Regular Meeting of Council
Agenda
April 3, 2017

A Regular Meeting of Council will be held in the Council Chambers
of the Municipal Hall at 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, B.C.

Commencing at 1:00 p.m. for Committee of the Whole
Immediately followed by a Closed Council meeting
Reconvening at 7:00 p.m. for Regular Council proceedings

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:00 P.M.)
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
4. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
   (a) Parking Enforcement Pilot Project
       RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
       1. That staff be authorized to proceed with administration and
          enforcement of the Parking Enforcement Pilot Project effective June
          1 through to October 1, 2017;
       2. That staff report back to Council with statistics on the Project’s
          achievements and challenges upon its conclusion; and
       3. That the parallel parking on the west side of Oyama Street, between
          Israel Avenue and Kenney Avenue be retained.
   (b) Rezoning and Development Variance Permit Applications to
       facilitate a 2-lot subdivision for the property located at 8351
       McTaggart Street
       This report details the rezoning and development variance permit
       applications to allow a two (2) lot subdivision on the property located at
       8351 McTaggart Street and identifies the necessary amendment to the
       Zoning Bylaw.
       Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have
       listed Zoning Amendment Bylaw 5644-2017-5050(247) under the
       “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also
       support the development variance permit application, which will be listed
       for Council consideration under the “Development Permits for
consideration section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the zoning amendment bylaw.

subject to council’s approval, a public hearing will be scheduled for april 18, 2017.

5. corporate administration and finance

(a) quarterly financial reporting – december 31, 2016

this report is to brief council on the current status of the 2016 year-end results and explanations for the year-end results that have a budget variance of +/- $10,000 or +/- 10%. this report is provided for information purposes only. no staff recommendation accompanies this report and council action is not required.

(b) standards of conduct for employees policy

this report is to advise council that a new policy has been drafted, standards of conduct for employees, which outlines how district employees are expected to conduct themselves. this policy will be presented to the chief administrative officer for approval.

this report is provided for information purposes only. no staff recommendation accompanies this report and council action is not required.

(c) royal canadian legion branch 57 application for temporary change to liquor primary club license – 32627 logan avenue

recommendations: council consider and resolve:

1. that the application from royal canadian legion branch 57 to the british columbia liquor control and licensing branch for a temporary change to liquor primary club license #152527 for the property located at 32627 logan avenue to allow the use of an outdoor tent for the following special events in 2017:
   - june 24, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (legion week, mission legion’s 90th birthday)
   - july 1, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (canada day car rally)
   - november 11, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (remembrance day)
   be supported as “no objection” in part 12 of the application; and

2. that the following comments be included in part 12 of the application:
   a) with respect to the potential for noise: the royal canadian legion is located in an area that is primarily zoned and designated for commercial land uses. activities undertaken at this location are such that they would not generate excessive noise, even with the event proposed within a tent. in this regard, no adverse impact is anticipated if the application is approved.
   b) with respect to the potential impact on the community: given that the change to the existing license is temporary and would only allow the use of a tent for special event days, no
adverse impact on the community is anticipated if the application is approved.

c) With respect to views expressed by neighbouring residents: The views of residents were not sought as part of this application as it is considered to be minor in nature.

6. **PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE**

(a) **Muse Awards**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That $5,000 be designated biennially to support the Muse Awards;
2. That $5,000 to support the 2018 Muse Awards be added to the 2017 budget, with funding from the Gaming Reserve Fund;
3. That the ongoing $5,000 biennial amount, commencing in the 2019 for the 2020 event and carrying on every two years thereafter, be added to the District’s budget with ongoing funding from the Gaming Reserve Fund; and
4. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

(b) **2017 Special Occasion Beer Garden License Requests**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

That the 2017 Special Occasion requests from:

- Mission Slo-Pitch;
- Mission Firefighters Charitable Society;
- Mission Folk Music Festival;
- Downtown Business Association; and
- Root’s and Blues Festival

be declared Community Special Events for the purposes of securing a Special Event Permit from the BC Liquor Control and Licensing Branch.

7. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

(a) **Federal Grade Crossing Regulations Update**

This report is to update Council on the status of Mission’s public grade crossings as it relates to Transport Canada’s new Canadian Grade Crossing Regulations.

(b) **Rot Pot Compost Promotional Options**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That, starting in 2018, the annual Rot Pot compost giveaway event be discontinued;
2. That Option 3a, as outlined in the report titled “Rot Pot Compost Promotional Options” from the Environmental Coordinator, dated April 3, 2017, be implemented starting in 2018, which includes:
   a. Rot Pot compost be sold at cost for $25 per tonne ($13.50 per cubic yard) at the Mission Landfill to Mission residents
b. Mission residents be given the option of self-loading compost anytime throughout the active gardening season, or having compost machine loaded on up to six scheduled Saturday mornings from March through June at an additional flat loading fee of $5 per load; and

3. That, following 2018, Option 3a be re-evaluated for impacts to taxpayers and potentially be adjusted to Option 3.

8. **FORESTRY**

(a) **Telus Communication Site Powerline Access Agreement**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Council consider and resolve:

That the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the Telus Compensation and Logging Agreement attached to the Manager of Forestry Business’s report dated April 3, 2017.

9. **RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Council consider and resolve to rise from Committee of the Whole

10. **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC, RECESS THE PUBLIC MEETING UNTIL 7:00 P.M. AND IMMEDIATELY CONVENE INTO CLOSED SESSION**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That pursuant to Section 90 and 92 of the *Community Charter*, the public be excluded from this portion of the meeting as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:
   - Section 90(1)(f) of the *Community Charter* – law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment;

2. That the public portion of the meeting be recessed until 7:00 p.m.; and

3. That Council immediately resolve into the closed portion of their meeting.

11. **RECONVENE (7:00 P.M.)**

12. **MISSION MOMENTS: FREEMAN OF THE CITY**

13. **RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

(a) **Committee of the Whole report dated April 3, 2017**

Report of recommendations to be circulated at the 7:00 p.m. reconvened public meeting
14. DELEGATIONS
   (a) Rotary Club of Mission Mid-Day
       Re: Sports Clock for the Mission Rotary Sports Park
   (b) Kim Kokoszka
       Re: Proposed cell tower at the Mission Rotary Sports Park

15. PROCLAMATIONS
   (a) Mental Health Week
       May 1 to 7, 2017

16. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   (a) Public Hearing Notice for April 3, 2017
       For reference
   (b) i. Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5622-2017-4052(47)
        OCP16-001 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to redesignate the
        properties located at 8540, 8554, and 8590 Nottman Street from
        Urban Residential Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact
        ii. Zoning Amending Bylaw 5623-2017-5050(232)
        R16-010 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to rezone properties at
        8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone
        to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential
        Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone
        Copy of Notice to Owner/Occupant and previous staff report
        included as background information
   (c) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5625-2017-5050(233)
        R16-030 (Cavas) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 32290 and 32336
        Lougheed Highway from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to
        Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone
        Copy of Notice to Owner/Occupant and previous staff report included as
        background information
   (d) Land Use Contract Discharging Bylaw 5626-2017
       A bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract between the District of
       Mission and the Mission Builders Market Ltd
       See item 16(c) for background information
   (e) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5632-2017-5050(238)
        R16-048 (Redekop) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 7354 Wren
        Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact
        465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone
        Copy of Notice to Owner/Occupant and previous staff report included as
        background information
(f) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5633-2017-5050(239)**
R16-050 (Civic Consultants) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 32554, 32596 and 32598 Cherry Avenue from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone
Copy of *Notice to Owner/Occupant* and previous staff report included as background information

(g) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5635-2017-5050(240)**
R16-043 (Mani) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 7297 Wardrop Street from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone
Copy of *Notice to Owner/Occupant* and previous staff report included as background information

(h) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5636-2017-5050(241)**
R16-034 (Tiegen & Toor) – a bylaw to rezone properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone
Copy of *Notice to Owner/Occupant* and previous staff report included as background information

(i) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5638-2017-5050(243)**
R16-047 (Pankratz) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33759 Ferndale Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone
Copy of *Notice to Owner/Occupant* and previous staff report included as background information

17. **COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES**
   (a) Joint Shared Services Committee Meeting – January 19, 2017

18. **BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION**
   (a) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5644-2017-5050(247)**
       *First & Second Readings*
       R16-054 (Hatzic Properties) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 8351 McTaggart Street from Urban Residential 669 (R669) Zone to Urban Residential 558 (R558)
       See “Development Services” section 4(b)

   (b) **Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5622-2017-4052(47)**
       *Second & Third Readings*
       OCP16-001 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to redesignate the properties located at 8540, 8554, and 8590 Nottman Street from Urban Residential Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact
       See “Public Hearings” Section 16(b)i
Zoning Amending Bylaw 5623-2017-5050(232) – Second & Third Readings

R16-010 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(b)ii

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5625-2017-5050(233) – Third Reading

R16-030 (Cavas) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(c)

Land Use Contract Discharging Bylaw 5626-2017 – Third Reading

A bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and the Mission Builders Market Ltd

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(d)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5632-2017-5050(238) – Third Reading

R16-048 (Redekop) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 7354 Wren Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(e)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5633-2017-5050(239) – Third Reading

R16-050 (Civic Consultants) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 32554, 32596 and 32598 Cherry Avenue from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(f)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5635-2017-5050(240) – Third Reading

R16-043 (Mani) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 7297 Wardrop Street from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(g)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5636-2017-5050(241) – Third Reading

R16-034 (Tiegen & Toor) – a bylaw to rezone properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(h)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5638-2017-5050(243) – Third Reading

R16-047 (Pankratz) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33759
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Ferndale Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone

See “Public Hearings” Section 16(i)

(k) **Freedom of Information Bylaw 5560-2016**

A bylaw for the administration of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*

19. **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

   **RECOMMENDATION:** That the following minutes be adopted:

   (a) Special Council Meeting (Administrative Hearing) – March 13, 2017

   (b) Regular Council Meeting – March 20, 2017

20. **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

21. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

22. **QUESTION PERIOD**

23. **ADJOURNMENT**
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services
SUBJECT: Parking Enforcement Pilot Project

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That staff be authorized to proceed with administration and enforcement of the Parking Enforcement Pilot Project effective June 1 through to October 1, 2017;
2. That staff report back to Council with statistics on the Project’s achievements and challenges upon its conclusion; and
3. That the parallel parking on the west side of Oyama Street, between Israel Avenue and Kenney Avenue be retained.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In response to a delegation from the Oyama Street area at the December 6, 2016 regular Council meeting, staff were directed to report back with possible changes to improve safety and compliance regarding illegal parking on Oyama Street, adjacent to the Mission Sports Park (the park). The delegation expressed concerns that vehicles are parking illegally on Oyama Street during the evenings and weekends when sports activities are taking place at the adjacent Mission Sports Park.

Mission, from a community planning perspective, is experiencing significant growth and physical changes. Mission’s scenic beauty combined with steadily increasing demand for access means that the District's popularity comes at a price. The District has heard from the community and the Downtown Business Association (DBA) that illegal parking must be considered a priority. Common themes associated with parking complaints are: limited availability of parking spaces, pedestrian and driver safety issues, concerns about emergency vehicle access, and citizens parking longer than permitted in designated areas. These issues are especially problematic downtown, at sports parks and construction sites, in laneways, cul-de-sacs, along the waterfront area, and at the Leisure Centre.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s approval to initiate a parking enforcement pilot project (project) that would focus on the areas of the Mission Sports Park and downtown. The project would improve the delivery of the District’s parking enforcement services. The general components of the project include, but are not limited to the following:

- enforcement of on and off-street parking regulations;
- resolution of citizen complaints;
- arranging to tow vehicles that are parked unsafely or in violation of the Traffic Regulation Bylaw; and
- collection of evidence and giving testimony in relation to parking-related files.
BACKGROUND:
On December 5, 2016, a resident attended Council to discuss parking issues and safety concerns for Oyama Street next to Mission Sports Park. The resident showed Council photographs of cars parked illegally on Oyama Street and noted that on evenings and weekends, both sides of the street are full of parked cars, while the parking lot for the sports field sits empty. The resident also noted that cars will park facing the fields and idle their engines, which backs directly onto her yard. The resident requested that parking signs be removed and the boulevard be cleaned up to discourage people from parking on it. On December 5, 2016, Council resolved that staff provide a report with recommendations to improve safety and compliance regarding illegal parking on Oyama Street adjacent to the park.

