



## REQUEST FOR DECISION

Tiger Bay Development Corporation -  
OCP & Zoning Amendment Application  
(South Britannia)

**Meeting Date: November 26,2020**

**To: Committee of the Whole**

**Applicant: Tiger Bay Development Corporation “Tiger Bay”**

**Location: South Britannia, Electoral Area D**

### Legal Descriptions:

1. Part of District Lot 1583 Group 1 New Westminster District Except: Firstly; Part In Reference Plan 4390, Secondly; Part in Reference Plan 4878, Thirdly; Part on Plan 21576, Fourthly; Part Shown as 8.31 Acres on Highway Plan 76 Fifthly; Part Shown as 0.08 Acres on Highway Plan 76, Sixthly: Portion on Plan BCP29232 PID 010-026-151
2. Lot A, Except Part Dedicated Road on Plan BCP28651, District Lots 1583, 2001 and 7034 Plan 21576 PID 010-077-227
3. Parcel 1 (Reference Plan 4878) of District Lot 1583 Group 1 New Westminster District Except Part on Plan 21576 PID 010-025-952
4. Parcel 1 (Reference Plan 4878) of District Lot 2001 Group 1 New Westminster District Except Part on Plan 21576 PID 010-025-901
5. Part of Lot A Except: Part Dedicated Road on Plan BCP25632 District Lot 2001 and 7035 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 20309 PID 006-646-921
6. Part of District Lot 4008 Group 1 New Westminster District Except: Firstly: Part on Highway Plan 76, Secondly: Part on Plan BCP29235 PID 010-025-766

|  |  |                                   |  |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>OCP Designation:</b><br/>Mixed Residential,<br/>Single Family<br/>Residential,<br/>Community<br/>Commercial, Tourist<br/>Accommodation,<br/>Park, and Open<br/>Space</p> <p>Electoral Area D<br/>OCP Bylaw No.<br/>1135-2013</p> | <p><b>Zoning:</b><br/>Rural Resource 3<br/>and Rural<br/>Resource 4</p> <p>Electoral Area D<br/>Zoning Bylaw No.<br/>1350-2016</p> | <p><b>ALR Status:</b><br/>N/A</p> | <p><b>Development<br/>Permit Areas:</b><br/>Wildfire, RAR,<br/>Comprehensive</p> |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. That prior to the Board's consideration of first reading of bylaw amendments to Electoral Area D Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1135-2013 and Electoral Area D Zoning Bylaw No. 1350-2016 in respect to South Britannia, the applicant:
  - (a) Work with SLRD staff to resolve all remaining outstanding issues that need to be addressed as part of advancing the land use plan, zoning and term sheet, including, but not limited to, amending the plan with respect to the distribution of residential density, the timing of delivery of the rental housing, the amount of park space provided for each residential subdivision phase, and the amount and location of Minaty Bay public parking;
  - (b) Agree to a term sheet that summarizes all the obligations of the applicant with respect to the timing, amount, location and other pertinent information for all amenity contributions and any other relevant matters associated with the proposed development, including, but not limited to, rental housing, Minaty Bay Park and other park space, Minaty Bay Park public parking, a pedestrian overpass of the CN Rail tracks, the trail system, a community centre, a playfield, transit facilities, a public works yard, a contribution to upgrading fire services, the conceptual design for an upgraded highway underpass, and the preparation of water, wastewater and stormwater master plans.
2. That prior to the Board's consideration of second reading and referral to Public Hearing of bylaw amendments to Electoral Area D Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1135-2013 and Electoral Area D Zoning Bylaw No. 1350-2016 in respect to South Britannia, the applicant agree to an updated term sheet, as required, to include any additional details pertinent to the amenity contributions and any other relevant matters associated with the proposed development.
3. That prior to the Board's consideration of adoption of bylaw amendments to Electoral Area D Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1135-2013 and Electoral Area D Zoning Bylaw No. 1350-2016 in respect to South Britannia:
  - (a) The SLRD receive written confirmation from CN Rail that it has approved a plan for the location, design and all terms and conditions for a railway crossing that provides permanent public access to Minaty Bay Park;
  - (b) Water, wastewater and stormwater master plans be completed for the entire site;
  - (c) A section 219 development agreement covenant be prepared and registered that reflects all the items set out in the term sheet agreed to by the SLRD and the applicant;
  - (d) The section 219 development agreement covenant include a provision that no development or building permits will be issued for any residential use on the site until construction of the surf park and associated commercial components has substantially commenced;
  - (e) The section 219 development agreement covenant include a provision that no building over 6 storeys or 20 metres in height be permitted until fire services are available to accommodate fighting fires for taller buildings.
4. That, subject to the preceding resolutions, the application move to the Board's consideration of first reading of bylaw amendments to Electoral Area D Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1135-2013 and Electoral Area D Zoning Bylaw No. 1350-2016.

## **BACKGROUND:**

On June 24, 2020, a staff report was presented to the Board that addressed the items that were raised in a Board resolution of April 19, 2017 regarding a previous application for South Britannia by what was then known as Taicheng Development Corporation (now Tiger Bay Development Corporation). The report can be viewed here: [June 24, 2020 Staff report](#)

At the June 24, 2020 meeting, the following resolutions were made:

*THAT the application move forward to a comprehensive review but before the preparation of any bylaws, a staff report be brought to Committee of the Whole meeting(s) for Board review and input.*

*THAT the application be referred to the Regional Growth Strategy Steering Committee for consideration.*

## **DISCUSSION:**

The applicant has provided a summary of their development proposal, which is contained in Appendix A and a land use plan, which is contained in Appendix B. Attention is drawn in particular to the master plan concept on page 6 of Appendix A, which provides the overall vision for the site, and the Appendix B land use plan, which summarizes the major land uses visually. Table 1 on the following page of this report provides more detail on these uses.

