

From: [DNV Input](#)
To: [Dan Milburn](#); [Jody Chartier](#)
Cc: [Graeme Budge](#); [Council Liaison](#)
Subject: FW: Monday's Regular Council Agenda 8.1 (DARP Update) needs a workshop BEFORE this meeting.
Date: October 29, 2025 3:55:33 PM
Attachments: [The District of North Vancouver at an upcoming public meeting will consider agenda item 8.1 .pdf](#)

Hello,

The below is forwarded for your attention. If you provide a response to the resident, please BCC CouncilLiaison@dnv.org and your reply will be circulated to Council.

-----Original Message-----

From: Corrie Kost [REDACTED]
Sent: October 29, 2025 3:32 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <council@dnv.org>
Subject: Monday's Regular Council Agenda 8.1 (DARP Update) needs a workshop BEFORE this meeting.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Your Worship & Members of Council,

Having read the approx 33 page staff report, it was clear (at least to me) that council and the public needed a discussion on this matter before council deliberation on this complex issue.

Attached is an interaction I had about this matter with ChatGPT. I highlighted the transcript so it is a bit easier to follow.

Please consider sending this to a workshop before dealing with it in a regular council meeting.

Yours truly,
Corrie Kost

[REDACTED]

The District of North Vancouver at an upcoming public meeting will consider agenda item 8.1 DARP Update as per an attachment to follow. This is a complex proposal involving many parts/issues. I ask for guidance on identifying key issues that one should focus on. Note that recent Province of BC Bills 44 and 47 as well as upcoming Bill 25 (which is at first reading) will have major impacts on agenda item 8.1

ChatGPT said:

Thought for 27s

Key issues to focus on for Agenda item 8.1 — DARP (Development Approvals / Development Approvals Process Review) Update

Below I've distilled the highest-priority issues you — and others at the public meeting — should surface, with suggested questions/lines to raise and why they matter. I've called out where provincial Bills 44, 47 and the newly introduced Bill 25 are directly relevant and linked authoritative sources so you (or staff) can follow up.

Quick context (what DARP likely is)

“DARP” on the District website is the District’s **Development Approvals Process Review** — the review of how applications, permits, engineering reviews, inspections and community consultation are carried out. This update should describe proposed changes to process, timelines, fees, responsibilities and staffing. [District of North Vancouver](#)

Top issues to focus on (priority order)

1) Compliance with recent provincial housing legislation — what must change

Why: Bills 44 and 47 already required municipalities to enable small-scale multi-unit housing and to create/implement Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) requirements. Bill 25 (first reading) proposes further changes on small-scale multi-unit housing and short-term rentals. The DARP must demonstrate how District processes will implement those requirements (zoning/bylaw changes, administrative process changes, timelines). Ask for a clear mapping: **which parts of DARP change are driven by provincial law vs local choice.** [Legislative Assembly of British Columbia+2Government of British Columbia+2](#)

Suggested questions / motions:

- “Show us a table that maps each DARP amendment to the specific provincial requirement (Bill 44, Bill 47, Bill 25) or to local policy.”
- “Which DARP items are mandatory under provincial law and which are discretionary?”

2) Effect on local land-use control and Official Community Plan (OCP) alignment

Why: Provincial laws have narrowed local discretion in some areas (e.g., required SSMUH permissions and TOD designations). The community will want to know whether DARP changes preserve the District's OCP objectives, heritage protections, and neighbourhood character where still permitted. Ask how legal risk (non-alignment with OCP or provincial regs) is being managed. rdkb.com+1

Suggested questions:

- “Will any DARP change require OCP amendments or re-interpretation? If so, where and with what timeline?”
- “Has legal counsel reviewed potential conflicts between OCP wording and new provincial requirements?”

3) Transparency, public consultation and notice provisions

Why: DARP updates often adjust who is notified, what consultation is required, and when. With provincial rules accelerating permitted housing, citizens may feel consultation is being reduced. Confirm how public notice, neighbour referral, and public hearing requirements will change (if at all). docs.dnv.org

Suggested questions:

- “Which notification/consultation steps are being reduced or eliminated? Provide before/after flowcharts.”
- “If the Province shortens local approvals, what does the District propose to keep for meaningful public input?”