It was noted that vehicles are parking along the east side of Oyama Street, which is marked with ‘no parking’ signs. Also, although parking is permitted on the west side of Oyama Street, the shoulder is fairly wide and drivers often park with either an ‘angle’ or ‘90 degree’ orientation, disregarding the existing ‘Parallel Parking Only’ signs. A concern regarding excessive speeds in the 30 km/h speed zone on Oyama Street was also noted. The delegation’s request is for a ‘no parking’ restriction be installed on the west side of Oyama Street, that the boulevard on the west side of Oyama Street be landscaped or otherwise improved to discourage parking, and that parking and speed enforcement is conducted.

It was noted by the delegation that the parked vehicles mostly belong to either participants or parents of children participating in sports activities at the playing fields fronting Oyama Street. This street parking is frequently used rather than the parking lots within the park, due to the close proximity to the playing fields and as a result of some spectators who want to watch the activities from their vehicle, particularly during poor weather. Additional concerns expressed by the delegation are that the parked vehicles are often kept running while spectators watch the games, damage has been done to the fence by the parked vehicles and drivers are speeding on Oyama Street.

Parking Requirements for the Mission Sports Park
Approximately 176 paved parking spaces are currently available onsite at the park. Although these parking spaces will satisfy the general parking demand when the sports fields are not at capacity, large bookings or tournaments will generate a significantly higher parking requirement that cannot be accommodated with the onsite spaces currently available. The overflow parking will need to be accommodated by using available street parking in the surrounding area.

The land area of the park is extremely valuable for its active sports facility use, and it is not practical to use an additional amount of this land, within the facility, to supply increased parking. In addition to using up valuable sports activity area, paved parking spaces are very expensive to construct. A compromise is to provide the basic parking needs onsite and then provide street parking as a practical and economical alternative for the overflow parking requirements during large events. Street parking is typically available adjacent to most District parks and residents who live near a park usually expect to see this street parking being used by park visitors.

Parking Concerns in Other Areas of the District
Unfortunately, the parking concerns on Oyama Street are not isolated, and the District is trying to respond to increasing demands for parking enforcement. Complaints against illegal parking appear to be increasing, although staff are working to develop more effective tracking systems. District staff also met with the DBA on February 1, 2017 at their monthly meeting. Staff received significant feedback from the DBA and agreed to consider their recommendations. The DBA was clear that downtown parking enforcement and homelessness should be considered a first priority. Similar concerns are being echoed across the community, so there appears to be a high level of support for the idea that parking compliance needs to be well-managed by the District. Staff believe that it would be beneficial to increase the visibility of parking enforcement in Mission, particularly on weekends and evenings from June through to September.
District bylaw officers have worked diligently to improve the service delivery model in order to provide our citizens with a sense of safety and security. The Bylaw Enforcement Division strives to cost-effectively integrate District resources to work in coordination with local RCMP to support the needs of the community. The Bylaw Enforcement Division is operated by municipal staff within Development Services, and the unit currently employs three full-time bylaw officers, one full-time bylaw clerk, and one part-time bylaw clerk. The duty of the division is to enforce all aspects of the District’s bylaws as well as business licensing, property use violations, and the new secondary suite program. Staff received approximately 3,000 complaints in 2016, of which there were about 500 bylaw officer investigated files. Bylaw officers also issued approximately 200 tickets. Given the volume of citizen complaints and the average length of investigations, parking enforcement (timed parking violations, parking contrary to posted signs, etc.) has not received priority. Providing sustainable parking enforcement is an important part of supporting downtown businesses (i.e., the Downtown Mission Façade Improvement Program). Parking enforcement also supports the overall strategic goals of the District for coordinated delivery of our services to our citizens, for enhanced lifestyle opportunities and community health, and for improved public safety.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The project is a short-term plan focused on providing some immediate relief to address parking violations during the busy summer season. Long term, Council may want to direct staff to examine the risks and benefits of a parking strategy that can be used to support investments in parking or other economic development initiatives.

Under the Project, the District would hire a dedicated parking enforcement person (Parking Attendant) using a service orientated and more effective model. The Parking Attendant would also provide additional eyes on the streets, linked directly to our bylaw enforcement division and RCMP efforts, thereby increasing visibility and compliance. If Council approves the Project, staff will report back at the conclusion of the Project to highlight the successes and challenges of enhanced enforcement. As with any parking enforcement program, there will be increased complaints associated with the ticketing system. The goal of the Project will be to generate more compliance but not to be aggressive and focused on revenue generation. In fact, many parking enforcement programs fail or lose credibility because enforcement levels are unrealistic. This will not be the case for this Project as enforcement resources will remain lean but simply become more efficient. Parking fines are regulated under the Traffic Regulation Bylaw. The majority of offences are set at $50.

In addition to parking enforcement activities, the Parking Attendant would provide a visible presence in the downtown core and act as an ambassador for the District. The District would be looking to recruit a person with experience in customer service, conflict resolution, and bylaw enforcement. The Parking Attendant would have the ability to accurately answer questions from visitors and locals alike in regards to Mission. The Parking Attendant would be recruited as a Schedule B employee under the CUPE Collective Agreement. Schedule B employees work thirty-six hours per week (9 hours per day) and may be scheduled to work evenings and weekends which will provide a sustained and uniformed presence. This would also enable parking enforcement to operate seven days per week on a rotation basis as needed.

The addition of a Parking Attendant will provide the District with the ability to address parking and its complexities across the District. As noted above, this will include such things as the ability to address parking on residential streets, problems associated within neighbourhoods, planning for sustainable parking management, resolution of disputes, and overall management of the parking function.

A review has been done, in coordination with Corporate Administration and the Finance Department, to assess the financial impact of the Project. Staff believe that the project will be cost neutral. Engineering staff have also been consulted and provided input on the contents of this report.
COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
Objective 2: Improved Public Safety – Strategies that support improved public safety will ensure a safe environment for all citizens and provide enhanced tools for identifying and addressing the concerns of our community.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
It is anticipated that the project will be cost neutral, as parking fine revenue is reasonably anticipated to offset the additional costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Attendant Position</th>
<th>New District Costs</th>
<th>Parking Enforcement Pilot Project by Month</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>$21,243</td>
<td>June, 2017</td>
<td>$8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform, Cell Phone, &amp; Miscellaneous Costs</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>July, 2017</td>
<td>$9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Clerk Position (0.5 FTE to 1.0) FTE for four months</td>
<td>$11,474</td>
<td>August, 2017</td>
<td>$9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
<td>$8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Costs</td>
<td>$34,217</td>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff estimate the project cost to be $34,217, based on wages for the 16 week duration of a parking attendant (working 36 hours weekly), as well as for increasing the status for a bylaw clerk from part time to full time to provide increased administrative support. The intent for the pilot project is to make use of the existing Bylaw Enforcement vehicles, which is possible given that the Parking Attendant would be working for the most part during different hours than existing Bylaw Enforcement staff. Any additional vehicle operating costs during the pilot program are anticipated to be covered within existing budgets. If the pilot program proves to be a success, an additional vehicle may be required if the parking enforcement program were to become permanent.

The projected revenue for the duration of the project is $35,000 and is based on issuing 10-15 fines per day, 4 days per week. Revenue projections are likely on the conservative side, however, compliance levels do fluctuate and this is the first year of monitoring compliance directly. If the fine revenue is not sufficient to offset the additional costs of the Parking Attendant, the shortfall could be funded by other operating budget savings that may materialize, otherwise funding from reserves may be required. Staff will monitor the situation and advise Council if necessary.

The need for further improvements would be monitored over time with Council’s input and any capital investments would be subject to consideration in future financial plans.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance
COMMUNICATION:
If Council proceeds with approving staff’s recommendation, the District will communicate to citizens that there will be increased enforcement of parking bylaws commencing May 31, 2017 due to requests from residents and the DBA. Information would be posted on the District’s website and advertised in the local newspaper. Residents will be encouraged to review the Traffic Regulation Bylaw or to contact staff in order to familiarize themselves with parking requirements.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Based on the above discussion, the Inspection Services Division recommends that Council authorize staff to initiate the project as documented in this report, for the provision of parking enforcement services for a 4-month period commencing on June 1, 2017 and ending on October 1, 2017.

SIGN-OFFS:

Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services
Reviewed by: Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed by: Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Design and Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning and Development Variance Permit Applications to facilitate a 2-lot subdivision
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4 – Site Plan for Proposed Development Variance Permit

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 8351 McTaggart Street

APPLICANT: Hatzic Properties JV

OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Residential OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: January 31, 2017

LOCATION: Hatzic
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a two (2) lot subdivision on the property located at 8351 McTaggart Street and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed Zoning Amendment Bylaw 5644-2017-5050(247) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also support the development variance permit application, which will be listed for Council consideration under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 18, 2017.

SUMMARY:

Rezoning, subdivision and development variance permit applications have been received from Hatzic Properties JV, applicant, for the property located at 8351 McTaggart Street (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from the Urban Residential 669 Zone (R669) to the Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision, as shown in (Appendix 3).

BACKGROUND:

The subject property was created in a previous rezoning and subdivision application which created a total of 61 lots. As part of the subdivision requirements of an adjacent development, concessions were made by the developer for road requirements. In this case, a portion of the subject property was dedicated as road right-of-way in order to maintain a 15 metre road dedication on McTaggart Street at Henry Avenue. The purpose of maintaining a 15 m road dedication was to avoid a pinch point at the intersection. Approximately 75 m² (807 sq ft) of land was given up in order to allow for the 15 metre wide road right-of-way.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is approximately 1,159 square metres (12,475 sq ft) in size and is located in the Hatzic neighbourhood in a developing subdivision at the northwest corner of McTaggart Street and Henry Avenue. The property is designated Urban Residential in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is within the R669 Zone. The land is relatively flat with no watercourses indicated from the District’s mapping system.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Urban Residential in the OCP and is zoned R669. The proposal for a rezoning to the R558 Zone would accommodate the future subdivision of the land into a maximum of two lots with a minimum lot size of 558 square metres (6,006 sq ft) each.

The proposed rezoning conforms to the OCP to provide for a variety of residential lifestyle options in Mission. Staff have identified several other properties in the Hatzic neighbourhood that also have the potential to rezone to the R558 Zone to facilitate a subdivision.
Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within the Hatzic neighbourhood. Lands to the north and east of the property are under development and within the R669 Zone. Lands to the south and west are developed with single family dwellings on large urban lots mainly in the Urban Residential 930 Zone (R930).

The proposed two (2) lot subdivision will allow for one additional lot while fitting in with the context of the development pattern from the north.

Servicing:
Municipal services are available to the site.

Tree Retention:

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of four trees, two trees for each of the two lots created. This condition will be met as part of the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater) that will be removed except in the areas defined as (a) building envelope to a maximum of 2,000 m² (21,528 ft²), (b) driveways, (c) septic field and (d) wells.

Parks and Trails:

The subject properties are located in close proximity to a community park, approximately 200 metres to Hatzic Park.

Community Amenity Contribution (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities):

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $2,815 ($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

The application seeks to vary one Zoning Bylaw regulation in order to create the subdivision as proposed. The requested variance is for the proposed southern lot seeks to vary Section 501 Urban Residential Zones, Part C. Lot Area, Subsection 1 of the Zoning Bylaw, by reducing the minimum lot depth for an R558 Zoned lot from 30 metres (98.42 feet) to 24.8 metres (81.4 feet), as shown in (Appendix 4).

The proposed variance is being requested on proposed Lot A, the corner lot. The Zoning Bylaw defines “lot depth” as the shortest distance within the lot between the front lot line and the rear lot line. As such, the shortest distance happens to be 24.8 metres (81.4 feet) but proposed Lot A also reaches a maximum depth of 30.4 metres (99.7 feet) on the opposite side. Although the lot depth would be reduced, the lot area and lot width still exceeds the minimum requirement of the R558 Zone by 43 square metres (463 sq ft).

Proposed Lot A exceeds the Zoning Bylaw in all other aspects of the Lot Area, as outlined in the table below. As such, staff support the variance to reduce the lot depth of the proposed lot as it facilitates the creation of one additional residential lot, utilizes an oversized lot, and still fits into the surrounding neighbourhood.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw requirement R558 (corner lot)</td>
<td>558 square metres (6,006 square feet)</td>
<td>19.5 metres (64.0 feet)</td>
<td>30.0 metres (98.4 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot</td>
<td>601 square metres (6,469 square feet)</td>
<td>21.8 metres (71.5 feet)</td>
<td>24.8 metres (81.4 feet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNICATION:**

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted two (2) development notification signs on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties within a radius of 152 metres (500 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the *Local Government Act*

3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

**REFERRALS:**

**Engineering**

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project.

**Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI)**

A referral to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) is necessary given the development site’s proximity to Lougheed Highway.

**REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:**

The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve;

2. The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s (MoTI) approval of the Zoning Amending Bylaw is received; and
3. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw and Public Hearing submissions.

SIGN-OFFS:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
## Appendix 1

### Information for Corporate Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address:</th>
<th>8351 McTaggart Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID:</td>
<td>029-981-328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>Lot 58 District Lot 476 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan EPP66405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 8351 McTaggart Street
Owner: Mil-Kai Investments Ltd
        (Gary Toor) &
        Tiegen Management Ltd
        (Jason Tiegen)
Applicant: Hatzic Properties JV Ltd
          Jason Tiegen & Gary Toor
Zoning: R669
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4

Proposed Development Variance Permit

Lot A – Variance to Lot
Depth from 30.0m to 24.8m
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix “A” - General Operating Fund Summary
Appendix “B” - Utility Operating Funds and Equipment Pool Operations Summary
Appendix “C” - Capital Budget Variance Summary
Appendix “D” - Service Levels
Appendix “E” - General Operating Fund Contingency and Mayor’s Contingency Transactions

This report is to brief Council on the current status of the 2016 year-end results and explanations for the year-end results that have a budget variance of +/- $10,000 or +/- 10%. This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
This report is to brief Council on the current status of the 2016 year-end results and explanations for the year-end results that have a budget variance of +/- $10,000 or +/- 10%.

BACKGROUND:
As part of the District’s financial reporting system, budget status reports occur on the quarters ending June, September and December, to provide Council with information in terms of the District’s overall financial performance.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
This quarterly financial review includes the current status of the 2016 year-end results with explanations for the year-end results that have a budget variance of +/- $10,000 or +/- 10%. Attached to this report are the following appendices:

- Appendix “A” summarizes the current year-end results on a departmental basis for the general operating fund, and provides budget variance explanations for variances over +/- $10,000 or 10%.
- Appendix “B” summarizes the current year-end results for the utility operating funds and the equipment pool operations, along with budget variance explanations for variances over +/- $10,000 or 10%.
- Appendix “C” summarizes the year-end results for the capital budget and provides budget variance explanations for all unfavourable variances.
- Appendix “D” is an update on departmental service levels for the year ending December 31, 2016 with estimated service level projections for 2017.
• Appendix “E” summarizes the transactions funded from the general operating fund contingency account and the Mayor’s contingency account for 2016.

Current year-end results show the general operating fund will have a surplus just over $1.6 million. It should be noted that some year-end accruals and adjustments have not been finalized and these may materially affect the general operating fund projected surplus and the utility fund transfers. The auditors will be on site from March 27 to March 31, 2017 and the final year-end numbers will be available in May.

### General Operating Fund Projected Year-end Results

The following table summarizes the current year-end results on a departmental basis for the general operating fund.

#### General Operating Fund Net Budget Variance Summary

**December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>VARIANCE $</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,248,438</td>
<td>804,030</td>
<td>-444,409</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services - Planning</td>
<td>1,126,218</td>
<td>765,359</td>
<td>-360,859</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>10,444,126</td>
<td>10,152,277</td>
<td>-291,849</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services - Inspections</td>
<td>147,033</td>
<td>-12,631</td>
<td>-159,664</td>
<td>-109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>2,398,295</td>
<td>2,286,111</td>
<td>-112,185</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>-31,968,465</td>
<td>-32,043,540</td>
<td>-75,075</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>2,664,872</td>
<td>2,607,744</td>
<td>-57,128</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Purchasing</td>
<td>1,514,220</td>
<td>1,461,688</td>
<td>-52,532</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations</td>
<td>3,290,109</td>
<td>3,237,831</td>
<td>-52,277</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>551,276</td>
<td>525,307</td>
<td>-25,969</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>948,089</td>
<td>925,428</td>
<td>-22,661</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>275,699</td>
<td>258,866</td>
<td>-16,833</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>2,269,413</td>
<td>2,257,563</td>
<td>-11,850</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services</td>
<td>1,727,651</td>
<td>1,720,440</td>
<td>-7,211</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>528,569</td>
<td>524,314</td>
<td>-4,256</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Recovery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>783,490</td>
<td>791,635</td>
<td>8,145</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>55,284</td>
<td>15,630</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>2,011,313</td>
<td>2,066,619</td>
<td>55,307</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Budget Surplus: 0 -1,615,677 -1,615,677

Negative variances = Under budget
Positive variances = Over budget

Budget variance explanations where year-end results are +/- $10,000 or +/- 10% from budget for total revenue and total expenditures for each departments are included in the attached Appendix “A”.
In reviewing the departmental year-end results and explanations, the current development activity in Mission has had a positive impact on 2016 year-end results.

Staff have identified the following large (over $150,000) variances within the department summaries:

- The RCMP contract is showing an estimated surplus of $252,919. This amount represents approximately 3% of the total RCMP contract budget. The contract is funded for 51 members with the current complement (December 2016) at 49.66.

- The development services department is projecting an increase to planning fees collected over the 2016 budget estimate by approximately $247,600 and an increase in building permit fees collected over the 2016 budget estimate by approximately $166,000 as development activity continues in Mission.

- The engineering department is projecting an increase to the subdivision inspection fees collected over the 2016 budget estimate by approximately $290,000 as development activity continues. The department is also projecting salary savings from vacant positions in 2016.

- Interest from investments is projecting an increase over budget of approximately $334,000 as we received favourable rates on our portfolio. Approximately $262,000 will be transferred to the reserves.

- Land sales and gaming revenue are projecting an additional $223,000 and $140,000 respectively, which are entirely transferred to the Land Sale and Gaming reserves.

- Payroll Overhead expenses have three areas of concern. Sick leave is projected to be $93,000 or 19% over budget from a few long-term illnesses, annual vacation is projected to be $95,000 or 9% over budget due to an increase to holiday payout and staff positions completely filled, and WorkSafe BC is projected to be $136,600 or 32% over budget as a result of the increase in premium of 15% for municipal staff and 40% for Forestry staff in 2016. These are partially offset by budget savings for health benefits. Staff are working on options for Council consideration that will be presented during 2018 budget discussions and will include impacts from the CUPE contract negotiations.

- Secondary dwelling program is estimated to generate an additional $164,000 in the water operating funds, $122,000 in the sewer operating fund, $26,000 in garbage levy and $9,000 in recycling fees.

- Landfill disposal revenue is projected to exceed budget revenue by approximately $771,000 due to increase in contaminated soil received, special projects and increase in residential traffic.

- Regional recycling depot, jointly operated between Abbotsford and Mission, experienced additional tonnage for the first part of 2016 increasing processing costs. This increase in expense plus the cost sharing formula for Mission went from 18% to 22% as Abbotsford’s private tonnage redirected elsewhere for processing created a net overage to the budget of just over $178,000 for the regional recycling depot.
Utility Operating Fund Projected Year-end Results

The following table summarizes the current year-end transfer to reserves for the utility funds and the equipment replacement reserve as detailed in Appendix “B”:

Utility Funds and Equipment Replacement Net Variances Summary

December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGETED TRANSFER TO RESERVE</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>VARIANCE $</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>113,583</td>
<td>842,065</td>
<td>-728,482</td>
<td>-641%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>2,893,249</td>
<td>3,419,533</td>
<td>-526,283</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>1,198,309</td>
<td>1,599,472</td>
<td>-401,162</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>258,188</td>
<td>-58,188</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Pool Operations</td>
<td>700,942</td>
<td>748,510</td>
<td>-47,568</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative variances = Additional Transfer to Reserves
Positive variances = Reduced Transfer to Reserves

All utility operating funds and the equipment pool operations are projecting higher transfers to reserves than budgeted.

Capital Fund Projected Year-end Results

All capital projects are either within budget target or showing a surplus, (see Appendix “C”). Overall the general capital plan is projecting to be under budget by $246,000.

The utility capital programs are within budget target with some regional water and sewer projects not undertaken in 2016.

Departmental Service Levels

The attached Appendix “D” shows the year-end service levels for each department in comparison to the prior years’ service levels of 2015 and the projected service levels for 2017.

General Operating Fund Contingency Account and Mayor’s Contingency Account

Appendix “E” summarizes the transactions, approved by Council, that were funded from the District’s 2016 general operating fund contingency account. Transactions from the Mayor’s contingency account are also included in this appendix.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

General Operating Fund: The general operating fund is projecting a surplus estimated at $1.6 million. Staff will present a report outlining options for Council to consider once the annual audit has been finalized and all the year-end accruals and adjustments have been completed.

Utility Funds and Equipment Pool Operations: All utility operating funds and the equipment pool operations are projecting higher transfers to reserves than budgeted.

Capital Fund: Overall the general capital plan is projecting to be under budget by $246,000. The utility capital programs are within budget target with several regional water and sewer projects not undertaken in 2016.

COMMUNICATION:

No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The 2016 year-end budget review summarizes the current year-end results at the department level along with budget variance explanations, where required.

Current projections indicate that by year-end the general operating fund is expecting a surplus. In reviewing the departmental year-end results and explanations, the current development activity in Mission has had a positive impact on 2016 year-end results.

The water utility operating fund, sewer utility operating fund, drainage operating fund, equipment pool operations and waste management utility operations are all projecting higher transfers to reserves than budgeted.

All capital projects are either within budget target or showing a surplus. Overall the general capital plan is projecting to be under budget by $246,000. The utility capital programs are within budget target, with some regional water and sewer projects not undertaken in 2016.

