



Addendum 1 – Responses to Questions for Request for Proposal (RFP COMDEV-2026-01) Development Approvals Process Review and Standardized Designs

Question:

Project timeline: What is the anticipated project start date, and are there any specific key milestones leading up to the completion date of May 12, 2028?

Response:

The project is anticipated to commence in late September/early October 2026. No specific milestones have been identified at this time. The District would expect proponents to identify an appropriate project schedule and key milestones in their proposal.

Question:

Is any design work expected based on local policy implications? For example, would we be expected to provide local adjustments to the provincial standardized housing designs?

Response:

The District is not currently anticipating that the consultant will be required to develop new or locally adapted architectural designs. The focus is intended to be on identifying the local policy, bylaw, process, and education changes needed to facilitate the use of the Province's standardized housing designs in Hope.

The District is open to recommendations regarding local implementation of the standardized designs, including innovative approaches that may improve their applicability within Hope.

Question:

For the bylaws listed in Section 2(b), is the expectation a recommendations report identifying proposed updates and directions for each bylaw, or does the District anticipate the consultant drafting amendment bylaw text?

Response:

The funding for this project, received from the Union of BC Municipalities, supports the review and recommendation of bylaw improvements but does not support the full drafting of new bylaws. The expectation is that the consultant would provide recommendations identifying proposed updates and directions for each bylaw based on



development process improvement and modernization, as well as implementation of standardized designs. The District would use these recommendations to inform subsequent bylaw amendments.

Question:

Can the District confirm that the review of the Development Cost Charges Bylaw (1995) is focused on structure, administration, clarity, and alignment with the development approvals process and current legislation?

Response:

The review of the DCC Bylaw for this RFP would focus on the development approvals process and recommendations for improvements, along with any implications for standardized design implementation. Given that the existing DCC Bylaw is quite dated, a comprehensive standalone review and update is required. This work will be undertaken separately by District staff and the District's engineering consultant on retainer and is outside the scope of this project.

The review undertaken as part of this RFP should identify opportunities for improvement relevant to the development approvals process and inform the comprehensive DCC Bylaw update.

Question:

Does the District expect the new Zoning Bylaw to be adopted before the bylaw review phase of this project begins? For the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw update currently underway, is the expectation that the consultant reviews the draft in progress, coordinates with the consultant leading that update, or reviews the bylaw following adoption?

Response:

The new Zoning Bylaw is unlikely to be fully adopted at the commencement of the project. The review could focus on the draft Zoning Bylaw presented to Council in August, which is anticipated to be adopted prior to the end of 2026.

The Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw update is also currently underway. The expectation is that the consultant would review the existing bylaw and provide recommendations relevant to development process improvement and modernization, along with any implications for standardized design implementation. These recommendations would be used to inform the larger Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw update being undertaken separately by the District.



Question:

Could you please confirm whether the scope also requires the consultant to:

Create new or adapted architectural designs;

Produce drawings or technical documentation; or

Develop site-specific, permit-ready, or construction-ready design packages?

If design work is required, could you also clarify the expected number of housing designs and the required level of documentation?

Response:

The scope is not intended to require the consultant to create new or adapted architectural designs, produce drawings or technical documentation, or develop site-specific, permit-ready, or construction-ready design packages.

The focus is intended to be on the bylaw, process, and education changes needed to facilitate the use of the Province's standardized designs as published.

The District is open to innovative ideas and recommendations regarding the application of the standardized designs within Hope, but proponents should not assume that architectural design or preparation of permit-ready or construction-ready drawing packages is required.

Question:

Section 2(a)(v) references recommendations for technology programs to modernize the development approvals process. Would the District consider a proposal scoped to a portion of the work, such as the technology, application forms, and applicant communications components, or must every proposal cover the full scope including bylaw review and standardized designs?

Response:

The proposal must cover the full scope of the RFP.

Question:

Are multi-firm teams acceptable, with one proponent as prime and others as subconsultants? If so, should the fee schedule identify rates for each firm's staff separately?

Response:

Multi-firm teams are acceptable, with one proponent as prime and others as subconsultants. The fee schedule should identify rates for all staff included in the proposal.



Question:

What prefab-ready considerations need to be taken into account for: a. The District regulatory side; b. The standardized designs themselves

Response:

There are no District specific prefab or modular housing considerations beyond compliance with applicable regulations. The District permits modular housing that complies with the BC Building Code and applicable standards for modular construction. Modular construction has been used successfully for both apartment and single-family residential projects within the District. The District does not permit long-term occupancy of RVs; modular housing units must be installed on a permanent foundation.

Question:

For "Generating a simple pro-forma": Can you provide more context about what the pro-forma will be for? E.g, Will it be for one/some of the provincial designs? Or referring to SSMUH more broadly? Will it focus on a specific SSMUH option?

Response:

The primary purpose of the simple pro-forma is to illustrate development costs so that property owners and developers have a clearer understanding of the financial considerations associated with SSMUH development.

The District is currently undertaking a Development Financial Feasibility Analysis, which is expected to be completed by November 2026. This work will examine a range of development scenarios, although it may not evaluate every SSMUH housing form individually.

It is anticipated that the Development Financial Feasibility Analysis may provide assumptions, data, and analysis that could inform the development of the pro-forma. Detached accessory dwelling units may be of particular interest; however, the District is open to consideration of other SSMUH forms. Proponents should not assume that the feasibility analysis will address every SSMUH housing form.

The District anticipates that the pro-forma will be a relatively minor component of the overall project (approximately 10% of the total project budget).

Question:

Standardized designs. Does the District expect the consultant to deliver adapted, permit ready drawing packages for the provincial standardized designs, or to focus on the bylaw, process and education changes needed for the provincial catalogue to be used



as published? If drawing packages are expected, how many design types does the District anticipate across the housing forms named in the RFP?

Response:

The focus is intended to be on the bylaw, process, and education changes needed for the provincial catalogue to be used as published. However, the District is open to innovative ideas regarding the application of the standardized designs within Hope.

Question:

Technology. Which software systems does the District currently use for development application intake, tracking and building permits?

Response:

We currently use MAIS.

Question:

First Nations meetings. Does the District anticipate convening the meetings with the four First Nations named in the RFP, with the consultant supporting the District in preparation, facilitation and materials?

Response:

The District intends to arrange the meetings and would appreciate consultant support with preparation, facilitation, and materials.