The development area covered by the proposed plan is 53.44 ha (132.0 acres). The applicant's total land holdings at South Britannia are 203.0 ha (501.6 acres), of which 138.9 ha (345.7 acres), or 68%, are not being developed. A further 10.58 ha (26.1 acres) are being set aside by the applicant for a future Highway 99 bypass route, if it is required in the future, but in the meantime it will also be undeveloped.

The applicant has indicated to staff that work is continuing on certain elements of their plan. While they believe that most of the substantive issues have been addressed, they are still working on topics such as the timing of delivery of certain amenities and uses. What they are seeking from the Board at this point is an indication of whether the Board believes that their plan is generally headed in the right direction or if there are any significant concerns that need to be addressed.

The following sections elaborate upon the key elements of the application.

### **1. Residential**

The applicant's proposed maximum of 1,000 residential units (plus 50 affordable rental units, as requested by the Board, which are considered bonus density and are not counted as part of the density total) for South Britannia complies with Electoral Area D Official Community Plan (OCP) policy (4.3.1.4).

#### ***Housing Forms***

The permitted housing forms for South Britannia in the OCP include single family (standard and small lot), town homes (including stacked) and apartments up to six storeys. The applicant is proposing that all the housing be in the form of townhouses and apartments up to six storeys.

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Uses

| Use   | Area ha (ac)         | Share (%)     | Comments  |
|---|----------------------|---------------|---|
| <b>Housing</b>                                  |                      |               |   |
| Town Home                                       | 11.79 (29.1)         | -             | 560 units (max)   |
| Apartment                                       | 1.99 (4.92)          | -             | 490 units (max), incl. 100 market rental & 50 affordable rental                     |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                                | <b>13.78 (34.0)</b>  | <b>25.8%</b>  | <b>1,050 units (max)</b>  |
| <b>Commercial</b>                               |                      |               |   |
| Recreation                                      | 3.66 (9.04)          | -             | Surf park & associated facilities   |
| General   | 1.11 (2.74)          | -             | Retail, office, food & beverage   |
| Tourist Accommodation - North Area              | 0.46 (1.14)          | -             | 20 temporary cabins, replaced by Surf hotel (50 units)                              |
| Tourist Accommodation - South Area              | 8.57 (21.1)          | -             | Minaty Bay lodge (30 units), Minaty resort (30 units), cabins & glamping (80 units) |
| Parking   | 0.38 (0.94)          | -             | 140 stalls @ Minaty Bay Loop Road & 320 u/g stalls @ surf park – 460 stalls total   |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                                | <b>14.18 (35.0)</b>  | <b>26.5%</b>  | -   |
| <b>Institutional</b>                            |                      |               |   |
| Public Works yard                               | 0.46 (1.13)          |               | SLRD facility   |
| Transit hub                                     | 0.17 (0.42)          | -             | Local public transit, private bus, car sharing                                      |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                                | <b>0.63 (1.55)</b>   | <b>1.2%</b>   | -   |
| <b>Parks</b>                                    |                      |               |   |
| Minaty Bay Park                                 | 5.19 (12.82)         | -             | Includes 0.9 ha (2.2 acres) of creek/riparian area                                  |
| Community Park                                  | 1.13 (2.79)          |               | Youth playfield (40m x 80 m), community centre shell (557 sq m) and public parking  |
| Other parks                                     | 1.32 (3.26)          | -             | Distributed throughout neighbourhood  |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                                | <b>7.64 (18.88)</b>  | <b>14.3%</b>  | -   |
| <b>Natural Spaces</b>                           |                      |               |   |
| Creeks / wetland                                | 1.48 (3.66)          | -             | Excludes creek area in Minaty Bay Park  |
| Riparian  | 7.70 (19.0)          | -             | Excludes riparian area in Minaty Bay Park   |
| Natural   | 3.65 (9.0)           | -             | Primarily steep slopes  |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                                | <b>12.83 (31.7)</b>  | <b>24.0%</b>  | -   |
| <b>Other</b>                                    |                      |               |   |
| Water treatment plant                           | 0.09 (0.22)          |               | Adjacent to Thistle Creek in residential area                                       |
| Right of Way                                    | 4.25 (10.5)          |               | Main boulevard  |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                                | <b>4.34 (10.72)</b>  | <b>8.1%</b>   | -   |
| <b>Total Development</b>                        | <b>53.44 (132.0)</b> | <b>100.0%</b> | -   |
| <b>Remaining</b>                                |                      |               |   |
| MOTI highway bypass                             | 10.58 (26.14)        | -             | Highway 99 bypass land designation  |
| Balance of holdings                             | 138.98(345.9)        | -             | Remaining lands owned by Tiger Bay  |
| <b>Total Land Area</b>                          | <b>203.0 (501.6)</b> | -             | -   |
| <b>Development Area as % of Total Land Area</b> | -                    | <b>26.3%</b>  | -   |

Source: SLRD staff based on data provided by the applicant.

### **Housing Density**

While the maximum proposed number of residential units and the housing forms comply with OCP policy, staff and the applicant do not agree with how that density should be distributed on the site.