It should be noted that some year-end accruals and adjustments have not been finalized and these may materially affect the general operating fund projected surplus and the utility fund transfers. The auditors will be on site from March 27 to March 31, 2017 and the final numbers will be available in May. Staff will present a report outlining options for Council to consider once all the year-end accruals and adjustments have been completed.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Reviewed by: Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
## General Operating Fund Summary
### December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>YEAR END VARIANCES $</th>
<th>% VARIANCE</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-234,016</td>
<td>-189,378</td>
<td>44,638</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>Funding for the Cemetery filing project not required as project is postponed until 2017. Revenue from Cemetery operations lower than anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>273,671</td>
<td>244,662</td>
<td>-29,009</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>Cemetery filing project postponed until 2017 created budget savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council and Grants Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-223,450</td>
<td>-201,216</td>
<td>22,234</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>Funding for awards ceremony reduced to actual costs. Lower funding to the Clark Theatre due to fewer subscribers. Funding for Donations in Kind and Community Special Events not required. One grant payment returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council and Grants Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>774,726</td>
<td>726,523</td>
<td>-48,203</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>Reduced costs for service awards ceremony and Council's conventions plus some grants not fully utilized. One grant payment issued returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Administration Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-203,678</td>
<td>-160,779</td>
<td>42,899</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>Funding for downtown security not required due to change in scope to Library only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Administration Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,473,091</td>
<td>2,418,342</td>
<td>-54,257</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>Costs for downtown security reduced due to change in scope to Library only. Savings realized in Corporate Training, Stave West project and Information Services due to staffing changes which are partially offset by increases in Legal and recruitment costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic/Land Development Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-151,075</td>
<td>-92,523</td>
<td>58,552</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>Internal funding not required for portion of projects related to Fraser Valley (FV) tech jobs web portal and the tech sector development strategic plan which will be completed in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic/Land Development Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>426,773</td>
<td>351,389</td>
<td>-75,384</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>Budget savings from projects related to FV tech jobs web portal and the tech sector development strategic plan which will be completed in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-431,782</td>
<td>-823,324</td>
<td>-391,542</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Unexpected increase in subdivision development. Increased development resulted in increased soil removal and royalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,680,220</td>
<td>1,627,353</td>
<td>-52,867</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>Salary savings due to vacant positions in department partially offset by increase to the transfer to Arterial Road reserve from increase in soil removal fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-167,983</td>
<td>-206,064</td>
<td>-38,081</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Real estate activity in Mission increased the revenue for tax certificates plus increase in third party billings to customers increased the Receivable Administrative Fee revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,682,203</td>
<td>1,667,751</td>
<td>-14,451</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>Budget savings from staff absences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-225,113</td>
<td>-213,548</td>
<td>11,565</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Fire Investigation Revenue reduced due to a low number of structure fires requiring an investigation in 2016 plus reduced sprinkler permits requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>3,515,222</td>
<td>3,451,380</td>
<td>-63,842</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>Budget savings due to an unfilled position in fire prevention for a portion of the year plus reduced calls at Station 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-6,258,812</td>
<td>-6,856,101</td>
<td>-597,288</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Investment portfolio performed above expectations. Unexpected revenue from land sales. Higher than anticipated gaming revenue. See below for increases to transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>8,657,108</td>
<td>9,142,211</td>
<td>485,104</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Increase transfers to Gaming reserve, Land Sale reserve and interest transferred to reserves resulting from increased revenue above. This is partially offset by budget savings from debt issues being refinanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Services Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-868,538</td>
<td>-846,728</td>
<td>-8,190</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>Building Permit and Inspection Fee revenue exceeded projections as a result of strong construction activity across the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Services Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>833,571</td>
<td>834,097</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Buildings Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-111,016</td>
<td>-112,689</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Buildings Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>894,506</td>
<td>904,323</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year End Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE $</th>
<th>% VARIANCE</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery Revenue</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>Funding for the Cemetery filing project not required as project is postponed until 2017. Revenue from Cemetery operations lower than anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Cemetery filing project postponed until 2017 created budget savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council and Grants Revenue</strong></td>
<td>223,450</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Funding for awards ceremony reduced to actual costs. Lower funding to the Clark Theatre due to fewer subscribers. Funding for Donations in Kind and Community Special Events not required. One grant payment returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council and Grants Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>774,726</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Reduced costs for service awards ceremony and Council's conventions plus some grants not fully utilized. One grant payment issued returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Administration Revenue</strong></td>
<td>551,276</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Funding for downtown security not required due to change in scope to Library only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Administration Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,269,413</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Costs for downtown security reduced due to change in scope to Library only. Savings realized in Corporate Training, Stave West project and Information Services due to staffing changes which are partially offset by increases in Legal and recruitment costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic/Land Development Revenue</strong></td>
<td>2,269,413</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Internal funding not required for portion of projects related to Fraser Valley (FV) tech jobs web portal and the tech sector development strategic plan which will be completed in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic/Land Development Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,269,413</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Budget savings from projects related to FV tech jobs web portal and the tech sector development strategic plan which will be completed in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Revenue</strong></td>
<td>431,782</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Unexpected increase in subdivision development. Increased development resulted in increased soil removal and royalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,680,220</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Salary savings due to vacant positions in department partially offset by increase to the transfer to Arterial Road reserve from increase in soil removal fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Revenue</strong></td>
<td>167,983</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Real estate activity in Mission increased the revenue for tax certificates plus increase in third party billings to customers increased the Receivable Administrative Fee revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,682,203</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Budget savings from staff absences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Revenue</strong></td>
<td>225,113</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Fire Investigation Revenue reduced due to a low number of structure fires requiring an investigation in 2016 plus reduced sprinkler permits requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>3,515,222</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Budget savings due to an unfilled position in fire prevention for a portion of the year plus reduced calls at Station 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government Revenue</strong></td>
<td>6,258,812</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Investment portfolio performed above expectations. Unexpected revenue from land sales. Higher than anticipated gaming revenue. See below for increases to transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>8,657,108</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Increase transfers to Gaming reserve, Land Sale reserve and interest transferred to reserves resulting from increased revenue above. This is partially offset by budget savings from debt issues being refinanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Services Revenue</strong></td>
<td>868,538</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Building Permit and Inspection Fee revenue exceeded projections as a result of strong construction activity across the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Services Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>833,571</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Buildings Revenue</strong></td>
<td>111,016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Buildings Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>894,506</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Operating Fund Summary
### December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>YEAR END VARIANCES</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Revenue</td>
<td>-150,677</td>
<td>-151,421</td>
<td>-744 $</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Expenditures</td>
<td>1,098,766</td>
<td>1,076,849</td>
<td>-21,917</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>948,089</td>
<td>925,428</td>
<td>-22,661</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Recovery</td>
<td>-6,630,256</td>
<td>-6,900,727</td>
<td>-270,471</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Expenditures</td>
<td>6,630,256</td>
<td>6,900,727</td>
<td>270,471</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WorkSafe BC premiums higher than anticipated. Higher usage of sick time due to serious illnesses with staff. Increase in holiday payout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Revenue</td>
<td>-471,332</td>
<td>-643,405</td>
<td>-172,074</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Expenditures</td>
<td>1,597,550</td>
<td>1,408,764</td>
<td>-188,785</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,126,218</td>
<td>765,359</td>
<td>-360,859</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services Revenue</td>
<td>-772,544</td>
<td>-818,203</td>
<td>-45,659</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services Expenditures</td>
<td>11,216,670</td>
<td>10,970,480</td>
<td>-246,190</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,444,126</td>
<td>10,152,277</td>
<td>-291,849</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Revenue</td>
<td>-726,397</td>
<td>-727,943</td>
<td>-1,546</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Expenditures</td>
<td>2,737,710</td>
<td>2,794,562</td>
<td>56,852</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,011,313</td>
<td>2,066,619</td>
<td>55,307</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Revenue</td>
<td>-63,865</td>
<td>-97,043</td>
<td>-33,178</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Expenditures</td>
<td>2,728,737</td>
<td>2,704,788</td>
<td>-23,950</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,664,872</td>
<td>2,607,744</td>
<td>-57,128</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration Revenue</td>
<td>-378,237</td>
<td>-339,719</td>
<td>38,518</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration Expenditures</td>
<td>906,806</td>
<td>864,033</td>
<td>-42,773</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>528,569</td>
<td>524,314</td>
<td>-4,256</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services Revenue</td>
<td>-2,228,342</td>
<td>-2,513,677</td>
<td>-285,335</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services Expenditures</td>
<td>3,955,993</td>
<td>4,234,117</td>
<td>278,124</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,727,651</td>
<td>1,720,440</td>
<td>-7,211</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation/Grants In-Lieu Revenue</td>
<td>-32,003,465</td>
<td>-32,068,973</td>
<td>-65,508</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation/Grants In-Lieu Expenditures</td>
<td>-32,003,465</td>
<td>-32,068,973</td>
<td>-65,508</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-31,968,465</td>
<td>-32,043,540</td>
<td>-75,075</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected General Operating Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,615,677</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Negative variances represent higher revenue in the revenue section and lower expenses in the expense section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Negative variances represent higher revenue in the revenue section and lower expenses in the expense section.
# Utility Operating Funds and Equipment Pool Operations Summary

**December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review**

## Water Utility Operating Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>YEAR END VARIANCES $(a)</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local System Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-6,340,959</td>
<td>-6,680,305</td>
<td>-339,347 5%</td>
<td>Increased Flat Rate Water revenue due to secondary dwelling charges. Increase in both commercial and residential meter water usage. Investment portfolio returned higher interest revenue, offset by increased transfer below. Water service connections higher than anticipated, offset by increased costs below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional System Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-18,008</td>
<td>-36,720</td>
<td>-18,712 104%</td>
<td>Unbudgeted refund from Municipal Finance Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-6,358,967</td>
<td>-6,717,026</td>
<td>-358,059 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Operating Expenditures

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local System Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,394,630</td>
<td>2,386,269</td>
<td>-8,362 0%</td>
<td>Unanticipated equipment replacement required at the Ruskin Station. Expenses related to increase in water service connections (see increase in revenue above). Interest from investment portfolio transferred to reserves. These increases in expenses partially offset by budget savings for System flushing due to work being postponed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional System Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,071,087</td>
<td>911,225</td>
<td>-159,862 -15%</td>
<td>Budget savings from vacant positions, lower property insurance, reduced costs for soda ash treatment partially offset with additional work required for creek gravel removal, intake works and Coanda screen repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>3,465,717</td>
<td>3,297,493</td>
<td>-168,224 -5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfer to Water Capital Reserve Fund**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>-2,893,249</td>
<td>-3,419,533</td>
<td>-526,283 18%</td>
<td>Increases in revenue plus overall budget savings results in net increase in transfer to reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sewer Utility Operating Fund

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local System Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-4,280,464</td>
<td>-4,524,010</td>
<td>-243,546 6%</td>
<td>Increased Flat Rate Sewer revenue due to secondary dwelling charges. Increase in both commercial and residential meter sewer usage. Investment portfolio returned higher interest revenue, offset by increased transfer below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional System Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-331,983</td>
<td>-425,741</td>
<td>-93,758 28%</td>
<td>Higher than normal load received from few industrial customers increased surcharge fee revenue plus unanticipated revenue from insurance claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-4,612,447</td>
<td>-4,949,751</td>
<td>-337,304 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Operating Expenditures

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local System Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,158,574</td>
<td>2,179,556</td>
<td>20,982 1%</td>
<td>Increased interest revenue from investment portfolio transferred to reserves partially offset by budget savings for system flushing due to work being postponed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional System Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,255,564</td>
<td>1,170,723</td>
<td>-84,841 -7%</td>
<td>Budgeted cost share at 23.73%, actual share cost for 2016 was slightly lower at 23.36% plus effluent outfall monitoring study completed under budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>3,414,138</td>
<td>3,350,279</td>
<td>-63,859 -2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfer to Sewer Capital Reserve Fund**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>-1,198,309</td>
<td>-1,599,472</td>
<td>-401,162 33%</td>
<td>Increases in revenue partially offset by additional expenses resulted in a net increase in transfer to reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Drainage Utility Operating Fund

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-1,704,938</td>
<td>-1,710,512</td>
<td>-5,574 0%</td>
<td>Increased number of applications for storm sewer connections and access permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,504,938</td>
<td>1,452,324</td>
<td>-52,614 -3%</td>
<td>Budget savings from Drainage Inspection Program, which will complete in 2017, partially offset by higher costs of Major Storm Emergency Service for storm cleanup in 2016 and the installation of new catch basins which were lengthy installations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfer to Drainage Reserve Fund**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>-200,000</td>
<td>-258,188</td>
<td>-58,188 29%</td>
<td>Increases in revenue plus overall budget savings results in net increase in transfer to reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utility Operating Funds and Equipment Pool Operations Summary
December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>YEAR END VARIANCES $ (a)</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Management Utility Operating Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>-4,327,977</td>
<td>-5,231,265</td>
<td>-903,288</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased revenue at landfill due to extra revenue from contaminated soil, special projects, increased residential traffic and recycling residue. Additional revenue from Regional Recycling depot for new tipping fees from private haulers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>4,214,394</td>
<td>4,389,200</td>
<td>174,806</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased costs to landfill operations due to high tonnage received and contaminated soil. Share of AMRD costs increased due to Abbotsford private tonnage going elsewhere. Increase to compost collection cost resulting from switching to bi-weekly garbage collection which is partially offset by savings to refuse contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Refuse Reserve Fund (b)</td>
<td>-113,583</td>
<td>-842,065</td>
<td>-728,482</td>
<td>641%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher revenue at landfill offset by increased costs resulted in net increase to the transfer to the reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Pool Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>-2,654,865</td>
<td>-2,626,444</td>
<td>28,421</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus Equipment Sales lower than expected as sales of several vehicles postponed until 2017. This is partially offset by additional vehicle revenue due to equipment being operational on a 24-hour basis during snow clearing efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>1,953,924</td>
<td>1,877,934</td>
<td>-75,990</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, the combined maintenance expense for all equipment was 13% under budget partially offset by the increased costs in the Equipment Pool Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Equipment Reserve Fund (b)</td>
<td>-700,942</td>
<td>-748,510</td>
<td>-47,568</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower expenses partially offset by reduced revenue creates a net increase to the transfer to reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Negative variance represents higher revenue in the revenue section and lower expenses in the expense section.
(b) Negative variance represents more funds available to be transferred to reserve than what was originally budgeted. Positive variance represents less funds available to be transferred to reserve than what was budgeted.
## General Capital Budget Variance Summary

### 2016 Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET CARRY FORWARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL RESULTS + CARRY FORWARD</th>
<th>YEAR END VARIANCES $</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>3,788,296</td>
<td>2,697,874</td>
<td>1,014,402</td>
<td>3,712,276</td>
<td>-76,020</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>4,199,548</td>
<td>3,489,487</td>
<td>653,226</td>
<td>4,142,713</td>
<td>-56,835</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>1,365,971</td>
<td>1,153,259</td>
<td>170,317</td>
<td>1,323,576</td>
<td>-42,395</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>611,518</td>
<td>341,788</td>
<td>232,867</td>
<td>574,655</td>
<td>-36,863</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Corporate Projects</td>
<td>637,863</td>
<td>74,396</td>
<td>529,800</td>
<td>604,196</td>
<td>-33,667</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>-469</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>563,947</td>
<td>394,103</td>
<td>169,844</td>
<td>563,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>382,367</td>
<td>250,498</td>
<td>131,869</td>
<td>382,367</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>236,384</td>
<td>203,693</td>
<td>32,691</td>
<td>236,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>69,990</td>
<td>39,548</td>
<td>30,442</td>
<td>69,990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Purchases</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services</td>
<td>6,684</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>6,684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 11,931,940 8,662,945 3,022,746 11,685,691 (246,249) -2%

