale for the “Special Study Area” submits that the District’s current ability to establish new commercial/industrial employment lands for development is limited and that limitations to available industrial land in the Metro Vancouver area have resulted in increased pressures to identify suitable industrial sites on agricultural land in the Fraser Valley. The ALC understands that the District’s wish to identify new commercial/industrial lands may be considered as part of a broader regional conversation around industrial development opportunities, but the ALC does not find it within its mandate to consider industrial land needs above those of agriculture. The ALC has a long-standing mandate to preserve and protect agricultural lands in the face of urban land pressures and the ALC encourages the District to consider under-utilized non-ALR lands as a more appropriate location for new commercial/industrial development.

The ALC requests that the “Special Study Area” be either amended to only encompass non-ALR lands, or that it be removed from the Bylaw; however, if the District intends to include the proposed “Special Study Area” without the ALC’s endorsement, the District must qualify the “Special Study Area” text in order to ensure clarity for plan readers.

- The District must include the following disclaimer before any of the text in the “Special Study Area” section:

  *The use of ALR land is subject to the ALCA and Regulation and any Orders of the Commission. The Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) has not endorsed the inclusion of ALR lands within the Special Study Area nor does the establishment of the Special Study Area denote ALC support for commercial or industrial use of these lands either at present or in future. The non-agricultural designation of ALR land without endorsement of the ALC is considered to be inconsistent with the ALCA and Regulation and would be, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect as per s. 46(4) of the ALCA.*

- This text must be included in a call-out box, or some other manner which ensures that it is highly visible to plan readers. *The same text must also be included as part of Figure 5.1.*

- *Please be advised that failure to include the wording outlined above may further land speculation and may render the District liable for misleading property owners and prospective purchasers.*

With regards to the proposed expansion of the Lougheed Highway adjacent to the “Special Study Area” lands, the ALC finds that an application would be required for any proposed transportation corridor expansion affecting ALR lands beyond what was
previously approved by Resolution #507/90. All highway expansion applications are reviewed by the ALC as per s. 6 of the ALCA.

If you have any questions about the above comments, please contact the undersigned at 604-660-7005 or by e-mail (Kamelli.Mark@gov.bc.ca).

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Kamelli Mark, Regional Planner

Enclosure: District of Mission Draft OCP Bylaw 5760-2017
ALC maps

cc: Ministry of Agriculture
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Our File: 2017-05672  

September 14th, 2017

Response To: District of Mission  
Item Referred: Draft OCP  
File No: Bylaw 5670-2017  
General Location: Mission  
Application Approved By: Kevin McGowan, Area Development and Operations Technician

RESPONSE SUMMARY

Thank you for the opportunity to review the District of Mission’s Draft OCP. The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure has no comments.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 604-795-8210, by fax at 604-795-8214 or by email at Kevin.McGowan@gov.bc.ca

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kevin McGowan  
Area Development and Operations Technician  
Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure  
Chilliwack Area Office  
Kevin.McGowan@gov.bc.ca  
604-795-8210
APPENDIX E
Proposed updates to Section 4.3 Agriculture

4.3 AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

The Fraser Valley includes some of Canada’s most productive agricultural soils. Mission, however, has significantly less agricultural land than neighbouring Abbotsford or Chilliwack due mainly to the topography. The Ministry of Agriculture is interested in increasing agricultural production and in assisting young and new entrants to be able to access land and get into farming.

In 2013, the BC Ministry of Agriculture prepared a Land Use Inventory Report based on a 2011 inventory of agricultural land in Mission. The remainder of this section is from that report. There are reported to be 1,539 ha of ALR land in Mission. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the ALR was surveyed, consisting of a total of 1,034 ha and 272 parcels. The remaining 505 ha are in Indian Reserves, rights-of-way, unsurveyed land, foreshore, or parcels less than 100 square metres in size. An additional 1,771 ha were surveyed outside of the ALR bringing the total inventory area to 2,805 ha.

In terms of land cover in the ALR, a total area of 400 ha (26%) was farmed (both actively and inactively), 102 ha was anthropogenically modified (7%), and 532 ha was in a natural or semi-natural state (34%). As mentioned above, 505 ha (33%) was not surveyed, and was not available for farming. Farmed land cover types included cultivated field crops, farm buildings/structures, and greenhouses. Some of the anthropogenically modified land covers may support farming, e.g., farm residences, vegetative buffers, and farm roads, but were not defined as “farmed” land covers for the purpose of this part of the analysis. An additional 236 ha outside of the ALR were farmed.