4) Timing, staff capacity and resourcing

Why: Faster or more numerous applications (driven by provincial law) will strain planning, engineering, inspections. DARP should include capacity analysis, budget/fee impacts, and staffing/training plans. If Bill 25 increases SSMUH duties, staff resourcing is critical. Ask for realistic processing time estimates and resources required. ubcm.ca+1

Suggested questions:

- “What is the current average processing time for typical applications, and what will it be under the new DARP? Show assumptions.”
- “What additional staff, technology or budget will be required? Will fees change to recover costs?”

5) Infrastructure and servicing implications

Why: Changes that enable more units affect stormwater, water, sewer, roads and parks. The DARP should require applicants to assess servicing impacts and show how the District decides when upgrades are needed and who pays. District of North Vancouver

Suggested questions:

- “How will DARP ensure cumulative infrastructure impacts are assessed (not just site-by-site)?”
- “What are triggers for requiring off-site upgrades vs. developer mitigation?”

6) Tenant protections and short-term rental rules

Why: Bill 25 explicitly references small-scale multi-unit housing and short-term rental rules. DARP should consider processes for tenant notification, displacement mitigation, and how short-term rental enforcement will be handled during development/transition. pibc.bc.ca+1

Suggested questions:

- “Will the DARP include procedural safeguards for tenants when redevelopment or conversions are proposed?”
- “How will short-term rental registration/enforcement be integrated into approvals?”

7) Equity, accessibility and housing outcomes

Why: Process changes can advantage well-resourced applicants. Ask whether the DARP includes equity screening (e.g., prioritized affordable units, design for accessibility), and how outcomes will be measured (units created, affordability, tenure). Government of British Columbia

Suggested questions:

- “What performance metrics will we track post-implementation (e.g., timeline, affordable units, appeals)?”
- “Does the DARP include any mechanism to secure affordable units (density bonusing, agreements)?”

8) Appeals, provincial overrides and legal exposure

Why: With provincial legislation increasing prescriptive requirements, the District should be clear on who can appeal, what triggers a provincial review, and litigation exposures. Request legal assessment. Legislative Assembly of British Columbia+1

Suggested questions:

- “Provide a legal risk summary: possible appeals, provincial orders, or judicial reviews arising from DARP changes.”
- “Has the District modelled potential costs of defending decisions?”

9) Performance guarantees, sureties and enforcement

Why: Faster approvals sometimes mean increased reliance on securities and post-construction enforcement. Ask how guarantees will be structured and when securities will be released. docs.dnv.org

Suggested questions:

- “What financial securities and timelines are proposed to ensure required works are completed?”
- “What enforcement capacity exists if obligations are not met?”

10) Monitoring, evaluation and a clear implementation timeline

Why: If DARP changes are adopted, there must be an evaluation plan and a committed review date so Council and the public can judge effectiveness. Ask for KPIs and a firm timeline for review (e.g., 12 months + metrics). District of North Vancouver

Suggested questions:

- “What KPIs will staff report and on what schedule? When will Council revisit the DARP for revision?”
-

Documents / evidence to ask the staff to provide at (or before) the meeting

- A one-page **before/after flowchart** of the approvals process and public engagement stages. docs.dnv.org
 - A **mapping table**: each DARP change → legal driver (Bill 44/47/25 or District policy) → implementation action → timeline. [Legislative Assembly of British Columbia+1](#)
 - **Staff capacity analysis**: current workloads, projected application volumes, additional FTE or contract needs, and cost recovery options. [District of North Vancouver](#)
 - **Legal opinion summary** on OCP conflicts, appeal exposure and provincial override scenarios. [Legislative Assembly of British Columbia](#)
 - Impact assessments for **infrastructure, heritage, and environment** for expected types of redevelopment. [District of North Vancouver+1](#)
-