### Utility Funds, Forestry, and Equipment Replacement Capital Budget Variance Summary

#### 2016 Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016 YEAR END RESULTS</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET CARRY FORWARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL RESULTS + CARRY FORWARD</th>
<th>YEAR END VARIANCES $</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewer</td>
<td>3,429,534</td>
<td>448,781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>448,781</td>
<td>-2,980,753</td>
<td>-87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water</td>
<td>2,176,764</td>
<td>1,054,207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,054,207</td>
<td>-1,122,557</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Regional Sewer</td>
<td>1,352,518</td>
<td>784,422</td>
<td>523,810</td>
<td>1,308,232</td>
<td>-44,286</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Regional Water</td>
<td>2,572,337</td>
<td>1,191,628</td>
<td>1,371,203</td>
<td>2,562,831</td>
<td>-9,506</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>326,971</td>
<td>188,377</td>
<td>138,203</td>
<td>326,580</td>
<td>-391</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1,487,317</td>
<td>557,734</td>
<td>929,583</td>
<td>1,487,317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>859,275</td>
<td>202,583</td>
<td>656,692</td>
<td>859,275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>67,058</td>
<td>77,942</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** Negative variances = Under budget Positive variances = Over budget

---

**Negative variances = Under budget**  
**Positive variances = Over budget**
## Service Levels
### December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEMETERY</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 Year-end Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities - Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full burials</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cremation burials</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of columbarium burials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>233%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Activities - Corporate Administration | | | | | |
| Number of bylaws prepared (prepared rather than adopted) | 58 | 60 | 68 | 113% | 60 |
| Number of Regular Council Committee of the Whole meetings | 23 | 24 | 22 | 92% | 24 |
| Number of Closed Council meetings | 40 | 27 | 35 | 130% | 30 |
| Number of Special Council meetings | 19 | 7 | 15 | 214% | 12 |
| Number of Freestanding Committee of the Whole meetings | 6 | 9 | 7 | 78% | 9 |
| Freedom of Information Requests | 66 | 55 | 63 | 115% | 55 |
| Number of media releases | 31 | 30 | 31 | 103% | 30 |
| Facebook / Twitter followers combined | 4,456 | 3,500 | 5,842 | 167% | 6,800 |
| Civic engagement Surveys | 10 | 12 | 5 | 42% | 8 |
| Survey Responses | 1,823 | 3,000 | 1,244 | 41% | 1,500 |
| Major public events (Open House, Town Hall etc.) | 4 | 8 | 13 | 163% | 8 |

| Activities - Information Technology | | | | | |
| Number of calls for service processed (estimated) | 3,740 | 4,000 | 3,885 | 97% | 4,000 |
| Number of calls for service processed - RCMP (estimated) | 1,552 | 1,500 | 2,450 | 163% | 1,500 |
| Number of computers supported (including remote computers) | 355 | 365 | 359 | 98% | 365 |
| Number of hits on the website | 348,135 | 375,000 | 384,969 | 103% | 375,000 |

| Activities - Human Resources | | | | | |
| Number of internal postings (unionized) | 46 | 30 | 54 | 180% | 45 |
| Number of external recruitments | 31 | 15 | 38 | 253% | 30 |
| Number of corporate training opportunities provided to staff | 8 | 5 | 10 | 200% | 10 |
| Number of employees participating in corporate training | 37 | 150 | 189 | 126% | 150 |
| Number of Grievences filed | NEW | N/A | 4 | N/A | 0 |
| Number of Grievences resolved | NEW | N/A | 3 | N/A | 0 |
| Number or reclassifications received | NEW | N/A | 5 | N/A | 1 |
| Number or reclassifications processed | NEW | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 |

| DEVELOPMENT SERVICES | | | | | |
| Service Levels - Building Inspection and Bylaw Enforcement | | | | | |
| Number of Days from Complete Building Permit Appl. rec’d to issuance | 19 | 20 | 90 | 450% | 20 |
| Number of Days from Demo Permit Appl. rec’d to Permit issuance | 2 | 3 | 10 | 333% | 3 |
| Number Days from Sign Permit Appl. rec’d to Permit issuance* | 5 | 5 | 7 | 140% | 5 |
| Number of dog licenses issued (2016 issued on behalf of FVRD) | NEW | 2,000 | 2,255 | 113% | 1,500 |
| Number of dog licenses issued with Mission tags | 5,966 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of tickets issued | 75 | 203 | 300 | 68% | 300 |
| Number of Inter-municipal Business Licenses issued | 80 | 75 | 92 | 123% | 75 |

*Length of time for issuance of sign permits can increase when incomplete and/or incorrect drawings are submitted.

| Activities - Building Inspection and Bylaw Enforcement | | | | | |
| Number of business licenses issued | 1,612 | 1,600 | 1,651 | 103% | 1,600 |
| Resident Businesses | 665 | 650 | 675 | 104% | 650 |
| Home occupation | 624 | 575 | 641 | 111% | 575 |
| Non-resident | 323 | 375 | 335 | 89% | 375 |
### DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - Cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Levels</th>
<th>December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of residential building permits issued</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Actuals</td>
<td>2016 Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of residential building permits issued</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Actuals</td>
<td>2016 Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28,846,714</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Industrial/Commercial/Institutional building permits issued</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Actuals</td>
<td>2016 Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Industrial/Commercial/Institutional building permits issued</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Actuals</td>
<td>2016 Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,652,230</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10 Year Building Permit History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential Numbers</th>
<th>Commercial Dollars</th>
<th>Industrial Numbers</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$30,467,423</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$5,725,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$28,846,714</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,876,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$22,614,727</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$3,280,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$17,341,560</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$4,381,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$12,670,842</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$4,606,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$17,176,013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$12,201,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$19,814,532</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$6,679,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$18,663,107</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$594,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$23,820,736</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$811,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>$42,376,049</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,953,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Levels - Planning**

| Number of days to issue PAR letters* | 28 | 15 | 32 | 213% | 15 |
| Number of days 3rd reading to PLA issuance (Rez w. SD) | 48 | 75 | 36 | 48% | 75 |
| Number of days all referrals received to PLA issuance (SD only) | 38 | 15 | N/A | N/A | 15 |
| Number of days from complete application received to public hearing | 41 | 45 | 88 | 196% | 45 |

**Activity Levels - Planning**

| Number of Lots created | 47 | 50 | 118 | 236% | 50 |
| Number of Units created | 22 | 75 | 61 | 81% | 75 |
| Number of Rowhouse lots created | 21 | 50 | 38 | 76% | 50 |
| Number of PAR Meetings | 70 | 60 | 133 | 222% | 60 |
| Number of Rez, SD, OCP, DP, DVP applications | 66 | 60 | 98 | 163% | 60 |

### ECONOMIC/LAND DEVELOPMENT & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

| Activities - Economic Development | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Number of business inquiries responded to * | 243 | 265 | 231 | 87% | 265 |
| Number of businesses contacted for retention purposes | 28 | 30 | 22 | 73% | 30 |
| Number of active businesses older than 10 years ** | 528 | 530 | 544 | 103% | 530 |
| Number of promotional trade shows attended | 3 | 6 | 5 | 83% | 6 |
| Number of followers | 776 | 850 | 997 | 117% | 1,125 |
| Number of tweets | 59,193 | 65,000 | 107,265 | 165% | 100,000 |
| Number of filming days | NEW | N/A | 58 | N/A | 55 |
| Estimated dollar value of filming *** | NEW | N/A | 259,177 | N/A | N/A |
| Number of filming inquiries/productions | 35 | 35 | 45 | 0% | 35 |

* Includes management of land use, business license, lease, and land and building purchase inquiries in 2016
** Breakdown of businesses older than 10 years (2016):
  - Resident = 274 (+7)[]
  - Home-Based = 198 (-6)
  - Non-resident = 72 (+15)[]

All categories = 544 companies over 10 years old
** Total wrap sheet expenditures reported was $161,377 divided by film days submitted = avg. expenditures/day.

Not all film projects submitted their wrap sheet, so total film days x avg. expenditure/day = $259,177
### Service Levels
*December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINNEERING and PUBLIC WORKS</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 Year-end Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Street Use Permits issued</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>166%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Extraordinary Traffic Permits issued</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hydrant Use Permits issued</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Filming Permits issued</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Public Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt rehabilitated (square meters)</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sidewalk installations (kilometers)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of major road repairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of dike maintenance/upgrades</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 Year-end Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable invoices processed</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,237</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable electronic fund transfers processed</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable cheques produced</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable invoices generated</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing card invoices processed</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFT payments received from customers</td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>10,473</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of BC On-Line Tax Certificate requests</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>136%</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Payroll</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Direct Deposits (average per bi-weekly pay)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of T4s</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Record of Employments issued</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Purchasing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of purchase orders issued</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>116%</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of competitive processes administered</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>213%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing card spending</td>
<td>$485,089</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$375,739</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>$387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central stores sales</td>
<td>$396,626</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$514,840</td>
<td>156%</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central stores inventory value on hand</td>
<td>$101,309</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$117,722</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>$129,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inventory value can fluctuate due to capital plan and seasonal needs creating higher value in the summer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRE &amp; EMERGENCY OPERATIONS</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 Year-end Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Fire Operations and Emergency Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fire Calls</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>193%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Related Incidents</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Emergencies</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>136%</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue (MVA, Electrical, Rope, etc.)</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>196%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Investigation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fire, Medical and Emergency Calls</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Life Safety Inspections</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>278%</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Public Life Safety Education</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>246%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Paid-on Call Fire Fighters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of paid-on call hours</td>
<td>18,155</td>
<td>18,150</td>
<td>18,566</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of career fire fighters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke Alarm Campaign, homes visited</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>141%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service Levels
### December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Facilities</strong></td>
<td>2015 Actuals</td>
<td>2016 Forecast</td>
<td>2016 Year-end Actuals</td>
<td>% of Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Civic Buildings maintained</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POLICE SERVICES

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Policing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of prisoners</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Record Checks</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital fingerprints obtained</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure Requests</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Files processed</td>
<td>17,139</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,351</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Statements transcribed for court purposes</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>184%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crime Prevention Office - Administration:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Enquiries</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/meetings</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crime Prevention Office - Operational:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Watch: Number of vehicles checked</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning letters issued</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles viewed for auto crime</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>27,449</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles scanned thru Stolen Auto Recovery (SAR)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>68,228</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC TRANSIT

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Public Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Bus Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of &quot;in-service hours&quot; per year</td>
<td>109,121</td>
<td>108,405</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly average ridership</td>
<td>2,344,903</td>
<td>2,372,840</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handy-Dart Service Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of &quot;in-service hours&quot; per year</td>
<td>27,015</td>
<td>27,116</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly average ridership</td>
<td>105,285</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** BC Transit reporting is quarterly and at this time only one of quarter data is available. YTD amounts are estimated. "In-Service Hours" are only provided annually from BC Transit.