The residential land use policies for the Britannia Beach Neighbourhood in the OCP include the following regarding housing densities:

#### *4.3.1.3 Housing types may include:*

- *single family at densities of 10 to 15 units per hectare (4 to 6 units per acre) (including home occupation and secondary suites);*
- *small lot single family at densities of 15 to 25 units per hectare (6 – 10 units per acre);*
- *town homes at densities of 20 to 30 units per hectare (8 – 12 units per acre);*
- *stacked town homes at densities of 30 to 40 units per hectare (12 – 16 units per acre);*
- *residential/commercial mixed use; and*
- *live/work units.*

The applicant's most recent site plan identifies a total of 13.78 ha (34.0 acres) of land accommodating the 1,000 residential units, which is 25.8% of the total development area. This yields a density of 72.6 units per ha (29.4 units per acre), which exceeds the densities of any of the housing types identified above (noting that while apartments up to six storeys are permitted, the OCP does not identify a density range for them).

The applicant is of the opinion that there is room for interpretation of the above policy since it is unclear if these are intended as net or gross densities, plus no apartment density is identified. The applicant also believes that the proposed concentration of residential density provides for a more compact (and therefore more efficiently serviced), contemporary and walkable community and that the compactness will help with housing affordability.

The applicant has also told staff that 1,000 units is the maximum number of units that they propose to build and, depending on market demand, it could end up being fewer units (e.g., more demand for larger town homes and less demand for apartments and/or smaller town homes). However, from a land use planning, zoning and servicing perspective, it has to be assumed that all 1,000 (plus 50) units are built.

Staff requested that the site density be proven through sample lot plans to demonstrate how the density can be appropriately accommodated in a compact area given the proposed building forms, with a focus on the town home component. The samples provided by the applicant show a very tight site with little room for resident and visitor parking and limited green space. **Staff believe that if the residential density were to be spread across the entire site, rather than being concentrated on only the northern portion of the site, the proposed density would work much better and provide for a much more livable site plan.**

Staff are not averse to an amendment to the OCP policies for South Britannia to accommodate densities higher than those currently set out in the OCP, which was created at a time when a more traditional spread-out form of residential development was envisioned for the site that

would essentially create a bedroom community with little local employment or services. However, what the applicant is proposing is not supported by staff.

Staff believe that the applicant should move some share of the residential density to the southern portion of the development area (south of the highway underpass and east of the railways tracks) that is proposed entirely for low density tourist accommodation use, including cabins, glamping and a small hotel. The southern area was proven by the applicant to be developable in previous plans for South Britannia.

Moving some share of the housing from the northern portion of the site to the southern portion, while still maintaining tourist accommodation as a use, would improve the residential site layout and still allow for a compact walkable community. It would add only several hundred more metres (less than 5 minutes' walking time) in distance to the village core.

The applicant believes that because of the slopes in this southern area and the cost of bringing more service infrastructure to this portion of the site, any residential development moved there, which would most likely be town homes, would be more costly and therefore less affordable. However, staff believe that has to be balanced out against creating a plan that appropriately distributes density.

### ***Housing Affordability***

The Board has indicated a desire for an affordable housing component as part of the South Britannia development, per the current RGS Bylaw that was updated in October, 2019 and includes a new Affordable Housing Goal (Chapter 3).

In response, the applicant is proposing 100 market rental apartment units and 50 affordable market rental units. As noted above, the 50 affordable housing units are exempt from the maximum permitted residential density on the site.

Per the RGS Affordable Housing Goal, affordable housing means rental or ownership housing priced so that monthly payments are less than 30% of gross household income.

The applicant (or a subsequent developer) will be required to enter into a housing agreement to ensure that 150 rental units are delivered and that 50 of these units are affordable. Staff and the applicant are working on the timing of when these units are delivered to ensure that they are constructed well in advance of the final phase of residential development. This will be one of the items covered in the development agreement.

## **2. Employment**

The OCP contemplates only a modest amount of employment generating activity at South Britannia in the form of up to 1,500 sq m (16,000 sq ft) of community-oriented commercial uses to serve residents (Policy 4.3.4.6) and up to 100 bedrooms of tourist accommodation (Policy 4.3.4.8). However, the Board has expressed a desire to see a significant amount of employment at South Britannia as part of creating a more complete community.

The current application includes the following employment generating uses:

- A surf park (also referred to as the “Wavegarden”) that includes associated facilities such as a surfing academy (e.g., instruction and rentals) and a skate park.

- Between 2,500 sq m (26,910 sq ft) and 4,000 sq m (43,060 sq ft) of general commercial floorspace, including retail, office, restaurants/cafes and a brewery/pub.
- Tourist accommodation in the form of:
  - A 50-room surf hotel adjacent to the surf park.
  - A 30-room boutique hotel with a café and convenience store on the southern portion of the site, along with 40 cabins and 40 glamping spots.
  - A 30-room waterfront lodge north of Minaty Bay Park with a restaurant and bar.
- Work/live space.

As elaborated upon on page 25 of the attached submission, the applicant estimates that these uses will create between 393 and 608 permanent jobs at full build-out. This will offer significant opportunities for people to both live and work at South Britannia, while recognizing that a share of these jobs will be taken by people living elsewhere, most notably Squamish because of proximity (a 10 - 15 minute commute each way).

Staff want to ensure that these employment generating uses are actually constructed and, to that end, believe that the residential component discussed above needs to be phased in such a way that by the time of the last phase of residential development, the final phase of commercial/tourist accommodation is also underway. This will be part of the phasing plan and associated terms and conditions set out in the development agreement.