Suggested brief speaking points you can use at the meeting

1. “I support streamlining where it improves certainty — but we must keep transparent public notice and robust infrastructure assessment.”
 2. “Please provide a concise mapping of DARP changes to provincial laws (Bills 44, 47, 25) so residents can see what is mandatory and what is local choice.” [Legislative Assembly of British Columbia+1](#)
 3. “We need a realistic staffing and budget plan before rushing new procedures into effect; otherwise processing times and service will suffer.” [District of North Vancouver](#)
 4. “Include tenant protection steps and measurable performance indicators; ask staff to return in 12 months with results.” pibc.bc.ca
-

Helpful references (authoritative)

- District of North Vancouver — Development Approvals Process Review (DNV DARP background). [District of North Vancouver](#)
 - Legislative text / info pages: **Bill 44 (Housing Statutes / small-scale multi-unit housing)**. [Legislative Assembly of British Columbia](#)
 - **Bill 47 — Transit-Oriented Areas** legislative summaries and municipal guidance. [Government of British Columbia+1](#)
 - **Bill 25 (Housing & Municipal Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 2025)** (first reading): introduces further adjustments for small-scale multi-unit housing and short-term rental rules. [Legislative Assembly of British Columbia+1](#)
 - UBCM and municipal briefings on the strain of SSMUH implementation (context on local capacity). ubcm.ca
-

If you'd like, I can:

- Draft a one-page **mapping table** (DARP change → provincial driver → questions to ask staff) you can print and bring to the meeting; or
- Produce a short set of speaking notes (30–60 seconds) tailored to your priorities (e.g., tenant protections, infrastructure, or local control).

Which would you prefer?

You said:

8.1 DARP Update 251103RC.pdf
PDF
I attached agenda item 8.1

ChatGPT said:

Excellent — I’ve reviewed your **Agenda Item 8.1 – DAPR Update** (District of North Vancouver, Nov 3 2025 Council meeting). Here’s a focused guide to the **key issues** that deserve attention at the public meeting, especially in light of **BC Bills 44 (2023), 47 (2023), and the pending Bill 25 (2025)**.

1. Overall Purpose

The report advances two bylaw amendments:

- **Bylaw 8763** – OCP Amendment 61
→ Expands staff delegation for *Development Permits* (especially Form & Character in industrial/business park areas) and allows inclusion of *minor variances* within delegated DPs.
- **Bylaw 8764** – Development Procedures Amendment 7
→ Streamlines *Minor Development Variance Permits* and establishes that *Public Hearings will not be held by default* when not required under the Local Government Act (LGA s. 464).

These collectively shift decision-making and procedural discretion **away from Council and toward staff**, citing the DAPR goal of shortening approval timelines.

2. Key Issues to Focus On

A. Delegation of Authority – Accountability vs Efficiency

Change: Staff gain power to issue:

- Industrial/Business Park Form & Character DPs;
- DPs with *minor* zoning variances;
- Minor DVPs related to subdivisions.

Questions / risks:

- What constitutes a “*minor variance*”? (The threshold remains somewhat discretionary.)

- What mechanisms ensure **public visibility** and **appeal rights** for delegated decisions?
- How will Council and the public track delegated approvals (quarterly reporting? online dashboard)?

Provincial link:

Bills 44 & 47 promote delegation to accelerate housing delivery. Bill 25 will extend this pressure through new *small-scale multi-unit housing (SSMUH)* mandates.

→ Ask staff to confirm that DAPR delegations won't inadvertently allow approval of SSMUH or mixed-use forms that should still receive Council scrutiny.

B. Public Hearing Elimination — Democratic Oversight

Change: Public hearings will *not be held by default* if the rezoning is OCP-consistent. A hearing occurs only if Council **actively opts in**.

Questions / risks:

- How will residents be informed early enough to ask Council to hold a hearing?
- What criteria will guide Council's discretion? (See new *Public Hearing Consideration Guidelines* in Attachment 6.)
- Does "OCP consistency" sufficiently capture local context, given the OCP was written pre-Bills 44/47/25?