### RECREATION, PARKS and CULTURE

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parks maintained</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of urban trails maintained</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Properties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space (approximate hectares)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Service Levels**

December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION, PARKS and CULTURE, Cont’d</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 Year-end Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leisure Centre visits - membership</td>
<td>128,044</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>123,208</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pre-registered programs - unlicensed</td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>7,758</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>7,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pre-registered programs - licensed (Club KIDS)</td>
<td>21,956</td>
<td>22,131</td>
<td>25,267</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>22,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leisure Centre drop in visits</td>
<td>67,632</td>
<td>64,249</td>
<td>75,304</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pool visits*</td>
<td>202,908</td>
<td>201,290</td>
<td>205,617</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>201,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fitness room visits*</td>
<td>91,878</td>
<td>94,127</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94,127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth Lounge visits</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>5,983</td>
<td>153%</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of special events (offered through or participation in)</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of limited income access passes (PLAY pass)</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overlap may occur, as many patrons often participate in both swimming and fitness during visit. Pool stat includes spectators and swim lessons.

| Activities - Social Development | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Number of Mission citizens served in Mission Connect | 137 | 300 | 270 | 90% | 300 |
| Number of Service Agencies at Mission Connect | 30 | 25 | 30 | 120% | 25 |
| Number of participants in Youth Fest | 80 | 120 | 60 | 50% | 0 |
| Number of Service Agencies at Youth Fest | 15 | 20 | 12 | 60% | 0 |
| Service agencies participating in the Mission Outreach Network | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100% | 50 |
| Number of Annual Connect Events | 2 | 2 | 1 | 50% | 2 |
| Number of Faith Organizations involved with Social Development | 6 | 6 | 6 | 100% | 6 |

| TAXATION/GRANTS IN LIEU | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Activities - Taxation | | |
| Number of properties on pre-authorized payment plan | 1,582 | 1,655 | 1,507 | 91% | 1,655 |
| Number of Tax Notices mailed to property owners | 14,102 | 14,150 | 14,251 | 101% | 14,350 |
| Number of penalties processed | 2,032 | 1,900 | 1,957 | 103% | 1,900 |
| Number of property deferment applications | 201 | 200 | 303 | 152% | 200 |
| Number of retro home owner grants processed | 56 | 40 | 65 | 163% | 40 |
| Number of delinquent properties January 1st | 384 | 370 | 326 | 88% | 370 |
| Number of delinquent properties July 1st | 196 | 195 | 140 | 72% | 195 |
| Number of delinquent properties at tax sale | 4 | 10 | 3 | 30% | 10 |

| EQUIPMENT POOL OPERATIONS | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Activities - Equipment | | |
| Number of fleet assets | 182 | 177 | 181 | 102% | 181 |
| Number of licensed vehicles in fleet | 96 | 95 | 100 | 105% | 100 |
| Total number of work orders completed | 1,373 | 1,400 | 1,173 | 84% | 1,400 |
| Total number of work orders not completed | 120 | 75 | 193 | 257% | 100 |
| Total number of Preventative Maintenance services | 321 | 380 | 291 | 77% | 380 |
| Total number of Commercial Vehicle Inspections | 35 | 40 | 37 | 93% | 40 |
| Total number of Fire Apparatus Pump Tests | 6 | 6 | 6 | 100% | 6 |
| Litres of unleaded E10 used by District fleet | 77,488 | 75,000 | 82,019 | 109% | 85,000 |
| Litres of B5 biodiesel used by District fleet | 174,879 | 175,000 | 197,329 | 113% | 190,000 |
| Kilometers driven by District vehicles* | 627,230 | 580,000 | 672,654 | 116% | 670,000 |

* Kilometers are estimates. Fleet staff review kilometer use for each piece of equipment annually.
## Service Levels

### December 2016, Winter - Year End Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAINAGE UTILITY</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 Year-end Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Drainage Utility Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Mains TV Inspected in kilometers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Mains Flushed in kilometers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Catchbasins Cleaned and Inspected</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Every second year (2013, 2015, 2017, etc.) a biannual flush is performed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEWER UTILITY</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Sewer Utility Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer mains television inspected (kilometers)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer mains flushed (kilometers)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metres of new sanitary mainline installed</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metres of sanitary mainline replaced</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metres of sanitary mainline relined</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Every second year (2013, 2015, 2017 etc.) a flush is performed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTE MANAGEMENT UTILITY</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Waste Management &amp; Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (buildings &amp; Fleet) Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compost Diversion (curbside food &amp; yard waste &amp; landfill green</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>4,476</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>4,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside Garbage</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside, Landfill, Recycling Centre Recyclables</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of loads received at Landfill</strong></td>
<td>58,669</td>
<td>59,739</td>
<td>76,187</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>76,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of loads received from account customers</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td>273%</td>
<td>7,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of loads received from cash customers</td>
<td>56,057</td>
<td>57,099</td>
<td>68,975</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>69,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-area Customers</td>
<td>56,107</td>
<td>57,288</td>
<td>72,031</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>72,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-area Customers</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>712%</td>
<td>1,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal/curbside/free tipping</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>2,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER UTILITY</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Water Utility Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water main lines cleaned (kilometers)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC watermain lines replaced (meters)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ICI water meters read (quarterly)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ICI water accounts billed quarterly</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ICI with second meters (two meters on 1 bill)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of residential water meters read (annually)*</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>254%</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fire hydrants receiving semi-annual maintenance</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties screened for leak detection</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaks located &amp; repaired - Service Leaks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5100%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaks located &amp; repaired - Water main leak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meter reads for property sales</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meter re-reads for ICI</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new residential meter installs</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ICI water meters replaced</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Residential meters read in October each year (includes 502 meters in pilot study billed on tax notice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX "E"

District of Mission  
General Operating Fund Contingency and Mayor's Contingency Transactions

### General Operating Fund Contingency Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-Dec-15</td>
<td>RC15/668</td>
<td>Community Cares: Mental Health Training program</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/054</td>
<td>Increase to Partnership Fee For Service Grant budget</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/054</td>
<td>Community Special Events Grants budget increase</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/054</td>
<td>Community Enhancement Grants budget increase</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Nov-16</td>
<td>C2016/213</td>
<td>Property Taxes/Utilities for properties purchased by the District</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/073</td>
<td>Hope for Freedom Society supportive recovery facility donation</td>
<td>$4,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/099</td>
<td>Hospice Donation for renovations</td>
<td>$1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Jun-16</td>
<td>RC16/307</td>
<td>2016 Pulling Together Canoe Journey - Sponsorship of a meal</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jun-16</td>
<td>RC16/345</td>
<td>Concrete repair &amp; site prep for Welcome Stairs Mural (Welton)</td>
<td><strong>Cancelled</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - Approved for Operating Uses $23,645

Balance of General Operating Contingency $14,355

### Mayor's Contingency Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-Apr-16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Purchased plants to enhance buffer</td>
<td>$892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance of Mayor's Contingency: $1,108
This report is to advise Council that a new policy has been drafted, Standards of Conduct for Employees, which outlines how District employees are expected to conduct themselves. This policy will be presented to the Chief Administrative Officer for approval.

This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the contents of the proposed Standards of Conduct for Employees (Appendix A) policy outlining how Employees are expected to conduct themselves, prior to the CAO approving the Policy.

BACKGROUND:

In November 2013, the former Manager of Human Resources brought forward a new policy, which formalized implied and acceptable employee conduct. This policy integrates existing human resources policies and sections of other policies, with the intent of establishing standards to which employees are expected to adhere.

During the meeting on November 4, 2013, a resident came forward and expressed concerns regarding the policy in two areas: first, it is illegal to place a prohibition on an employee wherein they are not allowed to sign an affidavit unless it was prepared by a District lawyer; he felt that this infringes on an employee’s individual rights. His second concern was that employees are forced to cooperate with lawyers defending the District’s interests – he feels this goes against the employee’s right/obligation to tell the truth. He provided a reference to a previous situation where a previous council had agreed to do something that was illegal, and in that situation, no employee should be forced to support their employer. As a result, the policy was referred back to staff for further revision and legal review (Appendix C). The results of the legal review have been incorporated into the document.

In the Audit Results and Communications Report to the Mayor and Council for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2015, several recommendations were made in regards to the need for a Conflict of Interest policy (Appendix D). In light of their recommendations, the drafted Code of Conduct for Employees draft policy was revisited.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

In the eyes of the public, each Employee is a representative of the District, and therefore, each Employee must behave in a way that adheres to the highest ethical standards, to maintain integrity and impartiality, and to prevent any real, perceived or potential conflict of interest. This ensures that Employees make decisions and carry out their duties to benefit the community as a whole.

This Policy clarifies the standards of conduct that is expected from all Employees, whether they are full-time, part-time, seasonal, auxiliary, contract, temporary, students or volunteers. At times, the difference between right and wrong can appear subjective; this Policy has been developed to help Employees make the right choice.

There are twelve sections to the policy, each designed to clarify expectations and steer Employee behaviour in a way that protects the District’s and their interests:

1. Loyalty
2. Confidentiality
3. Public comments
4. Political activity
5. Service to the public
6. Workplace behaviour
7. Conflict of interest
8. Allegations of wrongdoing
9. Legal proceedings
10. Working relationships
11. Human resource decisions
12. Outside remuneration and volunteer work

A legal review was conducted on the sections regarding Public Comments and Legal Proceedings. The paragraph under Public Comments was suggested by the lawyer from Harris & Co., and has been incorporated as recommended. The review of Legal Proceedings confirmed that the concerns expressed by the resident regarding the previous draft of this policy were valid, as the prohibition on employees executing affidavits in legal proceedings, save under the circumstances in the draft Policy, was overly broad and could unnecessarily and improperly constrain an employee from appearing as a witness in a matter. The review also suggested that the District did not have the authority to deny an employee’s personal right to appear as a witness. However, the District could oblige an employee to cooperate with lawyers defending the District’s interest during legal proceedings, as long as employees were advised they were only expected to tell the truth in the event.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This policy ties in to the following Council goal:

- Developing Organizational Excellence
  - Employee adherence to this Policy supports organizational excellence and offers best-in-class service to the public.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this report.
COMMUNICATION:
Once the policy is approved by the Chief Administrative Officer, it will be communicated to all employees by means of a workshop. Each Employee will attend a presentation where they are informed of the content of the policy and the expectations for their behaviour. Employees will be required to sign that they have received the policy and understand its contents.

For new Employees, they will be advised of the policy during the orientation program. They also will be required to sign the form stating they have received the policy and understand the contents.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
A new Standards of Conduct for Employees policy has been developed for approval by the Chief Administrative Officer and will become the “go-to” policy to guide Employees in acceptable workplace behaviours. It clarifies the expectations the Employer has in regards to not only Employees’ on-duty conduct but, in some cases, their off-duty conduct as well, where it may infringe on the District’s reputation.

SIGN-OFFS:
Heather Gherman, Manager of Human Resources

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
PURPOSE:

This Policy affirms the District of Mission’s belief in responsible social and professional behaviour from all Employees and clarifies the standards of conduct that is expected of all Employees. The Policy supports the core policy objective that Employees exhibit the highest standards of conduct.

The District of Mission’s work is diverse, multi-faceted and complex and, in the eye of the public, each employee is a representative of the District of Mission. Consequently, District Employees must be independent, impartial and responsible to the public in carrying out their duties to benefit the community as a whole. These principles also apply to interactions with co-workers and customers. By signing the Standards of Conduct for Employees, Employees acknowledge and accept responsibility to act and behave in a manner that is consistent with the expectations prescribed in this Policy. Employees collectively benefit from an overall atmosphere of high ethical conduct that flows from this commitment.

DEFINITIONS

**Administration** means the Chief Administrative Officer and Department Heads, who are responsible for ensuring that the policies, programs and directions of Council are implemented.

**Chief Administrative Officer** means the individual appointed by Council to the position of Chief Administrative Officer (or his/her designate) as the head of Administration.

**Confidential Information** includes, but is not limited to, information in the possession of the District that the District is either prohibited from disclosing, is required to refuse to disclose or exercises its discretion to refuse under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act or other legislation, and information concerning matters that are considered in a closed meeting under section 90 of the Community Charter.

**Conflict of Interest** means a conflict between the private interests and the official responsibilities of a person in a position of trust, that could improperly influence the performance of his or her official duties and responsibilities and which could include a direct or indirect financial interest in a matter. A *real* conflict of interest exists at the present time, an *apparent or perceived* conflict of interest could be perceived by a reasonable observer to exist, and a *potential* conflict of interest could reasonably be foreseen to exist in the future. Perceived or potential conflicts of interest can be as damaging as real conflicts of interest.
Corporate Officer means the individual appointed by Council to the position assigned the responsibility of corporate administration in accordance with the Community Charter [Part 5].

Council means the duly elected officials of the District, those being the Mayor and Councillors.

Department Head(s) means those District employees that are charged with overseeing a particular operational or departmental area and/or their designates.

District means the District of Mission, either in the sense of the geographic area of the municipality or in the sense of the identity of the municipal corporation, as the context requires.

Employee(s) means persons working for the District in an employment relationship regardless of whether they are employed on a full-time, part-time, seasonal, auxiliary, contract, temporary, or permanent basis, including volunteers and students.

POLICY STATEMENT:
The residents and businesses of the District of Mission are entitled to have fair, ethical and accountable local government administration. Accordingly, the District of Mission has high expectations of its Employees for integrity and ethical conduct in their service to the community.

The District recognizes that Employees strive to perform their duties in a manner that maintains and enhances public confidence and trust in the integrity, objectivity and impartiality of the District, understanding that trust and mutual respect are the cornerstones of any relationship between the public and its municipal government.

District Employees owe a duty of loyalty and commitment to the District as a condition of accepting employment with the District of Mission. In serving the public interest they are entrusted with access to a wide range of information, resources and responsibilities. The District expects its Employees to operate with a sense of honesty and accountability in accordance with the values and goals established in Council’s Strategic Plan, Employee Values and Service Standards of the District.

