

**From:** [Dickinson, Rob](#)  
**To:** "Greg Merchant"; [Wade, Marianne](#)  
**Cc:** [Schile, Jamai](#); [Gothard, Nancy](#)  
**Subject:** RE: LGA Regulation Amendment - Development Charge Instalments  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:54:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Thank you Greg, we are in receipt of this change in practice and are in the process of working through the administrative and legal steps required to implement this by the aforementioned deadline.

Sincerely,

**Rob Dickinson, P.Eng., PE** | **City of Courtenay**  
Acting Development Engineer  
T 250-228-2460 | E [rdickinson@courtenay.ca](mailto:rdickinson@courtenay.ca)



830 Cliffe Avenue , Courtenay, B.C. V9N 2J7  
[courtenay.ca](http://courtenay.ca) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

---

**From:** Greg Merchant <[gmerchant@wedler.com](mailto:gmerchant@wedler.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:27 AM  
**To:** Wade, Marianne <[mwade@courtenay.ca](mailto:mwade@courtenay.ca)>  
**Cc:** Dickinson, Rob <[rdickinson@courtenay.ca](mailto:rdickinson@courtenay.ca)>  
**Subject:** LGA Regulation Amendment - Development Charge Instalments

Hello Marianne,

Just passing along some information. I've been advised that the BC government are adopting changes to the LGA regulation that allows installment payments for DCC, ACC, and SSAC's. See attached. Amends B.C. Reg. 166/84 — Development Cost Charge and Amenity Cost Charge (Instalments) Regulation, effective January 1, 2026

I know the City is in the process of reviewing and amending the Zoning and SDS bylaws and wanted to know how the City was planning to implement the attached and when we can expect the City to adopt these changes.

**Greg Merchant, P.Eng.**  
Partner • Project Engineer



Offices in Abbotsford, Chilliwack, Courtenay, Surrey and Calgary

**Courtenay Office: 1 (250) 334-3263 ext. 106**

[wedler.com](http://wedler.com) • [facebook](https://www.facebook.com/wedler) • [linkedin](https://www.linkedin.com/company/wedler)

NOTICE: This email and any attachments ("this message") is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary, or otherwise subject to restricted use and/or restricted disclosure under the law. This message may be used ONLY for the purpose intended. Wedler Engineering LLP does not warrant or guarantee the information contained in this message, nor accept liability for any damages that may be incurred from any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and any copies.

**PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**  
**REGULATION OF THE MINISTER OF**  
**HOUSING AND MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS**

*Local Government Act*

Ministerial Order No. M197

I, Ravi Kahlon, Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs, order that, effective January 1, 2026, the Development Cost Charge and Amenity Cost Charge (Instalments) Regulation, B.C. Reg. 166/84, is amended as set out in the attached Schedule.

June 30, 2025

Date



Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs

---

*(This part is for administrative purposes only and is not part of the Order.)*

**Authority under which Order is made:**

Act and section: Local Government Act, R.S.B.C. 2015, c. 1, ss. 559, 570.2 and 572

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

R10917317

## SCHEDULE

- 1** *The Development Cost Charge and Amenity Cost Charge (Instalments) Regulation, B.C. Reg. 166/84, is amended by repealing the title and substituting the following:*

### **DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (INSTALMENTS) REGULATION .**

- 2** *Section 1 is amended*

*(a) by adding the following definition:*

“Act” means the *Local Government Act*; ,

*(b) by repealing the definition of “charge” and substituting the following:*

“charge” means a charge imposed under any of the following provisions of the Act:

(a) section 559 (1) [*development cost charges*];

(b) section 570.2 (1) [*amenity cost charges*];

(c) section 572 (1) [*school site acquisition charges*]; , **and**

*(c) by adding the following definition:*

“index date”, in relation to a charge, means the date of the subdivision approval or issuance of a building permit to which the charge relates.

- 3** *Section 4 is repealed and the following substituted:*

#### **Payment of charge**

- 4** A developer who elects to pay a charge in instalments must pay

(a) 1/4 of the charge on the index date, and

(b) the balance of the charge by the earlier of

(i) the date that is 4 years after the index date, and

(ii) if occupancy permits are required under section 298 (1) (d) [*building regulation bylaws*] of the Act in relation to the development, the date that is 15 business days after the date on which

(A) all of the required occupancy permits have been issued, and

(B) the local government gives written notice to the developer that the conditions, if any, in those permits have been satisfied and payment of the balance of the charge is due.

