

POTENTIAL FACILITATED MEETING REQUIREMENT

Committee of the Whole Meeting

February 21, 2019



Purpose

To provide Council with information, analysis, options, and recommendations in response to Council's motion of June 14, 2018 related to introducing a new facilitated meeting for some rezoning applications.



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Background

At the June 14, 2018 Council Meeting, the following motion was passed:

1. *That Council direct staff to report back to Council with a proposed amendment to the CALUC process that requires an initial meeting between the developer, the community, and city staff. The meeting would be facilitated by a neutral, third party facilitator with experience in bringing together disparate and diverse points of view.*
2. *That staff report back to Council on the appropriate threshold for requiring such a meeting to ensure that this is not an added, unnecessary step for most developments. Criteria might include a rezoning that increases density a certain percentage over the existing zoning or changes to the OCP.*
3. *That staff report back to Council on the budget implications of this proposal and suggest potential funding mechanisms for the mailout costs to be covered by the city.*
4. *Engage with CALUCs on this proposal.*



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Issues & Analysis

- Other Municipalities
- Feedback from CALUCs
- Threshold for when to Require a Facilitated Meeting
- Choosing a Facilitator
- Budget Implications
- Alternative Approaches



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Other Municipalities

City of North Vancouver includes a facilitator in some of their processes which:

- is required for larger projects,
- occurs later in the process, and
- is in addition to a development information session



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Feedback from CALUCs

- Discussed at Nov. 29, 2018 CALUC Check-In Meeting
- The CALUCs and UDI were also encouraged to provide comments in letter form to the City



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Threshold for when to Require a Facilitated Meeting

Threshold should:

- capture applications with greatest potential for differing points of view and tension
- not capture other applications to limit increased time and cost, and
- be clear and easy to understand



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Choosing a Facilitator

- Selection would be important to realize potential benefits
- Could be challenging because of different ideas as to what ideal qualifications should be



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Budget Implications

Potential costs include:

- the cost to mail notices to owners and occupiers within 200m of the subject site
- the cost to hire the facilitator
- staff time to complete the mail out and to attend the meeting.



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Alternative Approaches

- Potential for other solutions aimed at enhancing mutual understanding and improving relationships that would not require a facilitator
 - For example: standard feedback survey for Community Meeting participants to share their comments directly with the applicant and City.



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

OPTIONS & IMPACTS

- **Option 1:** Explore Alternative Approaches
- **Option 2:** Encourage Optional Facilitated Meeting
- **Option 3:** Explore formalizing a Process for Council to Require a Facilitated Meeting on a Case-by-Case Basis
- **Option 4:** Require a Facilitated Meeting



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Option 1: Explore Alternative Approaches

Potential advantages:

- provide more direct and detailed comments
- allow more flexibility in the meeting format
- provide an additional opportunity for affected parties to express their views of the proposal
- reduce potential tension

Potential disadvantages:

- the record of public feedback provided to the City and applicant would be longer and more detailed



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Option 2: Encourage Optional Facilitated Meeting

Potential advantages:

- the requirement for the meeting would likely correspond closely to the level of community interest
- the facilitated meeting would occur early in the process
- could help improve relationships and build trust

Potential disadvantages:

- if an applicant believes a meeting is not needed, the meeting would not occur even if the CALUC feels it is needed
- choosing qualified facilitators may be challenging
- additional costs, staff time and delays to application submission



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Option 3: Explore Formalizing a Process for Council to Require a Facilitated Meeting on a Case-by-Case Basis

Potential advantages:

- provides flexibility so that Council can require a facilitated meeting when needed
- could help improve relationships and build trust between the applicant, the CALUC, the public and the City

Potential disadvantages:

- the facilitated meetings would occur later in the process which may limit potential benefits



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Option 4: Require a Facilitated Meeting

Potential advantages:

- clear and easy to understand (with OCP amendment)
- consistent with the approach of requiring more consultation for applications that require OCP amendments
- could help improve relationships and build trust

Potential disadvantages:

- an OCP amendment does not always correspond with increased tension
- choosing qualified facilitators may be challenging
- additional costs, staff time, and delays to application submission



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement

Recommendation

That Council direct staff to engage the Community Association Land Use Committees and the development industry on ways of improving relationships, building trust and reducing tension in the development application process, and report back to Committee of the Whole on Options 1, 2, and 3 as outlined in this report as well as any other creative solutions that are identified.



Potential Facilitated Meeting Requirement