The District welcomes diversity and is committed to ensure that all persons working for or conducting business with the District will be treated in a fair and respectful manner.

SCOPE
The Policy applies to all Employees, as defined above in ‘Definitions’ (collectively referred to as ‘Employees’). The Policy provides the framework of principles for conducting business, dealing with other Employees, customers, contractors and suppliers.

This Policy is intended to supplement any other requirements imposed by applicable legislation, standards of professional practice, or any other requirements imposed by relevant District entities or departments.

RESPONSIBILITIES
a) Administration
   i) Provide timely advice to managers respecting the application of this Policy including guidance on an appropriate employer response to transgressions of the Policy;
   ii) Coordinate the development of awareness, training, and communication programs in support of this Policy to ensure all Employees and potential Employees are informed of the requirements of this Policy; and,
iii) Ensure that operational risks of conflicts of interest related to the District’s mandate are identified and managed.

b) Managers and Supervisors
   i) Advise Employees of the required standards of conduct and the consequences of non-compliance;
   ii) Deal with breaches of this Policy in a timely manner, taking the appropriate action based upon the facts and circumstances; and
   iii) Delegate authority and responsibility, where applicable, to apply this Policy within their area of responsibility.

c) Employees
   i) Abide by policies, procedures and lawful directions that relate to their employment with the District;
   ii) Perform their assigned duties and responsibilities with skill, honesty, care and diligence;
   iii) Objectively and loyally fulfill their assigned duties and responsibilities, regardless of the persons in power and regardless of their personal opinions;
   iv) Disclose and resolve real, perceived or potential conflicts of interest situations in which they find themselves;
   v) Maintain appropriate workplace behavior;
   vi) Check with their manager or supervisor when they are uncertain about any aspect of this Policy.

POLICY - SECTIONS

This Policy is comprised of the following sections:

a. Loyalty
b. Confidentiality
c. Public Comments
d. Political Activity
e. Service to the Public
f. Workplace Behaviour
g. Conflict of Interest
h. Allegations of Wrongdoing
i. Legal Proceedings
j. Working Relationships
k. Human Resource Decisions
l. Outside Remuneration and Volunteer Work

a) Loyalty

Employees have a duty of loyalty to the District as their employer. They must act honestly and in good faith and in the performance of their duties place the interests of the District ahead of their own private interests. The duty committed to in the oath of employment requires District Employees to serve the Council of the day to the best of their ability, and to avoid dishonest, illegal or improper business activities.
b) Confidentiality

Confidential information, in any form, that Employees receive through their employment must not be disclosed, released, or transmitted to anyone other than persons who are authorized to receive the information. Employees with care or control of personal or sensitive information, electronic media, or devices must handle and dispose of these appropriately. Employees who are in doubt as to whether certain information is confidential must ask the appropriate authority before disclosing, releasing, or transmitting it.

The proper handling and protection of confidential information is applicable both within and outside the District and continues to apply after the employment relationship ends.

Confidential information that Employees receive through their employment must not be used by an Employee for the purpose of furthering any private interest, or as a means of making personal gains. (See Conflict of Interest for details.)

c) Public Comments

Employees may comment on public issues but must not engage in any activity or speak publicly where this could be perceived as an official act or representation (unless authorized to do so).

Employees must not use their position at the District to lend weight to the public expression of their personal opinions. Employees are expected to use caution when giving their personal opinion on public issues to ensure that they are not perceived to be using or referencing information obtained during the course of employment with the District or which calls their impartiality into question.

d) Political Activity

Employees may participate in political activities including membership in a political party, supporting a candidate for elected office, or seeking elected office. Employees’ political activities, however, must be clearly separated from activities related to their employment.

If engaging in political activities, Employees must remain impartial and retain the perception of impartiality in relation to their work-related duties and responsibilities. Employees must not engage in political activities during working hours or use District facilities, equipment, or resources in support of these activities.

Partisan politics are not to be introduced into the workplace; however, informal private discussions among co-workers are acceptable.

e) Service to the Public

Employees must provide service to the public in a manner that is courteous, professional, equitable, efficient, and effective. Employees must be sensitive and responsive to the changing needs, expectations, and rights of a diverse public in the proper performance of their duties.

f) Workplace Behaviour

The conduct of Employees in the workplace must meet acceptable social standards and must contribute to a positive work environment, including avoiding engaging in disorderly or indecent conduct. An Employee’s conduct must not compromise the integrity of the District.

All Employees may expect and have the responsibility to contribute to a physically and psychologically safe workplace. Employees are to treat others with respect and dignity and must not engage in discriminatory conduct prohibited by the Human Rights Code. Bullying and harassment is unacceptable behaviour and is not tolerated in this workplace. Employees must
report any incident if bullying or harassment is observed or experienced.  (See also Policy HUM.03)

Violence in the workplace is unacceptable. Violence is any use of physical force on an individual that causes or could cause injury or damage to person or property, and includes an attempt or threatened use of force. Employees must report any incident of violence. Any Employee who becomes aware of a threat must report that threat if there is reasonable cause to believe that the threat poses a risk of injury. Any incident or threat of violence in the workplace, including possession of a weapon while on employer premises or while conducting business on behalf of the District, must be addressed immediately. (See also Policies PER.37 and HEA.11)

Employees must report a safety hazard or unsafe condition or act in accordance with the provisions of the WorkSafeBC Occupational Health and Safety Regulations. (See Policy HEA.16 and SMS 103).

g) Conflicts of Interest

A conflict of interest occurs when an Employee’s private affairs or financial interests are in conflict, or could result in a perception of conflict, with the Employee’s duties or responsibilities in such a way that:

- The Employee’s ability to act in the public interest could be impaired; or
- The Employee’s actions or conduct could undermine or compromise:
  - The public’s confidence in the Employee’s ability to discharge work responsibilities, or
  - The trust that the public places in the District.

While the District recognizes the right of Employees to be involved in activities as citizens of the community, conflict must not exist between Employees’ private interests and the discharge of their employment duties. Employees must arrange their private affairs in a manner that will prevent conflicts of interest, or the perception of conflicts of interest, from arising. Employees who find themselves in an actual, perceived, or potential conflict of interest must disclose the matter to their supervisor, manager, or a human resources representative See Appendix 1. Examples of conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, the following:

- An Employee uses District property or equipment or the Employee’s position, office, or affiliation to pursue personal interests or the interests of another organization;
- An Employee is in a situation where the Employee is under obligation to a person who might benefit from or seek to gain special consideration or favour;
- An Employee, in the performance of official duties, gives preferential treatment to an individual, corporation, or organization, including a non-profit organization, in which the Employee, or a relative or friend of the Employee, has an interest, financial or otherwise;
- An Employee benefits from, or is reasonably perceived by the public to have benefited from, the use of information acquired solely by reason of the Employee’s employment;
- An Employee benefits from, or is reasonably perceived by the public to have benefited from, a municipal transaction over which the Employee can influence decisions (for example, investments, sales, purchases, loans, grants, contracts, regulatory or discretionary approvals, appointments);
- An Employee accepts from an individual, corporation, or organization, directly or indirectly, a personal gift or benefit that arises out of employment, other than:
The exchange of hospitality between persons doing business together;
Tokens exchanged as part of protocol;
The normal presentation of gifts to persons participating in public functions;
The normal exchange of gifts between friends; or
An Employee accepts gifts, donations, or free services for work-related leisure activities other than in situations outlined above.

The following four criteria, when taken together, are intended to guide the judgment of Employees who are considering the acceptance of a gift:
1. The benefit is of nominal or small intrinsic value,
2. The exchange creates no obligation or perception of obligation,
3. Reciprocation is easy, and
4. It occurs infrequently.

Employees will not solicit a gift, benefit, or service on behalf of themselves or other Employees.

While it is not possible to cover every possible conflict of interest situation that might arise, this Policy outlines the District’s expectations regarding real, perceived and potential conflicts of interest between an Employee’s personal interests and the best interests of the District of Mission. If Employees have questions or are unclear whether they have a conflict of interest, they are encouraged to discuss the situation with their supervisor or manager.

If suppliers or Council have questions in regard to this Policy, they may address these to the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer or his or her delegate.

h) Allegations of Wrongdoing

Employees have a duty to report any situation relevant to the District that they believe contravenes the law, misuses public funds or assets, or represents a danger to public health and safety or a significant danger to the environment. Employees can expect such matters to be treated in confidence, unless disclosure of information is authorized or required by law (for example, the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act).

Any Employee, who in good faith, raises a complaint or discloses an alleged breach of the Policy, while following correct reporting procedures, will not be disadvantaged or prejudiced. All reports will be dealt with in a timely and confidential manner.

i) Legal Proceedings

Employees are obliged to cooperate with lawyers defending the District’s interest during legal proceedings, by being truthful and forthcoming about the event or issue raised.

A written opinion prepared on behalf of the District by any legal counsel is privileged and is, therefore, not to be released without prior approval of the Corporate Officer or the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer.

j) Working Relationships

Employees involved in a personal relationship outside work which compromises objectivity, or the perception of objectivity, should avoid being placed in a direct reporting relationship to one another. For example, Employees who are direct relatives or who permanently reside together may not be employed in situations where:
• A reporting relationship exists where one Employee has influence, input, or decision-making power over the other Employee’s performance evaluation, salary, special permissions, conditions of work, and similar matters; or

• The working relationship affords an opportunity for collusion between the two Employees that would have a detrimental effect on the District’s interest.

The above restriction on working relationships may be waived provided that the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer is satisfied that sufficient safeguards are in place to ensure that the District’s interests are not compromised.

For the purposes of this Policy a relative is defined as the Employee’s spouse, fiancé, parent, sibling, child (or ward), grandchild, grandparent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, uncle, aunt, niece, or nephew, the terms step or adoptive applies to relevant relative term.

k) Human Resource Decisions

Employees are to disqualify themselves as participants in human resource decisions when their objectivity would be compromised for any reason or a benefit or perceived benefit could accrue to them. For example, Employees are not to participate in staffing actions, including recruitment, involving direct relatives or persons living in the same household.

l) Outside Remunerative and Volunteer Work

Employees may hold jobs outside of the District, carry on a business, receive remuneration from public funds for activities outside their position, or engage in volunteer activities provided it does not:

• Interfere with the performance of their duties as an Employee;
• Bring the District into disrepute;
• Represent a conflict of interest or create the reasonable perception of a conflict of interest;
• Appear to be an official act or to represent District opinion or Policy;
• Involve the unauthorized use of work time or District premises, services, equipment, or supplies; or
• Gain an advantage that is derived from their employment with the District.

COMPLIANCE

Failure to honour the provisions of this Policy will be considered breaches of the employment contract with the District and may be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment.

Should an Employee have questions about any aspect of the Standards of Conduct for Employees, they must seek clarification from their Department Head, the Manager of Human Resources or the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer.

This Policy will be reviewed annually by the senior management team and any necessary changes will be forwarded to Council for consideration.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AGREEMENTS AND/OR BYLAWS:

• Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, [RSBC 1996] CHAPTER 165
• Human Rights Code [RSBC 1996] CHAPTER 210
• HEA.11 Violence in the Workplace Program
• HEA.16 Occupational Health & Safety Program
• HEA.26 Use of Electronic Communication Devices
• HUM.02 Computer and Technology Acceptable Use
• HUM.03 Respectful Workplace
• HUM.05 Progressive Discipline
• PER.31 Staffing Policy
• PER.33 Subpoena for Court
• PER.37 Violence in the Workplace
• FIN.24 Procurement, Stores & Disposition Policy

*** END OF POLICY ***
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Appendix 1

Procedure for Disclosing and Assessing Conflicts of Interest

Employees must disclose any real, perceived or potential conflicts of interests as soon as they are aware that one exists. If an Employee is uncertain whether a conflict of interest exists or is likely to exist, clarification should be sought in a preliminary discussion with his or her Manager (the Manager) or the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer.

The Employee will disclose the conflict to his/her exempt Manager using the Conflict of Interest (COI) Disclosure Form. The District will seek to resolve disclosures or claims of conflict of interest as expeditiously as possible. The Manager shall investigate and consider the particulars of the situation to determine whether a conflict of interest exists; whether it will be allowed to continue or must be discontinued; and, if it is to be allowed, what, if any, conditions should apply. Where the Manager shares in the same conflict of interest, both parties shall disclose this to the Director or the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer.