In terms of land use, the entire parcel was examined and a “used for farming” definition was applied based on the percentage and/or scale of the parcel in cultivated crops, farm infrastructure, and/or scale of livestock production. In terms of land use in the ALR, 458 ha (30%) was defined as “used for farming”, and 575 ha (37%) was defined as “not used for farming”. In this analysis, farm residential uses and farm roads, were included in the “used for farming” subtotal (along with other mixed uses industrial, institutional, community, and commercial & service). As before, 505 ha (33%) was not surveyed, and was not considered to be available for farming.

Of the 1,034 ha in Mission’s ALR, 505 ha (33%) was not surveyed, but would not be available to be farmed or have the potential to be farmed, e.g., it was in road rights-of-way. A further 138 ha (9%) was considered to be unavailable for farming due to existing land use or land cover, e.g., it was in institutional uses, golf courses, non-farm residential uses. A further 263 ha (17%) was defined as having limited potential for farming due to site limitations, e.g., topography, soils. That left 398 ha (26%) of the ALR that was actively farmed, and 229 ha (15%) of the ALR that was available for farming. Of that 15%, 27 ha occurred on parcels that are already “used for farming” and 202 ha occurred on parcels “not used for farming”.

On-farm value-added activities were observed on 8% of all parcels “used for farming”. These included one parcel with argi-tourism (seasonal events), and nine parcels with direct sales, e.g., permanent or seasonal retail stores, U-cut trees.

European settlement in Mission, as in many areas, was characterized by the logging of the existing timber and followed by farming. Early agriculture in the region included a broad mix of dairy, beef, poultry, vegetables, berries, and forage and grain crops. In particular, Mission and the surrounding area became known as the “Home of the Big Red Strawberry” due to the size and quantity of the strawberries produced. The berries were shipped out by rail or processed into preserves locally. Mission’s well drained slopes have good sun exposure and are well-suited to growing high quality berries.

The amount of land designated for farming in Mission has decreased over the years. The ALR, however, is still significant and currently comprises nearly seven percent of the land area within the District of Mission.
Agricultural operations include a variety of livestock and crops, with a greater number of smaller farms than larger operations. A significant proportion of parcels in the ALR are not currently being farmed, particularly among the smaller parcels. As farming activities intensify in the Lower Mainland, the Mission land base represents a valuable resource where some sectors of agricultural production can be expanded. Current trends indicate a growing consumer interest in local agri-food production and in family oriented “farm experiences”.

**WHAT IS THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE?**

The Agricultural Land Reserve was established in 1973 to preserve lands with agricultural capability. Farming is encouraged and non-agricultural uses are restricted. The Agricultural Land Commission renders decisions on applications for subdivision, non-farm use, exclusion, inclusion, and transportation/utility corridors.

Less than 3% of the local labour force is employed in the agriculture industry. There are only one or two large working farms in the community, with the rest being smaller farming operations, hobby farms or nurseries producing fruits, berries, vegetables or forage crops for beef operations both within and outside of the community. Retaining and protecting agriculture in Mission is important to the community for food security. Many residents are interested in having access to a safe, locally grown food supply. Agricultural lands can also support wildlife habitat and biodiversity, and contribute to community character.

One principle of this OCP is to retain and enhance agriculture in the community for food security. The priority is to encourage agricultural uses on lands within the ALR because these lands have the greatest potential for soil-bound agriculture and a history of agricultural development.

Agriculture is protected by several significant pieces of provincial legislation including the Agricultural Land Commission Act (ALCA), the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation, and the Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act. The ALCA sets the legislative framework for the establishment and administration of the ALR. Mission has worked cooperatively with the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) to maintain the farming integrity of the ALR lands in Mission.

The role of agriculture is changing in communities. Rather than being simply an “industry” conducted separately from residential areas, agriculture is becoming integrated within urban and suburban communities through many forms of urban agriculture. Citizens are increasingly interested in producing their own food for reasons that include climate change, food security, home-grown organic food, social connections, and traditional ways.