Provincial link:

Bill 44 prohibits hearings for OCP-consistent residential rezonings. Bill 25 will broaden SSMUH permissions and may narrow discretion further.

→ Ask whether District procedures will automatically update if Bill 25 expands the "no-hearing" class.

C. Checks and Balances — Reconsideration and Appeal

Delegated decisions can be reconsidered by Council within 10 days on applicant request.

→ Should residents have a similar mechanism (e.g., notice + standing to request Council review)?

→ Will summary reports of delegated approvals be posted publicly?

D. Transparency and Public Confidence

The staff report cites "*significant efficiencies*" but little about **transparency metrics**.

→ Ask for quarterly metrics: average processing time, number of delegated approvals, appeals, reversals, and public complaints.

E. Alignment with OCP and Upcoming Bill 25

The OCP (2011) predates the SSMUH and TOD frameworks now required. If Bill 25 passes, the OCP itself may need updating.

→ Ask: “Would any DAPR amendments have to be revisited once Bill 25 becomes law?”

→ Request that staff flag any **OCP inconsistencies** early to avoid legal exposure.

F. Capacity and Training

The report card (Attachment 5) notes staff training and “change management,” but no quantitative workload analysis.

→ Ask for data on permit volume, staffing levels, and target turnaround times post-delegation.

→ Ensure efficiency gains are realistic without eroding review quality.

G. Financial Implications

Staff state there will be “reduced revenue but net gain through efficiency.” That assumes constant workload.

Ask for:

- Fee-revenue projections after delegation;
- Whether cost savings will offset increased volume from provincially mandated housing.

H. Future Amendments Already Planned

The report signals more to come:

- Use of **surety bonds** for land-use permit securities;
- **Environmental regulation housekeeping.**

→ Ask when these will appear and whether they’ll further change Council’s role.

3. Key Provincial Context Connections

Provincial Bill	Key Provisions Affecting DARP	Relevance
Bill 44 (2023)	Eliminates public hearings for OCP-consistent residential rezonings	Directly codified in Bylaw 8764 s. 5(2.1)–(2.2)
Bill 47 (2023)	Creates <i>Transit-Oriented Development Areas</i> with provincial density minimums	Will interact with future DAPR streamlining near Phibbs Exchange & Capilano U.
Bill 25 (2025) (1st Reading)	Expands SSMUH, short-term-rental enforcement, and province-led approvals	DARP’s delegation and no-hearing procedures must anticipate this; may require second-round updates

4. Suggested Questions to Raise at the Meeting

1. **Transparency:** “Will Council and the public receive quarterly summaries of all delegated permit and variance approvals?”
2. **OCP Compliance:** “How will DAPR ensure delegated decisions remain consistent with the OCP as amended by forthcoming Bill 25?”
3. **Public Voice:** “Can residents request a Council review or hearing before staff finalize a delegated permit?”
4. **Capacity:** “What data show that staff resourcing is sufficient to maintain quality while doubling throughput?”
5. **Legal Risk:** “Has the District’s solicitor reviewed DAPR amendments for compliance with current and anticipated provincial statutes?”
6. **Metrics:** “What are the target turnaround times and performance indicators for success after these amendments?”

5. Take-away

The heart of this DAPR Update is a **governance shift**: more approvals by staff, fewer by Council, and fewer public hearings — all justified under provincial streamlining mandates.

Your most effective focus will be on:

- Ensuring **public transparency and democratic accountability** survive the streamlining,
- Confirming **alignment with evolving provincial housing law**, and
- Demanding **data-driven evaluation** one year post-implementation.

Would you like me to prepare a **one-page summary sheet** (formatted for handout or speaking notes) highlighting these top issues and key questions?

You said:

Please Draft a one-page mapping table (DARP change → provincial driver → questions to ask staff) I can print and bring to the meeting;

ChatGPT said:

Here’s a **one-page mapping table** you can print or share at the Nov 3 2025 DNV Council meeting. It links each major **DAPR change** to its **provincial legislative driver** and a few **targeted questions** you can raise with staff or Council.

