

# **Anmore South Infrastructure Financial Analysis Open House Q&A Summary**

Virtual Open House via Zoom  
Monday, December 6, 2021  
7:00 p.m.

The following questions and answers are a culmination of those emailed directly to [cboit@islengineering.com](mailto:cboit@islengineering.com) and those asked during the meeting either live or through the chat function. Questions that were repeated have been consolidated into one question. Answers have been provided by ISL Engineering and GP Rollo & Associates.

**Q: Are Community Amenity Charges (CACs) a mandatory fee during a rezoning or is this a voluntary donation by the developer?**

A: CACs are voluntary donations by the developer that are offered as a result of gaining increased development rights through rezoning. While they are considered voluntary, there is an expectation that CACs will be negotiated as part of a rezoning application.

**Q: Have you included Development Cost Charges (DCCs) in the calculation in all options? If so, can you highlight the DCC for each?**

A: Yes, DCCs have been included for those scenarios that the bylaw applies (for single family home lots). DCCs that are collected by and kept for Village purposes are as follows:

Water \$5,555

Drainage \$1,050

Roads \$4,114

**Q: You mentioned that if Anmore has over 5,000 people, Anmore would need its own police force. Can you clarify? It is my understanding that Anmore could expand its contract with the RCMP and that the number of officers is determined by Council in each budget year.**

A: For clarity, the reference to population impacts on police services is about the cost for service; it's not about moving away from RCMP. Anmore already pays for police services through the annual property tax notice. In 2021, this contract amount was approximately \$250,000. This represents 10% of the actual cost for the policing services Anmore receives (the other 90% is paid for by the provincial government). If Anmore's population were to increase above 5,000, Anmore's share of the cost would increase to 70% (instead of 10%) and the Village would have a contract directly with the RCMP (as opposed to the service being provided through a contract the provincial government has with the RCMP). There may also be

a need for additional officers; however, that has not been assessed at this time and would be included as part of a development proposal process.

**Q: Could Anmore have a private police force?**

A: Council could request a municipal police force (instead of RCMP); however, there are a number of approvals that would be required.

**Q: How many people live in Anmore currently? Is it likely that the development would add enough residents to exceed 5,000?**

A: In the most recent Census (2016), the population in Anmore is 2,210. Provincial estimates put the 2021 population at close to 2,500. The increase in population would depend on the type of development. In the three scenarios considered in the study, in the first two scenarios (RS-1 Zone and Comprehensive Development Zone), total population would not exceed the 5,000 threshold; however, a Scenario 3 development would likely add enough residents to exceed 5,000.

**Q: As a resident of Countryside, I am concerned about the sewer connection, which of these options would provide sewer to all of Anmore?**

A: Scenario 3 in the study includes bringing a regional sewer connection to Anmore to service the development. This approach would mean that the developer is responsible for the cost to bring the sewer connection along with a direct water connection to Anmore – estimated at \$60 million. There would be no requirement for the rest of Anmore to connect to sewer; however, the system could be expanded in future to service existing properties. While technically, Anmore could pursue a sewer infrastructure connection for the community on its own if needed in the future rather than through a development in Anmore South, the connection to the Metro Vancouver infrastructure is an extremely expensive undertaking and would be at the cost of the Village taxpayers.

**Q: How did you develop the population increase numbers?**

A: The population increase estimates for Scenarios 1 and 2 were based on the type of housing that would be incorporated into each scenario along with comparisons to similar neighbourhoods in Anmore. For Scenario #1 (RS-1) it was assumed that there would be a principal home and coach house meaning an average of 5.2 people would live on each lot. For Scenario 2, coach houses and secondary suites are not permitted, so 3.2 people per parcel was used as this is the average population per parcel for single-family homes in Anmore as per the 2016 Census data. As noted, a population increase was not identified for Scenario 3 as the Village is waiting for the specific development application to determine this data.

**Q: The report has shown the increase in infrastructure costs for the various scenarios. As population increases, costs for staffing will also increase. Where is that accounted for?**

A: This report is focused on the infrastructure capital and replacement costs; however, specific staffing cost increases will be analyzed once a detailed proposal is received.

**Q: Can you clarify, will a tax increase for RS-1 and the CD Zone apply to all of Anmore residents?**

A: Yes, any time there is a new development in Anmore, the cost for replacing the infrastructure is typically paid by all residents through property taxes.

**Q: Could a hybrid development be possible, which would include elements of both Scenario 1 and 2 with consideration given to the impact on existing nearby properties?**

A: Yes, a proposal to that effect would have to come forward.

**Q: Would dedicated land be open to future development?**

A: This would be a decision of Council. During the rezoning process, dedicated land could either become parkland or be left for alternate uses in future.