Since the last OCP was prepared, Mission has obtained one new community garden beside Mission Central Elementary and a social enterprise community garden called Emma’s Acres. Increases in vendors and patrons at Mission Farmer’s Markets, and in community kitchens and community dinners, point to a growing public demand for local food initiatives.

Food security is a continuum from short-term daily relief to community capacity-building to future planning and food policy. Community gardens are extremely popular, especially in higher density areas where residents do not have private gardens. Urban agriculture also extends beyond community gardens and can include demonstration gardens, teaching areas, and the use of public space for edible landscapes and communal food production. This can include fruiting shrubs and trees, edible perennials and annuals, and vegetable plots, all of which can support pollinating, foraging, and harvesting. Beehives and hunting for waterfowl and game are also gaining interest among local residents.

Food security involves the ability to acquire or consume an adequate amount of healthy, affordable and culturally appropriate food in a dignified manner. Initiatives that encourage local food hubs or incentives
for healthy food retailers to locate in the commercial spaces of neighbourhood centres can help provide better accessibility to healthy food options.

In locations with large rural acreages, agri-tourism and agri-recreation are seen as potential opportunities. Many Lower Mainland communities have recently begun to develop their agri-tourism sectors. Agri-tourism and agri-recreation uses are regulated by the ALC.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. Protect and enhance opportunities for agriculture in Mission within and outside of the ALR.

2. Balance the importance of agriculture on non-ALR lands with other goals and needs, while recognizing agriculture as the priority use for ALR lands. Enhance food security by encouraging and supporting more local opportunities for agriculture and healthy food downtown and in neighbourhoods.

3. Encourage and promote opportunities to expand commercial and community agriculture and public awareness of its role and importance, and support agriculture in becoming a stronger economic driver in the community.

**POLICIES**

**Agriculture Policy and Practices**

4.3.1 Work with the ALC and Ministry of Agriculture to address agriculture-related issues.

4.3.2 Support public education, awareness, dialogue and input on agricultural issues in Mission and work with community groups such as the Mission Food Access Network, the ALC, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Fraser Valley Regional District to develop strategies and action plans for the ongoing improvement and expansion of Mission’s agriculture sector.

4.3.3 Support the use of disclosure statements (via a restrictive covenant) on titles of new developments adjacent to agricultural areas, and on title of all properties within 300 metres of the urban/ALR boundary as outlined in the Ministry’s Guide to Edge Planning, informing landowners of the possibility of noise, dust and odours arising from normal farm practices.

4.3.4 Encourage partnerships among the agricultural community, senior governments and private enterprises to promote the agricultural sector.

4.3.5 Explore partnership opportunities with the University of the Fraser Valley to expand programs and research related to agriculture, inclusive of technology research and development.

**Use of Agricultural Land**

4.3.6 Support the ALC’s mandate to maintain the farming integrity of lands designated as ALR.

4.3.7 Encourage the provision of a full range of agricultural and complementary uses in the ALR and encourage value-added activities that can improve agricultural viability in compliance with the ALCA and Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation.

4.3.8 Preserve contiguous areas of agricultural land and avoid severance or disturbance by recreation, parks, trails, transportation, utility corridors and urban development.

4.3.9 Encourage subdivisions outside of the ALR to be designed to accommodate and promote agricultural uses for which the immediate area is best suited, e.g., community gardens or communal food production.

4.3.10 Recognize and protect the needs and activities of agriculture operations when considering adjacent and nearby land uses, including stormwater runoff, vegetation clearing, and proximity to other land uses.
4.3.11 Design proper buffers, located on the non-ALR land, between agricultural uses and urban development to minimize reciprocal impacts, in accordance with landscape buffer specifications provided through the Ministry of Agriculture’s Guide to Edge Planning: Promoting Compatibility Along Agricultural-Urban Edges.

4.3.12 Encourage eco-friendly farming practices through the coordination of farming and environmental protection efforts (e.g., habitat protection, water use management, drainage management).

4.3.13 Encourage participation in the Environmental Farm Plan Program.

4.3.14 Pursue more intensive agricultural use of vacant and underutilized ALR lands by promoting the integration of farming with other supportive ancillary activities, e.g., agri-tourism, agriculture heritage preservation, local processing of agricultural products, as allowed by the ALCA and Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation.