DARP Update (Agenda Item 8.1) — Key Changes, Provincial Drivers & Questions to Ask

DAPR Proposed Change	Provincial / Legislative Driver	Key Questions for Staff or Council
1. Expanded staff delegation for Development Permits (Form & Character in industrial/business park areas)	<i>Bill 26 (2021)</i> – enables delegation of minor variances; <i>Bills 44 & 47 (2023)</i> – encourage streamlined approvals and delegated	• What checks exist to ensure delegated DP decisions stay consistent with Council policy and OCP intent?

DAPR Proposed Change	Provincial / Legislative Driver	Key Questions for Staff or Council
2. Delegated authority for “minor” variances including subdivision-related variances	decision-making for housing consistency with OCP <i>LGA s.498.1</i> (added via Bill 26 2021) – allows staff-issued minor DVPs	• Will quarterly reports summarize all delegated DPs for transparency? • How is “minor variance” quantitatively defined? • What opportunity will residents have to be informed or comment before approval? • What is the appeal or reconsideration process?
3. Default elimination of public hearings for OCP-consistent rezonings	<i>Bill 44 (2023)</i> – prohibits hearings for OCP-consistent residential rezonings (LGA s. 464 (3),(4)); <i>Bill 25 (2025, 1st Reading)</i> – expected to broaden “no-hearing” scope via SSMUH rules	• How will residents be notified early that a hearing will <i>not</i> be held? • Will Council publicly vote when deciding <i>to</i> hold a hearing? • How will this process adapt if Bill 25 passes?
4. Simplified definition of “minor development permit” and broader exemptions (e.g., façade, small additions ≤ 100 m²)	Administrative streamlining encouraged under <i>Bill 44 & Bill 47</i> – faster approvals, less Council time	• What proportion of DPs will now bypass Council? • How will consistency and design quality be maintained? • Does combining DP + minor variance decisions reduce oversight too far? • Are there safeguards if public interest issues arise?
5. Authority for staff to issue DPs that include minor variances	<i>Bill 26 (2021)</i> + District’s own 2023 Bylaw 8610 delegation	• Will these guidelines be made public and updated after Bill 25? • Can residents petition for a hearing under certain conditions?
6. “Public Hearing Consideration Guidelines” (Attachment 6)	Response to <i>Bill 44 (2023)</i> – codifies staff criteria when recommending hearings	• When will these come forward and will Council retain final approval authority? • How will bond use affect small developers?
7. Staff to explore use of surety bonds and environmental housekeeping changes (future)	<i>Bill 25 (2025)</i> may standardize securities and compliance tools	• What are the measurable targets for reduced timelines? • How will success, public transparency, and fairness be evaluated after one year?
8. DAPR objective: “Streamline approvals and reduce timelines”	<i>Provincial Housing Mandates (Bills 44, 47, 25)</i> – accelerate approvals and remove “red tape”	

Overall Focus for the Meeting

- Ensure **delegation ≠ loss of transparency**.
- Confirm **OCP alignment and democratic oversight** remain intact under Bills 44–47 and the coming Bill 25.
- Request **annual public reporting** on delegated decisions, appeal outcomes, and approval timelines.

Would you like me to format this table into a **print-ready PDF (landscape, one page)** for easy distribution at the meeting?

You said:

That's enough for me to absorb for now. Can we continue this later?

ChatGPT said:

Of course — we can pick this up anytime. I'll remember that you're reviewing the **DNV DARP Update (Agenda Item 8.1, Nov 3 2025)** and that we were building a concise mapping of **local changes vs. provincial housing legislation (Bills 44, 47, 25)** to prepare for the meeting.

When you're ready to continue, we can:

- finalize a one-page PDF handout;
- go deeper into any section (e.g., delegated authority or public-hearing rules); or
- add short speaking notes for the meeting.

Would you like me to keep that context in mind for when you return?

You said:

Yes please. Thank you.

ChatGPT said:

Updated saved memory

Got it — I'll remember that context for when you're ready to continue your DAPR