**Q: With regards to schooling, what is the plan? Will there be a middle or high school in any of these plans?**

A: School requirements for our area are decided by School District No. 43. The Village provides regular updates to the School District regarding developments and expected growth.

**Q: Would the Village of Anmore lobby to reopen the David Avenue connector in order to accommodate increase in traffic?**

A: Anmore has always indicated that the David Avenue connector should remain open and continues to support this position. Through the development process, notification and discussion with adjacent communities and government agencies would be required, and transportation would be a part of those discussions.

**Q: Did you go back and balance out the infrastructure cost with the current infrastructure levy (for the 4.1 km of road in Scenario #3)?**

A: Yes, the infrastructure estimates have been confirmed for all scenarios. It's important to understand that the amounts represented in the infrastructure levy are based on historical costs to replace like for like. Infrastructure estimates for the scenarios take into consideration new standards and an increase in service level (e.g. streetlights, curb and gutter, etc.).

**Q: The Official Community Plan (OCP) RLU [Residential Land Use]-8 states the gross density for CD zones cannot exceed 1.8 per acre. This does not allow for ¼ acre lots - why is this the scenario size for scenario 2? The only CD lot of this size that I know of is the sales office for Bella Terra.**

A: The ¼ acre lot size was selected because this is the smallest lot that could accommodate a septic field.

**Q: A recent Vancouver study found that on the West side increased density nearby had a negative impact on property values in that neighborhood. Interestingly, this was not the case on the East side. The interpretation was that West side residents place a higher value on privacy. Do you have any thoughts on how these scenarios might impact existing property values?**

*A: It is unknown how the property values may be affected by any development within Anmore.*

**Q: Does Anmore Council have to accept any proposal put forth by a developer - especially if it is counter to the OCP?**

*A: Anmore Council must consider all completed proposals brought forward but does not need to accept any proposal.*

**Q: Anmore is currently outside of the Metro Vancouver Urban Containment Boundary. Why is this seemingly not of greater importance in proposals for developing Anmore South land?**

*A: First, it's important to note a developer can come forward with any development proposal it chooses. Any proposal that requires a sewer connection would also require an application to change the land use designation and an adjustment to in the Urban Containment Boundary with Metro Vancouver. These types of changes are very important and involve a comprehensive process, which would be an important consideration for a proposal similar to Scenario #3.*

**Q: How did you determine the estimated property values for Scenario #1 (\$5 million)?**

*A: Multiple factors were taken into consideration, including using Fair Market Value statistics and speculating out 2-3 years (when development might start) the value of a 1-acre lot. The estimate for the land on its own were based on \$1.9 million, and it is assumed that the home would be the maximum allowable building (Floor Area Ratio or FAR) costing \$3.1 million (in future dollars).*

**Q: Will there be a requirement to upgrade the high voltage power lines that run through Anmore as a result of the development?**

*A: The transmission lines that run through Anmore provide service to a larger area than Anmore. Ultimately, BC Hydro will determine if the lines need upgrading based on usage for the whole area, not just the Anmore South lands.*

**Q: Why didn't Tsawwassen First Nation connect to Metro Vancouver's regional sewerage system and construct their own sewerage treatment plant?**

*A: While we cannot comment on the rationale for another jurisdiction's decision making, Anmore could consider building a sewerage treatment plan instead of connecting to regional sewer; however, we do not believe it would be in the best interest of the Village.*

**Q: How does the Village make decisions about road placement, and would they consider the roads in the new development to be strata (not public), similar to the latest development at the top of Heritage Mountain in Port Moody?**

*A: Road placement will be in part determined by the Roads Master Plan and will be proposed by the developer. Strata roads could be considered for a future development, but there are no decisions or plans at this time.*

**Q: Is there something wrong with the proposed OCP medium growth scenario of 61 people a year?**

*A: This scenario was not looked at in the report. The scenarios in the study were based on an RS-1 zone, a Comprehensive Development zone and a theoretical multi-family zone.*

**Q: I'm trying to understand how 150/151 acres was used as the basis for this ISL report. My calculations based on BC Land Title and Survey Authority registration shows 145.3 acres. In 2019, the Anmore portion of the IOCO Lands was re-surveyed (by the owner) and divided into 3 lots, each with their own PID and title. The field survey completed December 23, 2019 certifies that the total acreage of the three lots are:**

**20.1 hectares + 19.9 hectares + 18.8 hectares = 58.8 hectares or 145.3 acres**

**Can you explain this to me? The decreased acreage would certainly affect the other calculations.**

*A: The number of acres used in the study is based off of the GIS information ISL has on file. Specific acreage will need to be provided any future development proposal.*