**WHAT IS AGRI-TOURISM?**

Agri-tourism is “travel that combines agricultural or rural settings and products within a tourism experience”.

Agri-tourism provides visitors with a range of agriculturally-based experiences such as fruit and vegetable stand shopping (direct farm marketing), winery, orchard, garden and alpaca tours, farm-based harvest festivals, farmer’s markets and cattle drives.

Agri-tourism in the ALR is defined by and regulated under the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation.
## Proposed updates to the general text sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Land Uses</td>
<td>Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Single Family (when proposed within a comprehensive plan of predominately multi-unit residential land use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum 0.36 ha (0.88 acre)</td>
<td>• Minimum 0.36 ha (0.88 acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2000 m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ½ acre) when serviced with municipal water and an approved on-site septic disposal system; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1000 m² minimum lot sizes (approximately ¼ acre) with water and municipal sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Special Study Area</td>
<td>Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Underutilized Land in the ALR</td>
<td>• Adjacent lands not within the ALR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add the following policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 8.1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On larger parcels, complementary single family lots may be considered in conjunction with the attached multi-unit residential buildings when the site is comprehensively planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add the following policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 8.1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Special Planning Area denotation does not preclude development applications (for lands not within the ALR) from proceeding in absence of the full review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Replace Policy 8.3.6</td>
<td>New:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 8.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to any neighbourhood planning, require developer(s) to work with Mission to review and update overall, high-level plans in Silverdale for transportation, environmentally sensitive areas to be protected, water and sewer services, geotechnically sensitive areas to be protected, and the identification of lands suitable for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Add Policy 8.3.7</td>
<td>Add:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 8.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Require developers to work with Mission to delineate appropriate land areas for neighbourhood plans based on geographic characteristics, transportation and servicing areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Add Policy 8.3.8</td>
<td>Add:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 8.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare neighbourhood plans in accordance with the neighbourhood plan structure in Section 8.2 and the parameters below, considering previous plans but based primarily on current conditions and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

PROPOSED UPDATES TO SECTION 9.6 DP AREAE: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA

9.8 DP AREA E: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA

Category
488 (1) of the Local Government Act

(a) establishment of objectives protection of the natural environmental, its ecosystems and biodiversity

(h), (i) and (j) for the establishment of objectives to promote energy conservation, establishment of objectives to promote water conservation, and establishment of objectives to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, respectively

Area of Applicability

The Natural Environment Development Permit Area applies to all land properties identified on Map 14 and also applies to properties that have been identified as having environmentally significant features.

Designation

The Natural Environment Development Permit Area is designed to establish guidelines for the protection of the natural environment, its ecosystems and biodiversity, and to promote practices that will minimize negative impacts on these areas.

Justification

Mission has extensive natural areas that include the Fraser River, creeks, lakes, ponds, wetlands, riparian areas, significant forested areas, and steep hillsides and rock features. These areas are ecosystems that provide many functions necessary for the health and well-being of fish, wildlife and humans.

Intent

The intent of this DPA is to guide development to minimize negative effects on environmentally sensitive and significant areas, habitat, water quality, biodiversity, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, watercourse maintenance and dredging costs, outdoor recreation opportunities, food production, and many other tangible and intangible benefits of natural areas.

Objectives

1. To protect environmentally sensitive and significant areas
2. To protect fish and fish habitat for environmental, economic and recreation reasons
3. To protect the quality and quantity of groundwater and surface water
4. To prevent or reduce air, land, and water pollution
5. To conserve/scare resources and rare species
6. To minimize the introduction and spread of non-native invasive species
Guidelines

1. Prior to any development or disturbance within 30 m of any watercourse and during the processing of rezoning or subdivision applications or completing development plans, require an environmental assessment by a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP).

2. **Encourage developers** to identify and describe all environmentally sensitive and significant areas in addition to those covered by the Riparian Areas Regulation, including review of terrestrial habitats and species at risk assessments for large developments or as part of neighbourhood plans or as identified by the Director of Development Services or their designate.

3. Encourage developers to exceed the minimum standards of the Riparian Areas Regulation.

4. Strive to **achieve ensure that development results in** no net loss of habitat areas.

5. Where loss of habitat is unavoidable, replace the value of lost riparian habitat at a ratio of 2:1, and identify appropriate mitigation or compensation for the loss or degradation of terrestrial habitat as described in an environmental assessment prepared by a QEP.