As a starting point, the applicant has committed that they will not apply for the first phase of residential development (subdivision, development permit and building permit) until construction of the first phase of commercial is underway (pages 18 and 22 of the attached submission). That will include the surf park and some of its associated commercial uses, a brewery/pub and 20 tourist cabins that will be there temporarily until permanent tourist accommodation is constructed. This will form part of the development agreement.

Since the OCP does not contemplate the scale of employment generating activity proposed, amendments will be required to both the commercial and tourist accommodation policies.

### **3. Parks and Trails**

OCP Policy 4.3.2.1 recommends the following with respect to parks:

- *Encourage provision of an additional waterfront park at Minaty Bay, in the general location shown on the land use plan, to protect the beach, the picnic area, and the peninsula, retaining the natural character of this public use area. The minimum recommended size for the park is 4.9 hectares (12 acres), which includes land in the bluff area on the south side of the bay, as well as the picnic area north-east of the beach, extending east to the railway tracks.*
- *At least 3.5 to 4 hectares (8.5 to 10 acres) [of community and neighbourhood park] for the Britannia South gravel pit site, based on a land use allocation of 850 to 1000 units.*

### ***Minaty Bay Park***

The applicant is proposing to dedicate 5.19 ha (12.82 acres) at Minaty Bay to the SLRD as a park (page 13 of the attached submission), which is more than the recommended 4.9 hectares (12 acres). This includes 0.9 ha (2.2 acres) of creek (Minaty and Daisy) and riparian areas that will be part of the park.

A critical component of Minaty Bay Park will be to create a safe pedestrian crossing of the CN Rail tracks. While there is currently a private level vehicle crossing of the tracks at Minaty Bay, it can be only be used by the landowner and its employees (although some members the public have also been using it for many years to get to the bay).

Preliminary indications from CN Rail are that it will not permit this level crossing to be used for general public foot or vehicle traffic (although it may possibly be permitted to be used for vehicles servicing the park and the proposed adjacent Minaty Bay lodge).

An elevated pedestrian crossing of the track is therefore anticipated to be required by CN Rail and, under the assumption that it will be a requirement, the applicant has committed to constructing it and turning it over to the SLRD as part of the Minaty Bay Park amenity.

There are a number of technical details to be determined with respect to this pedestrian crossing, but CN Rail has indicated to the applicant, as it has in the past to staff, that, given limited resources, it is only prepared to enter into these discussions if the Board gives third reading to the amending bylaws. CN Rail also wants confirmation from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI) that it supports the project.

Staff are therefore proposing that the SLRD receive written confirmation from CN Rail that it has approved a plan for the location, design and all terms and conditions for a railway crossing that provides permanent public access to Minaty Bay Park as one of the conditions of the Board's consideration of adoption of the bylaw amendments.

Another consideration is the timing of when Minaty Bay is turned over to the SLRD as park. Staff believe that this should occur at the same time as the pedestrian overpass is constructed (unless CN Rail is prepared to consider some amount of general public foot traffic across the existing level crossing for at least some period of time) since there needs to be safe access to the park. This can only be determined after third reading and staff and the applicant have entered into detailed discussions with CN Rail, as noted above.

The applicant is currently exploring options for the location and amount of public parking that will be provided for visitors to Minaty Bay.

### ***Other Parks***

As noted, the OCP calls for at least 3.5 to 4 ha (8.5 to 10 acres) of community and neighbourhood park in South Britannia. The applicant is proposing 2.45 ha (6.05 acres) on top of the 5.19 hectares (12.82 acres) at Minaty Bay, as follows:

- A 1.13 ha (2.79 acre) community park that will include a community centre (discussed below), youth playfield (40 m x 80 m) and public parking.
- Other public park space totaling 1.32 ha (3.26 acres) that includes a 0.43 ha (1.06 acre park planned for the area below a cliff in the village centre.



The remainder of the other park space will include smaller park spaces created as part of each phase of residential subdivision, but the size and other details of these park spaces have not yet been discussed. This is an area where further discussion is needed between staff and the applicant to determine what is appropriate in the way of smaller park spaces.

Along with amenities such as trails (discussed below) and significant natural open spaces (discussed in Section 5 of this report), as well as a slightly larger park at Minaty Bay than recommended by OCP policy, staff believe that the applicant's parks proposal meets community needs.

### **Trails**

The OCP includes the following trails objectives and policies that include South Britannia:

*4.3.2 (a) Encourage provision of public pedestrian access to and along Howe Sound where possible, retaining existing public use areas as such.*

*4.3.2 (c) Encourage provision of a trail system throughout the community and alongside environmentally sensitive areas where possible.*

*4.3.2.4 Encourage provision of pedestrian access along the shoreline of Howe Sound on the Britannia South frontage and the Britannia North frontage, with a pedestrian link between these two areas.*

*4.3.2.4 Encourage provision of pedestrian access along the shoreline of Howe Sound on the Britannia South frontage and the Britannia North frontage, with a pedestrian link between these two areas.*

*4.3.2.6 Encourage provision of a trail system throughout the community and to adjacent communities (e.g., Furry Creek), linking commercial areas, residential areas, and parks and open space. Encourage provision of trail-head facilities (e.g. road access, small parking lot, signage) where possible and appropriate. The trail system should include major trails for walking and bicycle use, as well as hiking trails. Consideration should be given to designation of specific trails that can accommodate mountain biking.*

*4.3.2.7 Encourage a trail access point for the Sea-to-Sky Trail at Britannia South.*

In response to these policies, the applicant is proposing the following (see page 16 of the attachment for context):

- The above noted pedestrian overpass of the CN Rail tracks to the future Minaty Bay Park.
- Trails along the four creek riparian areas, where appropriate, and around the wetlands.
- A waterfront trail from Minaty Bay Park to the northern property line of the applicant's land holdings. Extension of the trail beyond that point would be the responsibility of other land owners.
- A trail on the east side of Highway 99 Park to the northern property line of the applicant's land holdings. Extension of the trail beyond that point to connect up to North Britannia would also be the responsibility of other land owners.