- 4** *Section 7 is repealed and the following substituted:*

#### **Surety for payment of charge**

- 7** (1) A developer who elects to pay a charge in instalments must, on the index date for the charge, deposit with the financial officer a surety in the form of

(a) an on-demand surety bond of an insurer that has a business authorization issued under the *Financial Institutions Act*,

- (b) an irrevocable letter of credit from
  - (i) a bank, or
  - (ii) a credit union or trust company that has a business authorization issued under the *Financial Institutions Act*, or
  - (c) a security duly assigned.
- (2) Subject to subsection (4), a financial officer may decline to accept the deposit of a surety under subsection (1) if the financial officer is not satisfied that, on default, the balance of the charge will be recoverable.
- (3) For certainty, subsection (2) does not authorize a financial officer to require or prohibit deposit of a form of surety described in subsection (1) (a), (b) or (c).
- (4) Subsection (2) does not apply in relation to an on-demand surety bond for a charge if the following criteria are met:
  - (a) the insurer who issues the bond has one of the following credit ratings:
    - (i) a rating of at least A- from AM Best;
    - (ii) a rating of at least A+ from Fitch Ratings;
    - (iii) a rating of at least A1 from Moody's;
    - (iv) a rating of at least A (high) from Morningstar DBRS;
    - (v) a rating of at least A+ from S&P Global Ratings;
  - (b) the bond provides the following:
    - (i) the insurer must pay the local government the balance of the charge within 15 business days after the local government demands payment from the insurer in accordance with subparagraph (ii);
    - (ii) a demand referred to in subparagraph (i) must be made in writing and must include
      - (A) a statement that the local government has determined that the developer has failed to pay the balance of the charge in accordance with section 4 (b), and
      - (B) the balance of the charge;
    - (iii) a payment referred to in subparagraph (i) must be made despite any objection by the developer, and the insurer may not assert any defence or other grounds for not making the payment;
    - (iv) the insurer may not terminate its obligations under the bond unless
      - (A) the insurer gives written notice to the local government and the developer at least 90 days before the date on which the insurer intends to terminate its obligations, and
      - (B) the developer deposits another surety in accordance with this section at least 30 days before the date on which the insurer intends to terminate its obligations.



Attention: City of Courtenay

I'm reaching out on behalf of Cameron Contracting to express our strong concerns regarding the proposed increases to Development Cost Charges (DCCs) currently under review. While we understand the importance of maintaining and expanding municipal infrastructure, the scale of the proposed changes—particularly in the parks and sewer components—appears disproportionate and, quite frankly, unreasonable.

These two areas have seen exponential increases in the proposed DCC rates, which will significantly impact development feasibility across our region. Sewer infrastructure is vital, yes—but these increases far exceed what we believe is a fair reflection of actual servicing costs. Similarly, while we value access to parks and green space, the scale of the proposed park DCC hike feels detached from both market realities and the rate at which development has evolved.

As builders deeply involved in creating housing for growing communities, we already carry a heavy load of front-end investment in planning, permitting, site prep, and development coordination. Adding sharp DCC increases on top of that—especially without transitional measures—puts immense pressure on not only builders, but also future homeowners already contending with record affordability challenges.

We respectfully ask your office to revisit these proposed increases and consider a more measured, phased-in approach that balances infrastructure needs with the realities of delivering sustainable housing. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this further and to provide constructive feedback from the perspective of a company actively working on the ground to build community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Don Cameron



## Dickinson, Rob

---

**From:** Dickinson, Rob  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 7:57 AM  
**To:** 'don@cameroncontractingltd.ca'  
**Cc:** PlanningAlias  
**Subject:** FW: DCC - Letter of Opposition for Review

Good morning and thank you for the response to the proposed DCC changes. My apologies for taking so long to respond.

Your response will be included in the feedback presented to Council for their consideration.

The City is in the process of summarising all the feedback related to DCC's and bringing a report to Council on November 3<sup>rd</sup> for first to third reading of the bylaw, once published we will send out that report for the development community to review and attend the meeting of Council.

After third reading by Council the bylaw is sent to the Provincial Inspector of Municipalities for their approval. After their approval (likely the spring) Council will consider adoption and that report will also be sent out to the development community for consideration.

Sincerely,

**Rob Dickinson, P.Eng., PE | City of Courtenay**  
Acting Development Engineer

T 250-228-2460 | E [rdickinson@courtenay.ca](mailto:rdickinson@courtenay.ca)



830 Cliffe Avenue, Courtenay, B.C. V9N 2J7  
[courtenay.ca](http://courtenay.ca) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

---

**From:** Don Cameron <[don@cameroncontractingltd.ca](mailto:don@cameroncontractingltd.ca)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 31, 2025 4:00 PM  
**To:** PlanningAlias <[planning@courtenay.ca](mailto:planning@courtenay.ca)>  
**Cc:** Wade, Marianne <[mwade@courtenay.ca](mailto:mwade@courtenay.ca)>  
**Subject:** DCC - Letter of Opposition for Review

Good Afternoon,

Please see my attached letter of feedback on the proposed DCC costs under review.  
Please confirm receipt.

