

OVERVIEW
COUNCIL WORKSHOP
COMMUNITY PLANNING DEVELOPMENT
APPLICATION PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS
TUESDAY 8TH MAY 2001
(Margaret Fraser)

Note: Councillor Muri not present; Rick Zerr, Irwin Torry, Brian Bidewell, Doug Allen, Brian Eadie (spelling???) and about six other staff plus the two reps. from PWC. Myself, one rep. from Chamber of Commerce and one other unknown gent in the “gallery”.

Please note that I have added some comments within the main text, even if they came out of questions later on – (think that is more relevant for your reading purposes).

Please also note that Richard Zerr is now Director of Community Planning, Building and Environment

Brian Bidewell introduced the Phase 1 update (building and environment permits)

- Of 97 recommendations, 57 are complete, 8 in progress. The remainder to be introduced as soon as possible over the next few months.
- Merged process of building and environment requests (i.e. one overall charge instead of two separate ones)
- Master Requirement List (MRL) being developed for all applicants (60 items plus workbook)
- Defined cycle times (better indication of “how long”)
- Proactive case management
- Consolidated security deposits (one charge covering all)

Next Steps:

- Information on the District web site with “how to’s”
- Applications able to be done through web site
- Tracking of applications
- Payments and inspections requested also tracked

Irwin Torry gave overview of Phase 2:

- Community planning development applications will be co-ordinated into one team to now include environment, plan checking, traffic plan, engineering, residential, commercial and industrial team (missed any?)
- Streamline the existing process
- Consolidate fragmented activities
- Eliminate unnecessary work for both staff and applicant (e.g. draft partial plan BEFORE starting the process)
- Technology helps these improvements (more staff training needed)
- Specify appropriate service levels
- Demystify the process!

Workflow to Date: (i.e. the above taken into consideration, the following are being worked on)

- OCP Amendments
- Re-zoning. Development permits
- DVP
- Subdivisions
- Commercial plan checking

Internal staff critique of “old” process:

- No clear standard operating policies and procedures (too many people not knowing what the other is doing etc.)
- Permit plan not fully deployed (done in bits because of above)
- Unclear requirements for staff and customer
- Inconsistent process and requirements – real and/or perceived
- Process not interpreted, coordinated or synchronized
- Unclear roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders
- Staff training and education not sufficient (especially in process and technology)
- Staff coverage and internal co-ordination
- Re-alignment of key performance indicators and passive case management
- Conflicting corporate, divisional, departmental priorities

Irwin also noted that interviews/focus groups had been held with the Chamber of Commerce, FONVCA, and applicants for various types of projects – commercial, subdivision, etc. to identify the differences in expectations and requirements.

From applicants and Cof C:

- Clarify defined processes and requirements needed
- Timeliness of an application and feedback (from staff to applicant) – trying to get this down to four week average (or less) (the last 3 months it has been 17 days for initial pre-application process)
- Single point of contact (this will be the planner in charge of the project)
- Identify opportunities to address issues raised during Public Review phase (better explanation of process to applicants)
- Staff availability
- Clarification and formalization of service agreements (developing a fill-in-the-blanks format)
- Simplify securities deposits (done and in process)
- Smooth and timely turnaround on building permit process
- Limit applicant RISK through due process and identify “show stoppers” (e.g. be aware of potential opposition/complaints/concerns before project starts, not 6 months into building – Glencanyon Drive???)

FONVCA:

- Early notification and discussion with applicants
- Applicant and DNV to follow same process (B.D. asked for example – ATF – not enough notice of public meeting to or from Council) 10-day period to be extended for sufficient notice of all meetings etc.
- Planning department to comment to applicant and Council on OCP/LAP re-amendments
- Co-Chair public meetings (this not clearly stated, may have to be re-addressed if and when)
- Second Public Information Meeting to be held to resolve questions and answers
- Able to correct errors of fact arising from Public Hearings (e.g. taking back questions for clarification, so that erroneous information is not the last word. DNV lawyers stated that if incorrect info' had been stated at Public Hearing, corrections CAN be done by staff for Council's benefit.)
- Compliance to plans, conditions and by-laws (monitoring the project and ensuring compliance as it proceeds)
- DNV staff to monitor sites
- Notify neighbours of construction schedules (e.g. Mountain Highway and 27th – some residents thought the project had been cancelled – no notice of it starting up!)

GOVERNING PRINCIPLES:

- Council – commit to avoiding delays
- FONVCA - early involvement of Community Associations and better follow-up
- Applicant – clear process
- Staff – defined procedures and timelines (involving fee for service – this will mean case management team going out to site, doing preliminary overview and charging fee for service – even if applicant ultimately withdraws request).

Doug Allen and Brian Eadie gave briefing on overhead which outlined the process. We will be receiving this for our further comments.

Next Steps:

- Continue development of multi-media package
- Realign key performance indicators
- Re-visit with FONVCA (and others of course)
- Complete “route maps” (how to's) and standardize operations
- Develop recommendations
- Develop and implement schedule
- Present final report.

Questions/Comments from Council:

Don – requested that a breakdown of DVP's per area and D.P.s' per area be circulated, including stats. on what has and has not been approved in the past year.

Doug – that the Chairs of Committees of Council also be asked for input. Irwin meeting with APC next week but agreed to circulate to others.

Heather – that not only FONVCA, but all C.A's receive copies for input because not all C.A's are members, therefore FONVCA doesn't represent all communities)

Don – CFIB should also receive copies.

Ernie – C.A's also represent merchants' interests – some dispute about this.

* * * * *