- Trails east into the upper areas of the site that remain undeveloped and that will connect to the existing trail network in the area.
- Trails through the tourist accommodation area on the southern portion of the site.

#### **4. Institutional**

The OCP includes the following institutional policies for South Britannia:

*4.3.3.1 Support provision of one elementary school site, and potentially a second school if the proposed population requires it ....*

*4.3.3.2 Encourage provision of a site for public indoor recreation facilities to serve the community within or near the Britannia South school/park site.*

*4.3.3.3 Work with other government agencies to determine the need for sites for other community amenities. A fire hall will be retained at Britannia North.*

#### **School**

The applicant has had discussions with School District No. 48 and has told SLRD staff that the School District does not wish for a school site to be designated and set aside at South Britannia. This is because the School District does not believe that there will be a sufficient number of school-age children living in the community to justify a school. The School District also believes that it will cost less money to operate school bus service between South Britannia and existing schools in Squamish than to build and operate a school in South Britannia.

This is in line with what SLRD staff have heard in the past from the School District, but staff are seeking written confirmation from the School District that this remains its formal position.

#### **Community Centre**

The applicant is proposing to construct a 557 sq m (6,000 sq ft) community centre adjacent to the playing field at the community park noted above. The facility will be a shell and turned over to the SLRD to be finished however the SLRD wishes.

Staff believe that the community centre should be designed in a way that makes the space as flexible and multi-purpose as possible to serve a range of community needs (e.g., daycare, meetings and events, adult evening classes, fitness, youth drop-in).

Public parking will be constructed adjacent to the community centre. The applicant estimates that 54 parking stalls can be accommodated, but this is subject to further evaluation.

#### **Public Works Yard**

The applicant is proposing to dedicate a 0.46 ha (1.1 acre) site for an SLRD public works yard. It will be located between the highway and the surf park.

#### **Fire Services**

As noted above, the existing fire hall in North Britannia is intended to also serve South Britannia. However, the introduction of a large number of residents in South Britannia along with the commercial and tourist accommodation development will place significantly more demands on the Fire Department.

The SLRD has retained consultants to assess the impact of proposed developments in the corridor, including the Britannia Beach, Furry Creek and Porteau areas. This report is scheduled to be received by the Board at the November 26, 2020 Committee of the Whole meeting on the same agenda as this report. Since the Board has not yet seen that report, staff have not taken direct quotes or detailed conclusions from it to include in this report.

However, at a high level, specifically with respect to the Britannia area, the Fire Department will need to change its level of service from Exterior Operations (outside of structures only) to Interior Operations (both outside and inside of structures) and will require additional apparatus, as well more firefighters. The move to Interior Operations will also increase the Department's training requirements. The report does note, however, that while the required changes are substantial, they will occur over a significant period of time that could be 20 years or more. The challenge for the Department and the SLRD is the need to build out the Department as the developments begin to ramp up.

The applicant has indicated that they anticipate a requirement by the SLRD to make a contribution to the upgrading of the existing public safety services to expand their capacity. There has not yet been any discussion with SLRD staff as to the amount or timing of that contribution, which will be part of the development agreement.

The development agreement for the site will also include a provision that no building over 6 storeys or 20 metres in height be permitted until fire services are available to accommodate fighting fires for taller buildings.

## **5. Natural Environment and Open Space**

The OCP contains the following objectives and policies for South Britannia with respect to the natural environment and open space:

*4.2.3 (a) Encourage the protection and enhancement of existing environmental resources.*

*4.2.3.1 Streamside protection and enhancement areas shall be established in accordance with the Streamside Protection Regulation contained within the Fish Protection Act.*

*4.2.3.2 Require environmental assessments prior to subdivision approval. The assessments shall address wildlife habitat and migration corridors (unique, rare or endangered or essential), fish habitat (unique, rare or endangered or essential), and vegetation (unique, rare or endangered). The assessment shall also identify areas where development should not occur, including required setbacks from watercourses, recommended mitigation measures, and enhancement measures that could improve environmental resources.*

*4.3.2.5 Encourage provision of natural open space in all environmentally sensitive areas, hazard areas, and the upland remainder of Britannia North and South which are not intended for future development. It is anticipated that the open space will be publicly accessible where there are no safety or environmental impact concerns, and that other portions may be inaccessible where safety or environmental resources would be at risk. Encourage retention of existing vegetation in these open space areas, and environmental restoration of land previously disturbed*

The applicant is proposing significant areas of natural environment and open space (per page 16 of the attached submission), including the following:

- Per Table 1 in this report, the applicant's land holdings total 203.0 ha (501.6) acres, of which 138.9 ha (345.7 acres), or 68%, are not being developed. A further 10.58 ha (26.1 acres) are being set aside by the applicant for a future Highway 99 bypass route, if it is required in the future, but in the meantime it will also be undeveloped open space.
- The four main watercourses running through the site - Thistle, Gravel, Minaty and Daisy Creeks - will be enhanced and will have significant riparian areas ranging from 10 m (32.8 ft) to 15 m (49.2 ft) on each side of the creek.
- An existing wetland fed by Gravel and Thistle Creeks will be reconstructed and enhanced.
- Pockets of sloped areas that are too steep for building within the development area will be left in a natural state.