**Q: Metro 2050 - The Regional Growth Strategy Sensitive Ecosystems 5.2 5 and GIS.Metrovancouver.org/mvmaps/SEI attachments show much of the designated land in Anmore South as riparian with SPEA [Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area] requirements and mature forest. Can you with any precision tell me exactly how much of Anmore South is not available for development per Federal, Provincial, Regional, and Municipal requirements to protect such lands? Will the parkland dedication of 5% be above and beyond these Environmentally Sensitive Ecosystems lands?**

*A: We do not have this information at present. Significant time and effort will be required by the proponent to identify and meet these regulations. The 5% dedicated parkland in Scenario 1 is only the land that the Village would control. The other protected environmentally sensitive areas would likely end up as part of someone's private property, much like the rest of Anmore.*

**Q: The Anmore Official Community Plan Bylaw No 532, 2014 states: "It is anticipated that by 2041 our current population of about 2,200 will almost double to an anticipated build-out population of approximately 4,000 residents... Based on population projections and market research conducted as part of the Financial Sustainability Plan, Scenario 2 is most**

consistent with the actual population growth experienced in Anmore in recent years - an average increase of 61 people per year."

However, the Burrard Commons Development that Council was considering in 2019 stated: "The residential component would consist of between 1,440-1,580 apartment units that would be situated in mixed use buildings (commercial on the ground floor and, in some areas, on the second floor). The mixed-use buildings would be up to 40 metres in height, which is approximately 12 storeys. The projections that the applicant has provided would see an additional population of 4,268 residents by the year 2036. The units would be a mix of sizes ranging from 1-4 bedrooms".

The Local Government Act Part 14, Division 4 legislates that the "Official community plans describe the long-term vision of communities. They are a statement of objectives and policies that guide decisions on municipal and regional district planning and land use management. These decisions impact communities' sustainability and resilience." There seems to be a big disconnect between the population projections in the Anmore OCP Growth Management Strategy and 'urban' density considerations for Anmore South, Can you explain why Anmore Council would even consider such an urban density development proposal when it seems so inconsistent with the OCP?

*A: This analysis was to review what could potentially happen in the future – these scenarios are not development plans. For Scenarios 2 and 3, OCP and zoning changes would be required prior to any development, and Scenario 3 would also require changes to the land use designation and Urban Containment Boundary through Metro Vancouver.*

**Q: There are a number of reports about the nature of the Anmore South financial prospects, ecosystems, traffic etc. that were prepared by consultants for the same developer and others (including the ISL traffic report done for Port Moody) for the same land. The land has not changed. The developer has not changed. Only the name has changed. Have these reports been considered in this latest ISL Anmore South Infrastructure Financial Analysis? If not, why not?**

1. Burrard Commons Development Overview provides an overall look at the development proposal and includes a summary of many of the individual technical reports and population projections. (Attachment 1\*)
2. A transportation study looking at traffic impacts in Anmore and proposing an
3. independent transit service. (Attachment 2\*)
4. An economic impact and employment analysis. (Attachment 3\*)
5. Fiscal impact analysis on the Village's finances, that includes the cost implications of police and fire service (Attachment 4\*)
6. An environmental assessment, including watercourse, riparian areas and fish habitat assessments. (Attachment 5, Attachment 6, Attachment 7\*)

**7. An infrastructure and servicing options report which addresses the provision of water and sewer services for the development proposal.**

*A: The current study was focused on infrastructure costs for three scenarios and did not include the broader studies you have listed. These are previous reports that were based on a proposal that was withdrawn. New reports will be required to be submitted with any new application and will be reviewed and analyzed at that time.*

**Q: You may recall that the ISL Engineering David Avenue connector traffic study done for Port Moody in 2018 concluded that the roads in Port Moody which would service Anmore South traffic are at or near capacity (loco Rd/Guildford-Murray/Heritage Mountain Way, Forest Park Way). Does ISL Engineering stand behind its professional assessment at that time that there is no road capacity for any development beyond a hundred +/- homes? Or would that number of homes now be even smaller due to the additional development along loco Road?**

*A: Chris Boit was not involved with this report; however, we're sure the authors would stand by their assessment. The report also stated that the David Avenue R/W connector be maintained; however, Port Moody recently removed this R/W. An independent traffic assessment should be completed based on any future proposal received. Such a report would highlight the issues and possible solutions.*

**Q: It seems to me that the costs for water and sewer identified in the Aplin Martin report for Burrard Commons would still be much the same for Anmore South. Rather than a simple connection at the corner of loco Rd and 1st Ave, the report shows many kilometres of sewer and water mains required (pages 9-17). Have all of these extra costs for density, ongoing infrastructure maintenance, and the additional fire and policing costs been factored into your analysis?**