Cheers,

Don Cameron

**From:** [Nancy Henderson](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [Dickinson, Rob](#); [Shaw, Kyle](#); [Bourgeois, Lisa](#)  
**Subject:** RE: DCC Feedback -Arden  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:23:40 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

Hi Caley,

Thank you for your email regarding the City of Courtenay DCC Project. I am replying on behalf of the City. The Arden multi-use pass project was not included as a DCC project as this project has other funding sources allocated for its completion.

The project is set to be constructed in parallel with the new CVRD/City/KFN Water Transmission main. The CVRD is aiming to start construction as early as 2026. The project's scope would provide a new MUP from Laketrail Rd., south along Arden/Comox Logging Rd. to the City's boundary or Livingstone Rd.

Thanks for your interest in the DCCs.

Regards,

Nancy

**Nancy Henderson**  
Senior Local Government Advisor



B-550 Comox Road | Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6  
c 250-718-8803  
w [urbansystems.ca](http://urbansystems.ca)

---

**From:** Caley Leimert <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:02 PM  
**To:** PlanningAlias <[planning@courtenay.ca](mailto:planning@courtenay.ca)>  
**Subject:** DCC Feedback

Hi,

I am curious as to why the Arden multi use path is not included in the DCC project list. It seems like a substantial omission especially in light of the substantial development

interest in the area and active rezoning application off Cumberland road.

Thanks,  
Caley Leimert

## Dickinson, Rob

---

**From:** Dickinson, Rob  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 5:04 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Rick Waldhaus; patriciaann maloney; Maloney, Patricia; Gothard, Nancy  
**Subject:** FW: DCC Bylaw Growth Projections

Hi Brian, apologies for the long wait for an answer, frankly it was a really good question and Urban Systems went away and checked their data and calculations and found a rather small error compared to the issue you raised. The delayed response however is mostly my responsibility.

### Industrial

The industrial projections are determined with methods outlined in the 2005 BC DCC Best Practice Guide (new version of the guide released March 2025, after projections completed). These methods combine vacant land and per capita methods (current per capita rate of industrial floorspace or land projected forward with population growth), which were utilized for the City of Courtenay. You have inquired if the Industrial projection is for gross land, not for floorspace. This is a gross land projection and will be clarified in updated version of the Report.

### Commercial

The commercial projection utilizes historical building permit data and projects growth based on recent trends. We have reviewed the inputs and it has come to our attention that there was a discrepancy between building permit coding and DCC definition of commercial for one development that influences commercial projections. The team will amend the projections accordingly, which will result in a marginally higher DCC rate.

### 2022 OCP

The 2022 OCP was limited to the data available at the time and the population projections therein are much lower than they were in the 2024 BC Stats population projections that were used to inform the DCC projections. For example, the 2022 OCP projects the population to reach 32,504 by the year 2051. The 2024 BC Stats population projections and estimates utilized for the Courtenay DCC Bylaw indicate that the Courtenay population is 32,309 in 2025, and that the population will be 45,081 in the year 2045. Based on this population growth compared to the anticipated growth at the time of completion of the 2022 OCP, it follows that the demand for commercial and industrial floorspace would differ considerably. The City is in the process of updating the OCP projections.

Sincerely,

**Rob Dickinson, P.Eng., PE | City of Courtenay**  
Acting Development Engineer

T 250-228-2460 | E [rdickinson@courtenay.ca](mailto:rdickinson@courtenay.ca)



830 Cliffe Avenue , Courtenay, B.C. V9N 2J7  
[courtenay.ca](http://courtenay.ca) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:06 PM  
**To:** Dickinson, Rob <[rdickinson@courtenay.ca](mailto:rdickinson@courtenay.ca)>  
**Cc:** [rwaldhaus@crownsisle.ca](mailto:rwaldhaus@crownsisle.ca)  
**Subject:** DCC Bylaw Growth Projections

Yesterday meeting at City hall on the OCP update and Crown Isle lands unearthed a significant discrepancy in the City of Courtenay's growth projections. The 2022 OCP anticipated Employment Lands Supply and Demand Projections (Table A-1; page 17) were as follows:

Commercial - additional demand by 2041 = 291,742 SF  
Office – additional demand by 2041 = 148,640 SF  
Industrial – additional demand by 2041 = 16 acres

However, Urban Strategies report for the DCC Bylaw dated June 2025, projects the following in Table 3, page 4 of the report:

Commercial – 20 year growth = 159,300 M2 (1,714,600 SF)  
Institutional – 20 year growth = 27,100 M2 (291,702 SF)  
Industrial – 20 year growth = 190,700 M2 (2,052,677 SF)

These latest projections seem to be widely out of step with the regions growth and development potential for the next 20 years. Ten times the amount of commercial projected?? Should there numbers have been square feet?? Look forward to discussing. There is no way these numbers should be driving he OCP.

Cheers,

*Brian McCauley, President*  
**Terra Pacific Consultants Ltd.**

[REDACTED] Seabank Rd. Courtenay BC V9J 1Y1  
**C:** [REDACTED]