## 6. Transportation

The OCP includes the following transportation objectives and policies for South Britannia:

*4.2.1 (a) Support improvements to the safety of Highway 99 through Britannia South and opportunities to develop land near the waterfront that is uninterrupted by the highway.*

*4.2.1 (c) Minimize the impacts of new roads through development areas.*

*4.2.1 (d) Encourage and support opportunities and infrastructure for public transit, including improved bus, rail and passenger ferry service for commuters and tourists.*

*4.2.1.1 Consider the realignment of Highway 99 around Britannia Beach as generally shown on Map 3 – Transportation and Service Areas with a grade-separated access off the highway if traffic volumes should warrant it.*

*4.2.1.3 Encourage and support internal community roads narrower and steeper than typical Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure standards to reduce visual and environmental impacts. This could require private or strata-title development of roads.*

*4.2.1.4 Encourage provision of transportation demand management facilities, such as park and ride/carpool lot.*

*4.2.1.5 Encourage and support provisions for future commuter rail, ferry and bus services, such as space for train stations, covered bus depots / shelters and ferry terminals in key locations, such as Britannia North and South.*

*4.2.1.6 Encourage the building of safe bicycle paths and trails.*

### **Traffic Impact and Highway Improvements**

A "South Britannia Master Plan Transportation Impact Analysis Draft Update 4" dated June 26, 2019 was prepared by Bunt & Associates. The study approach included the following key considerations:

- Phase 1 opening day is anticipated to be 2025, the Phase 2 opening day is anticipated to be 2028, the Phase 3 opening day is anticipated to be 2032, and the Phase 4 opening day is anticipated to be 2037.
- An additional 2047 longer term horizon year was included in the analysis to account for the full build-out plus 10 years horizon.
- In order to account for growth along the Highway 99 corridor, a 2.3% per year growth rate was applied.
- The typical Friday AM, Friday PM and Sunday afternoon peak hours, which generally represent the peak hour traffic volume conditions along the Highway 99 corridor, were evaluated.
- Access A (page 15 of the attached submission) is assumed to be the only access for Phase 1. This access will house full movements and will be un-signalized.
- Access D will also be un-signalized, but will only house right-in, right-out movements, including and beyond Phase 2 development.

Based on the results of the traffic impact analysis, the following conclusions were reached:

- By 2025, a second northbound lane with a second southbound lane at the intersection of Copper Drive needs to be considered to alleviate northbound and southbound delays / queues during the Friday afternoon and Sunday peak hour conditions. This improvement is limited by the existing sheer rock on the east side of the highway and the railway tracks on the west side that create a “pinch point” along this stretch.
- Access A will require, at a minimum, a northbound right turn deceleration lane for access to the site while an additional northbound lane (making two northbound lanes total) at the access will be required as part of Phase 1.
- A full movement un-signalized Access A is adequate to serve the site.
- Access D requires proper acceleration and deceleration lanes for the right in/out configuration because it is located right at a curvature and an uphill roadway condition and is needed as part of Phase 2 conditions.
- The improvements to the long term condition of the highway and the accesses indicate beyond capacity conditions and it is assumed that in the actual case peak spreading will have occurred to accommodate highway capacities.
- The Highway 99 corridor itself is anticipated to exceed capacity by the 2032 horizon (background conditions) regardless of added development and continuous highway corridor observations are suggested to more accurately determine the improvement needs from a timeline perspective.

- MOTI anticipates that a highway bypass that would alleviate and detour traffic volumes away from the existing Highway 99 in the vicinity of the study area that would likely render the above traffic improvement unnecessary. At this point, MOTI has not authorized the construction of the highway bypass.
- Noting the above, improvements to the highway should only be implemented based on observed demand as-and-when necessary.
- In the context of the development, it is assumed that the developer is only responsible for the highway improvements associated with Access A and Access D.

MOTI staff reviewed this updated draft study (they had provided comments to the applicant and consultant on an earlier draft) and, on a preliminary basis, have accepted the analysis and conclusions with respect to the external road network. They have also reviewed the internal road network and noted that it will require further review later in the process as part of the subdivision approval process, but they have already commented on the highway underpass, as discussed below.

SLRD staff anticipate that MOTI will be undertaking further review of the applicant's transportation impact analysis if the amending bylaws receive first reading by the Board.

### ***Highway Bypass***

In response to the OCP desire for a Highway 99 bypass route, as well as the conclusions of the traffic analysis, the applicant is proposing to set aside an 80 m (262 ft) wide route immediately east of the development area at a higher elevation that will run parallel to the existing BC Hydro right-of-way (page 16 of the attached submission). This bypass reserve area is 10.58 ha (26.1 acres).

### ***Highway Underpass***

There is currently a single lane highway underpass (often referred to as "the tunnel") that connects the north and south areas of the site. This underpass has been in place for many years and was used by commercial vehicles as part of the former gravel extraction operation. It is also how the above discussed existing private level crossing of the CN Rail tracks to Minaty Bay is normally accessed.

SLRD staff have maintained throughout both the currently proposed plan and previous plans for South Britannia that this underpass should be upgraded to accommodate two lanes of vehicle traffic, plus pedestrian and cycling use. The applicant's position is that this would be a major expense and that it is not justified given the low density of development proposed for the south part of the site.