6. Minimize impacts to a stream’s base flows, natural drainage patterns, and the natural stream channel geometry.

7. For land in a natural or naturalized condition, retain existing vegetation, topography and hydrology to the degree possible. Conserve trees in stands (groups of trees along with their associated understory) to preserve long-term health and stability of each tree within the stand.

8. Conserve trees by protecting their root systems from disturbance.

9. Within natural environment areas, only plant species native to the Coastal Western Hemlock Biogeoclimatic Zone.

10. Remove invasive plants and take measures to prevent their spread in accordance with best management practices or the recommendation of a qualified environmental professional.

11. If suitable areas of land for the use intended exist on the property outside the areas recommended for protection by the QEP Natural Environment DPA, the proposed development should be directed to those areas in order to minimize the impact of development in the DPA. The onus will be placed with the applicant to demonstrate that encroaching into the Natural Environment DPA environmentally sensitive area is necessary due to circumstances such as topography, hazardous conditions or lack of...
alternative developable land, and that every effort is made to minimize adverse impacts.

12. Where a parcel of land is entirely within the Natural Environment DPA, site development to maximize the separation between the proposed building/land use and the most sensitive area.

13. Where there is significant disturbance within the Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA), restore and enhance the riparian area per a vegetation restoration plan, to be installed under the supervision and in accordance with the recommendations of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) or Registered Landscape Architect.

14. Avoid locating trails, roads and utility corridors across protected natural environment areas. If such crossings are unavoidable then design crossings that:
   ■ are perpendicular to the protected natural environment areas, as narrow as possible, and elevated where possible
   ■ are sited to minimize impacts on the vegetation, and where applicable, the stream channel
   ■ are sited to conform to the natural topography as much as possible
   ■ are constructed and maintained to prevent erosion and allow the natural movement of surface water and groundwater

15. When adjacent to development or areas of recreation use, protect riparian areas with fencing that is as natural in appearance as possible while accomplishing the desired intent, e.g., log rails with wire mesh to avoid entry of pedestrians and dogs.
## APPENDIX H

**Proposed updates to Appendix C: Maps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NAME &amp; NUMBER</th>
<th>CURRENT or justification for proposed change</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designations Map 1a</td>
<td>(Mission Urban/Infill Area)</td>
<td>• Remove this label - unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designations Map 1b</td>
<td>Cedar Valley Area border unclear</td>
<td>• Make Cedar Valley Border wider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designations Map 1c</td>
<td>Study/Planning area borders</td>
<td>• Make area boundaries wider/bolder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Network Map 6</td>
<td>Labels not consistent with Transportation Masterplan</td>
<td>• Use same terminology and labels as the Transportation Masterplan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cycling Network Map 8 | Labels need to clarify on road vs. off road (multi-use) trails | • Labels to be amended to differentiate as follows:  
  • Cycling Network (on road)  
  • Trail Network (off road & multi-use) |
| Transit Network Map 9 | Need to clarify portion of the Railway that is part of the West Coast Express transit system | • Amend colour scheme on the map and add a new category for CPRail network vs. West Coast Express |
| Sanitary Sewers Map 11 | Need to clarify that this map depicts the District’s Sanity system | • Change name to Sanitary Sewer System. Change categories to reflect appropriate name |
| Gravel Pits and Resources Map 13 | Categories don’t reflect actual on-site use | • Change category from Gravel Extraction to Gravel Pits & Resources |
| Development Permit Area F Fraser River Map 15 | Not clear as to what and where the development permit area applies | • Remove reference to the 10 metres  
  • Include a new category: Development Permit Area Boundary and identify with dotted heavy blue line |
| Development Permit Area G Geotechnical Hazards Map 16 | Need to include all of Mission within this Development Permit Area | • Add line around all of Mission and include entire area within the development permit area |
| Development Permit Area H Fire Interface Map 17 | Area subject to a development permit is not clear | • Change Wildfire Area to Fire Interface Development Permit Area  
  • Remove Hatzic flats from this development permit area |
| Development Permit Area I Mission City Downtown Map 18 | Area identified does not match the Mission City Downtown Design Guidelines | • Need to amend the map to align with the Mission City Downtown Design Guidelines map on page 1 of Appendix B |