*A: The additional sewer and water connections would be required by Metro Vancouver for such a development. Anmore could not be serviced by existing infrastructure outside of our jurisdiction. Further, additional fire, policing and staffing costs will be analyzed once a completed proposal is received.*

**Q: As shown in the Infrastructure Financial Analysis, an 'urban' designation in Anmore South has the potential to generate a windfall of \$10-\$13 million in Community Amenities Contributions from a developer based on land lift for CD zoning. Can you help me understand your thinking about CACs in Anmore South? This assessment seems inconsistent with the July 2020 GP Rollo CAC study for Nanaimo which recommends a fixed CAC (density bonus) per housing type. (page 7)**

**"Given our research and analysis GPRA recommends the City increase its CACs as follows:**

- **Single Family: \$3,000 per unit in 2021; \$5,500 per unit in 2022, and**
- **\$8,000 per unit in 2023 and beyond.**

- **Townhouse: \$2,500 per unit in 2021; \$5,000 per unit in 2022, and \$7,500 per unit in 2023 and beyond.**
- **Strata Apartments: \$2,000 per unit in 2021; \$3,500 per unit in 2022, and \$5,000 per unit in 2023 and beyond."**

**Also, I recall that when GP Rollo recommended a \$150,000 CAC for an infill half acre lot in Anmore, at the same time a similar report recommended \$1,500 CAC for infill in Pitt Meadows. It was explained that Anmore was unique, but I don't remember the reason for the great CAC disparity between Anmore and the other communities listed in the GP Rollo Infill report. With the provincial government currently requiring municipalities to negotiate and not appear to be selling rezoning, and also considering eliminating CACs in the near future, can you explain why Anmore seems to be so 'out-of-step' with other neighbouring communities relative to CACs?**

*A: These are very different sets of analyses between Nanaimo and Anmore. The Nanaimo market is very different and has a much higher starting point for base density than does Anmore. Secondly, there is a significant difference between the Nanaimo work centred around flat fees for CAC rates as opposed to an ad hoc analysis such as this, which we would still recommend Nanaimo do if one came across their desk.*

*With regard to our infill lot work, there's no comparison to the sizes of lots in Port Moody to those in Anmore generally. The point was that you could take a 1-acre lot and split it in two and the value doesn't really get halved, it actually retains about 80% of the value of the one lot but now times two.*

*As to the last point, yes CACs are to be negotiated. Flat fees essentially are suggested expectations to start negotiations and give up a fair bit to err on the side of caution so as to not be punitive to developers while also providing a measure of cost certainty in proformas when considering purchasing development lots.*

**Q: In a May 13, 2021, report to Council, CAO Juli Halliwell states that Council would have no input in the development of the scenarios in this Anmore South Infrastructure Financial Analysis. However, she does not mention staff. The person who has all the input appears to be the Manager of Development Services, who is also responsible for the Infrastructure Financial Analysis report which sets out the parameters (such as taking riparian land as the 5% parkland dedication). When I asked this question, Ms. Halliwell explained that there are efficiencies related to hiring ISL to prepare the Anmore South Infrastructure Financial Analysis because Mr. Boit is familiar with the Anmore context. This seems strange to me. Do you not see a problem with the Anmore Manager of Development Services and one-in-the-same person at ISL Engineering and Land Services being responsible for the Anmore South Infrastructure Financial Analysis report?**

*A: There is no conflict or issue with ISL undertaking this work.*



**Q: How much did it cost to do this Financial Analysis?**

*A: Council approved up to \$20,000 to review these scenarios.*

**Q: Scenarios 2 and 3 envisage dedicated land (e.g. parkland) as almost totally enclosed within developable land. Is this because the dedicated land is already more ecologically sensitive than the developable lands? Do the maps provided not seem to indicate that this dedicated land will become the preserve of the new residents of Anmore South? How do you facilitate access to this dedicated land for the people living in the rest of Anmore? Will Anmore South need to consider parking lots so the rest of Anmore can gain access to the dedicated land in Anmore South?**

*A: This is a high-level study, but the thought process behind the dedicated land is to try and preserve land that would have the highest amenity to current and future Anmore residents. As to the connection piece, this is something that would have to be determined in the future, but this could entail an increased trail network through Anmore and perhaps parking lots.*

**Q: As we all know Anmore has no streetlights. Do Scenarios 2 and 3 need to consider streetlights? What are the costs? If Anmore South has streetlights, does it then follow that the rest of Anmore will require streetlights? What are these costs for the rest of Anmore?**

*A: For this analysis ISL assumed streetlights would be installed and they add a significant cost to the roadway. This is something to bear in mind when the Village receives and considers any future development proposals. Street lighting adds roughly 25% to the costs of a roadway.*