However, staff believe that the tourist accommodation uses on the south part of the site are only a minor consideration in how much traffic will flow through the underpass. Staff anticipate that a significant share of the vehicles exiting the South Britannia community heading south will elect to travel through the underpass and take the loop road connecting to the highway (Access D) rather than attempting to turn left out of the site at un-signalized Access A, especially if there are heavy traffic volumes on the highway.

The above discussed Bunt traffic study supports staff's observation, stating;

*"As the tunnel will be utilized by alternating traffic flows, signalization will need to be provided....."*

*In each direction of movement, it is expected that several hundred vehicles could utilize the signalized tunnel based on an alternating signal. From a high level perspective and reviewing the anticipated trips generated, the tunnel could see 300 to 400 trips during the peak hours in each direction of movement. It is anticipated the tunnel should operate acceptably with this level of traffic.*

*Aside from vehicular travel, it is also envisaged that pedestrians and bikes will be able to use this tunnel as connection between the different phases of development.” (page 54)*

And;

*With the current access to the site, northbound transit traffic would enter the site via Access A and exit via Access A while buses southbound would enter Access D and exit Access D (thereby travelling through the tunnel).” (page 56)*

The key difference is that SLRD staff do not believe that a one-lane signalized tunnel is sufficient, whereas Bunt and the applicant believe that it should suffice.

**MOTI staff have considered this issue and informed SLRD staff that they concur that the underpass needs to be upgraded to two lanes plus pedestrian sidewalks.** The applicant has been informed of this by SLRD staff.

### ***Transit***

The applicant is proposing to construct a 0.17 ha (0.42 acre) transit hub in the village core that can be used by local public transit, private busses, car sharing, shuttles and similar services. It is expected that transit will be served by private operators until ridership increases to the point where BC Transit sees the provision of services as viable in the community.

The applicant has begun discussions with BC Transit on a location for a separate regional transit facility. Page 15 of the attached submission suggests that this will be determined before Board consideration of first reading of the two bylaws. It would be ideal to have this item resolved as soon as possible, but staff do not believe that it is a prerequisite to first reading of the bylaws. It will one of the items covered off in the term sheet and this term sheet can be amended as necessary as more details become available on this and any other items prior to Board consideration of second reading of the bylaws and referral to public hearing.

## **7. Engineering and Infrastructure**

The OCP includes the following objectives and policies related to engineering and infrastructure topics:

*4.2.2 (a) Encourage the development of community-based water supply and sewage treatment systems, so that one water and one sewage system can serve all of Britannia (North and South).*

*4.2.2 (b) Prior to development, clarify the administrative system to be used for planning, construction and management of infrastructure, particularly water supply and sewage disposal.*

*4.2.2 (c) Work with developers and agencies to develop a system in which the costs of providing services are shared in an equitable manner.*

*4.2.2 (d) Encourage the development of infrastructure that minimizes impacts to environmental resources.*

*4.2.2 (e) Respect the fact that the existing residents of Britannia Beach have little financial ability to contribute to the cost of improving servicing standards.*

#### *Stormwater Management Guidelines*

*(a) Stormwater should be managed to minimize negative impacts on watercourses, riparian areas, and other vegetation.*

#### *4.2.5 Natural Hazards*

*(a) Minimize development in areas of known risk.*

*b) Require the identification of areas involving known risk and minimize the risks to public safety and property associated with the hazards prior to development.*

*4.2.5.1 Require detailed geotechnical studies prior to development in the general areas identified as steep slopes and hazard areas on Map 2. These studies should identify potential flooding and debris flow risks, and site stability risks. The studies should also identify areas that are unsuitable for development, and mitigation measures for hazards that can be mitigated. The development plan shall comply with all of the recommendations of the geotechnical studies.*

*4.2.5.2 Recognize that provincial regulators require local government to maintain flood mitigation works. In the study area, this applies to Britannia, Thistle and Daisy Creeks.*

#### *4.2.6 Environmental Contamination*

*(a) Encourage the remediation and the environmental risk management of lands and water that have been subject to environmental contamination.*

### **Geotechnical - General**

Geotechnical investigations have concluded that the site is suitable for the intended purposes and that there is no danger of slope instability. More detailed geotechnical studies will be required at the building permit stage for each parcel of development, per SLRD Building Bylaw No. 1611-2020.

### **Geotechnical – Natural Hazards**

Gravel, Thistle and Daisy Creeks have debris flow potential identified by preliminary studies. This risk, while believed to be relatively low, must be addressed and appropriately mitigated by the applicant to ensure human safety and the protection of buildings and infrastructure.

In response, the applicant has recently had a more detailed debris flow hazard report completed for Gravel Creek by a geotechnical engineering firm. This report is currently being peer reviewed by a geotechnical engineering firm retained by the SLRD to determine if they concur with the analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

The applicant intends to undertake the same detailed studies for Thistle and Daisy Creeks shortly.



### ***Flood Protection***

A combination of land and building raising will be used for protection from sea flooding. There are only a few areas of the site where this will be necessary.

### ***Site Contamination***

Site investigations and soil analysis has concluded that the soil standards are appropriate for the proposed future uses.

### ***Water Service***

Water supply, including for the surf park, will be provided by three or four wells developed in the local aquifer that is recharged by infiltration from Gravel and Thistle Creeks and by runoff from the adjacent slopes. Based on the results of aquifer pumping tests of test wells, adequate flows can be pumped from the aquifer over a 100-day drought period without causing saltwater intrusion from Howe Sound.

The water infrastructure will consist of the wells pumping through a raw water (untreated) main to a water treatment plant and to the surf park for pool filling. The water treatment plant will be located on a 0.09 ha (0.22 acre) parcel of land adjacent to Thistle Creek in the residential area.

Treated water will be pumped from the water treatment plant to two elevated reservoirs directly above on the hill. Two reservoirs will be provided for redundancy during servicing. Water will be distributed to the system using a large diameter pipe extending from the reservoir to a pipe that extends from the North Access to the South Access. The pipes and reservoir will be sized to account for fire flow. Each development parcel will be serviced from this spine water main.

### ***Wastewater***

North Britannia is serviced by a gravity collection system and sewage pump stations discharging to a waste water treatment plant located on the north side of Britannia Creek and the east side of Highway 99. The treated effluent discharges through a marine outfall into Howe Sound. The plant was designed to accept the flow from both North and South Britannia, but was built to only treat the flow from North Britannia. The applicant will therefore be responsible for increasing the treatment capacity of the plant to handle the flows from South Britannia.

The sewage collection system will consist of conventional gravity sewers serving the northern part of the site and a low-pressure sewage pumping system serving the southern portion (tourist accommodation) of the site.

The gravity collection system will discharge to one sewage pumping station (also referred to as a lift station) located next to the public works yard between the highway and the surf garden. This lift station will pump the entire sewage flow from the development through a force main to the existing treatment plant in North Britannia.

### ***Stormwater***

Drainage patterns on the site are dominated by steep slopes to the east and the four creeks and associated low land wetland areas. The site experiences generally dry summers and wet winters. Large runoff events can be generated by winter storms and peak runoff is often generated by heavy rain associated with warm Pacific fronts falling on and melting snowpack in

the mountains. These peak events can generate debris flows in susceptible creeks, as discussed above.

There are eight development parcels, plus the sportsfield parcel, on the northern portion of the site and the tourist accommodation on the southern portion. Each parcel is accessible to one or more drainage discharges (streams or ocean) and each parcel will be required to independently manage its own storm water discharges in compliance with the detailed requirements that will be outlined in the master plan documents.

### ***Master Plans***

While the applicant has completed the high level work to determine that their water, wastewater and stormwater engineering plans are viable, full master plans are required. The applicant proposes to complete these master plans, which are extensive and costly for a site the size of South Britannia, after the two bylaws receive third reading and as one of the conditions of the Board considering adoption of the bylaws.

### **Electrical Power**

BC Hydro is responsible for power system planning, design and installation, with the construction of associated civil works being the responsibility of the developer. The electrical load for system design is estimated on the basis of building types and projected energy uses and this will be completed during the next stage of design. The surf park in particular will have a substantial power demand.

BC Hydro transmission lines run along the eastern boundary of the development area. North Britannia is serviced from a sub-station above the mine building on the north boundary of the development area. This sub-station will require upgrading and the costs and details are subject to negotiations between BC Hydro and the applicant.

### **Natural Gas**

Natural gas system design and installation is the responsibility of FortisBC, but there is currently no natural gas supply near South Britannia. According to the applicant, preliminary discussions with FortisBC indicate that the system could be extended to South Britannia but at substantial cost to the developer due to the anticipated long time line to sell properties and recoup the infrastructure investment. The applicant has indicated that further discussions will be carried out to determine if the cost can be absorbed by the project.

The applicant's stated fall-back position will be to use electricity for heating combined with high-efficiency building envelopes and appliances to reduce energy use, the cost to building owners, and the load on the grid.

### **RGS STEERING COMMITTEE:**

On August 18, 2020, staff provided an overview of proposed Howe Sound East developments (Furry Creek and South Britannia) to the RGS Steering Committee. Numerous comments were provided by the committee, notably on the following topics:

- There is a need for the creation of complete communities, rather than just residential, on the highway. Issues noted include: the ratio of residents to jobs created; a lack of transit service;

and climate change, especially the need for development to prioritize greenhouse gas reduction.

- These are transforming developments for the corridor. It was asked if the proposals are aligned with the numbers in the SLRD's OCP and RGS. More discussion was requested prior to first reading of bylaws.
- Fire protection issues were raised, including the ability to respond to fires in large, multi-storey buildings.
- The ability to provide adequate sewer and water services must be ensured
- There should be opportunities for public access to the waterfront, including the provision of waterfront parks.

The committee saw this meeting as an introduction to the developments and looks forward to providing further input, as requested by the Board.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

Based on the resolutions moved by the Board in Committee of the Whole, along with any other Board input, staff will continue to work with the applicant to resolve all remaining issues associated with the Tiger Bay application. Staff will then prepare bylaws to amend Electoral Area D Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1135-2013 and Electoral Area D Zoning Bylaw No. 1350-2016. A term sheet will also be prepared. Unless otherwise directed by the Board, the next time this item is brought forward will be to a Regular Board meeting with a staff report, the amending bylaws for consideration of first reading, and the term sheet.

#### **ATTACHMENT:**

Appendix A: South Britannia Committee of the Whole Submission by Tiger Bay, November 2020

Appendix B: Land Use Plan - South Britannia, November 2020.

Prepared by: E. Vance, Contract Planner and K. Needham, Director of Planning and Development Services

Reviewed by: K. Needham, Director of Planning and Development Services

Approved by: M. Helmer, Chief Administrative Officer