The Manager shall determine the course of action that is in the best interests of the District. In making this determination, the Manager may take into account the following factors:

- any possible harm to the District or its Employees or others acting on its behalf if the conflict is allowed;
- any possible harm to the interests of the community, residents or others served by the District, if the conflict is allowed;
- whether reasonable alternative arrangements are possible which do not create a conflict of interest;
- the consequences to the District, its reputation and future activities if the conflict of interest is not allowed;
- the consequences to the District and its reputation and future activities if the conflict of interest is permitted to continue;
- the economic or other interests of the District; and,
- the rights and interests of the Employee.

The Manager may request from the Employee additional information that relates directly to and is necessary to assess and decide the real, perceived or potential conflict. The Manager may consult with others before making a decision relating to a real or potential conflict of interest.

The Manager will impose terms and conditions before permitting a conflict of interest to continue.

In all cases, the Manager will issue an assessment on the COI Disclosure Form, setting out the issues assessed during the review, the decision made, and the reasons for the decision. Where the decision is to manage the conflict, the process for doing so will be set out. The Manager will forward the COI Disclosure form containing his/her decision to the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer for review and/or approval and to the Deputy Corporate Officer for record keeping.

A decision concerning an ongoing conflict of interest may be reviewed by the Manager at appropriate intervals. The original decision may be reversed or varied, subject to the same approval levels as the original disclosure decision.

Assessing and Managing Conflicts of Interest

Without limiting the discretion of a person assessing a disclosure to consider all relevant factors, the Manager must consider the following factors in assessing a disclosure:
• the impact on the Employee’s ability to satisfy his or her obligations to the District;
• the degree to which the proposed action will be detrimental to the interests of the District; and,
• the extent to which the proposed action or activity may be managed through an appropriate protocol.

Where a Manager is unable to determine an appropriate course of action, the disclosure will be referred to the next level of review with a copy of the disclosure report and any related documents.

Assurance Against Retaliation

As real, perceived or potential conflicts of interest can cause considerable damage to the District, Employees are encouraged to bring forward any conflicts of interest encountered in their employment, whether these affect them personally or that involve others. Retaliation against an Employee bringing forward a reported conflict, or a witness, is strictly prohibited and will result in appropriate disciplinary action.

Any reports made in bad faith, if proven to be made in a fraudulent or malicious manner, will result in disciplinary action being taken against the one making the fraudulent or malicious complaint.

Access to Disclosures

Disclosures made under Policy HUM.02 (Standards of Conduct for Employees) will normally be treated as confidential. However, it may sometimes be necessary for the District to permit persons within the District and, in some circumstances, persons outside the District, access to information about such disclosures and the terms and conditions imposed. Information will be disclosed only as permitted or required by law.

Records Management

Records created as a result of actions under this policy will be managed in accordance with Policy C-ADM.08, Records Management Policy, which delineates records retention requirements, timeframes, and final dispositions.
Acknowledgement Form

I have received a copy of the HUM.02 Standards of Conduct for Employees Policy. I have read and been informed about the content, requirements and expectations of this Policy. I am aware that violations of this Policy may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination of my employment, restitution, civil action, criminal prosecution or any combination thereof.

I understand that if I have questions, at any time, regarding the Policy, I will consult with my immediate supervisor, Human Resources staff members or the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer.

*Please read the Policy carefully to ensure that you fully understand the Policy before signing this document.*

Employee Signature: ______________________________________

Employee Printed Name: ____________________________________

Date Signed: _________________________

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM

The District recognizes the right of its employees to be involved in activities as citizens of the community, and to pursue their personal, financial and social affairs. However, all employees must prevent any conflict of interest from arising between their role as private citizens, and their role and responsibilities as employees of the District.

All District staff are expected to disclose any significant relationships that may pose a conflict with the principles of balance and independence. Please complete the following form to help us evaluate potential conflicts of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SECTION 1) – EMPLOYEE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SECTION 2) – DETAILS OF ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Type of outside interest which may create a real, perceived or potential conflict:</strong> Please check all that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Volunteer activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family ownership of private asset(s) or business interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other _________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. <strong>The outside employment/activity/interests identified in above:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Is done during my normal work hours and interferes with the performance of my regular duties or the duties of someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Uses advantages derived from employment in municipal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Involves the use of government premises, supplies, equipment, employees, etc. for outside benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) May create a real, perceived or potential conflict of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) May create an obligation, real or perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Explain the conflict of interest identified above:**

4. **How does this create a conflict?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SECTION 3) – DECLARATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the above information and understand the request for disclosure. I confirm that all the details above are a complete and accurate listing of my relevant financial interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is collected under the authority of Policy HUM.02. It relates directly to and is necessary to manage the District's conflict of interest policy. The information is used only in assessing and deciding the real or potential conflict of interested disclosed in it. If you have any questions about the collection and use of the information, please contact the Freedom of Information Coordinator (604-820-3724).
### (SECTION 1) – CHECKLIST

1. **Does a real, perceived or potential conflict of interest exist?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   *If Yes, please complete the form below. If No, please explain.*

2. **Can this conflict of interest be managed?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3. **Conflict of Interest Assessment and Management Plan**
   Please provide information on the assessment of the conflict, the management plan, and reasons for this decision. Please attach additional pages as needed.

### (SECTION 2) – SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### (SECTION 3) – HUMAN RESOURCES APPROVAL

1. **Decision of HR Manager:**
   - [ ] Approved.
   - [ ] Approved provided the following action is taken.
   - [ ] Refused.

2. **Explanation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. **Employee was notified of decision on(mm/dd/yyyy):**
Introduction

The District recognizes the right of its employees to be involved in activities as citizens of the community, and to pursue their personal, financial and social affairs. However, all employees must prevent any conflict of interest from arising between their role as private citizens, and their role and responsibilities as employees of the District. The public interest must be the primary concern of municipal employees in the performance of their duties. Observance and adherence to the highest ethical standards, integrity and impartiality must be maintained. Therefore, employees must take care to arrange their private affairs to prevent any perceived or actual conflict of interest from arising.

Definitions

"Employee" shall mean all staff whose name appears on the payroll records of the Municipality.

"Conflict of Interest" shall occur where an employee finds himself or herself in a situation in which the existence of some personal interest, of a financial or of any other nature, has influenced or may influence the exercise of his or her duties or responsibilities as a municipal employee.

"Person" shall include a corporation, society, organization, partnership or party.

"Personal Interest" shall include an interest arising from family, marriage or spousal relationships.

"Officer" shall include all employees of the District of Mission as defined by the District of Mission Officers Bylaw and amendments thereto.
Responsibilities

The Corporate Administration Department shall be responsible to provide each employee with a copy of this policy and any other supplemental policies.

Each employee shall undertake to familiarize himself with this policy and request clarification, if required, from his supervisor. Where an employee is uncertain as to possible conflicts of interest, he should discuss the matter, entirely and in detail, with his Department Head, who shall in turn notify the Chief Administrative Officer, who shall advise as to the correct approach. The employee's request for clarification and the reply shall be documented and retained by both the employee and the District. A copy shall be retained in the employee's personnel file.

The Corporate Administration Department is responsible for assisting departments in resolving difficult, sensitive, or new issues that arise in the administration and application of this policy, and assisting departments in the development of supplemental policies which address conflict of interest situations unique to the Department.

When a conflict of interest issue comes to the attention of the supervisor, it shall be referred to the relevant Department Head and the Chief Administrative Officer. If required, an investigation will be coordinated by the Chief Administrative Officer to determine the appropriate action or discipline. Council shall be advised in the event an investigation is required.

Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest shall include the following situations:

- where an employee's personal interests, of a financial or of any other nature, are, or appear to be, in conflict with his or her duties, responsibilities or obligations as a municipal employee which could impair the employee's ability to act in the interest of the District or the public;
- where an employee's personal interests or conduct could compromise the trust which the public places in the District.

Employees shall not engage in any business or transaction, nor shall they have a financial or other personal interest, direct or indirect, which is incompatible with the proper discharge of their duties, or which would tend to impair their independence of judgment or action in the discharge of their duties or responsibilities as municipal employees. This important obligation cannot be satisfied by simply placing an interest in the name of a third person such as a spouse, relation or friend if the employee maintains any ongoing interest in the incompatible business or transaction.

Employees shall not grant any special consideration, treatment or advantage to any person beyond that which is available to all members of the public, nor shall they place themselves in a position where they are under obligation to any person who might benefit from special consideration or favour on their part, or who might seek preferential treatment in any way.

Municipal officers, the Purchasing Agent and all those regular employees in the District's Community Development, Engineering and Inspections Departments who hold or acquire an interest in real estate within the District of Mission other than for their own dwelling, shall be required to advise the Chief Administrative Officer, in writing, of the nature of the interest held and the employee's intentions with respect to the development of the property. The Chief Administrative Officer shall deal with such disclosures in confidence for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the terms of this policy, and avoiding any potential conflicts of interest.

Failure to disclose pursuant to the terms of this policy by a staff member covered by this policy to the Chief Administrative Officer or by the Chief Administrative Officer to Council shall be regarded as wilfully acting contrary to an order of a superior.
Confidentiality
Many matters dealt with in the administration of the District’s affairs are confidential, whether or not they are specifically identified as such. These matters must remain confidential for the protection of the District's and the public's interest.

Employees shall not benefit, or appear to benefit, from the use of information acquired as a result of his or her duties with the Municipality unless such information is readily available to the general public. For example, employees shall not use information available only to municipal staff to guide personal investment in real estate or other forms of property, whether by direct means or indirectly through others.

Employees shall not disclose information which is not generally available to the public, without proper authorization.

Rewards and Benefits
Employees shall not accept commission, reward, advantage or benefit of any value from any person who is interested, directly or indirectly, in any manner, in business dealings with the Municipality.

It is recognized that moderate hospitality is an accepted courtesy of a business relationship. Recipients should not allow themselves to reach a position where they have been, or might be deemed by others to have been, influenced in making a business decision as a consequence of accepting such hospitality.

Failure to Observe
Failure to observe the terms of this policy may result in disciplinary action including possible dismissal.
7. CORPORATE SERVICES

Councillor Luck assumed the Chair.

**Standards of Conduct for Employees Policy**

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED: That draft District policy *HUM.02 Standards of Conduct*, be referred back to staff for a further refinement of the language and intent of the policy, and for further legal review.

CARRIED
Current Year Observations

1. Conflict of Interest Policy - Go Beyond the Legal Requirements

Observation

The Financial Disclosure Act requires that members of Council as well as employees appointed by Council (generally senior management) make written disclosure of their corporate holdings, business interests, other organizations which may compensate them, and their interests in lands. These disclosures must be updated yearly. The Community Charter contains an entire Division on Conflict of Interest, however this applies only to Council members and deals mostly with participation in meetings, prohibition against influence and disclosure of gifts and contracts.

Recommendation

We recommend where possible the District should go beyond the baseline requirements to enhance openness and transparency. Best practice would require that an in-house conflict of interest policy be developed and regularly reviewed. The policy on conflict of interest should include at least the following points:

- Description of who is covered by the policy (which likely would be all council members and all staff).
- Definition of what a conflict of interest is.
- Explanation of a perceived conflict, how it would be treated on par with a real conflict unless it can be managed.
- Description of how a perceived conflict could be managed.
- Requirement for all Council and staff to declare any conflicts or perceived conflicts as early in the process as could reasonably be expected.
- Agreement from all Council and staff that they will abide by the conflict of interest rules and the result may be lost business for organizations they are directly or indirectly connected to.
- Maintenance of a centralized listing of all conflicts that result from both the required statutory disclosures and as a result of this policy.
- Development of a form outlining highlights of the policy for review by suppliers and potential suppliers. Suppliers should sign this form and confirm that they will advise the District as soon as they become aware of any potential for conflict.
- Identification of a key senior staff member independent of finance and procurement who can:
  o Address questions that Council and staff may have in regard to the policy.
  o Address questions that suppliers may have in regard to the policy.
  o Address questions that may come from concerned third parties in regard to conflicts.
- Creation of document conferring agreement to abide by the policy that should be signed annually by all Council and staff (this is important both as a reminder and to enhance compliance).
- Establishment of procedures for resolving allegations of conflict of interest – particularly how to deal with any contracts that may already be in process.

The District already has processes and procedures that cover many of the above noted matters. However, it would be beneficial for the District to codify the procedures, supplement where necessary, and create a formal written policy. As noted above, explicit signing of compliance of the policy by both Council/staff and suppliers is also key to success in this area.
Management Comments

The District does have policy PER.02 - Conflict of Interest in place to address conflict of interest concerns. However, management acknowledges that the policy has not been updated recently. We appreciate the best practice points that have been suggested, and will consider updating the policy in the near future.

This communication is prepared solely for the information of management and those charged with governance and is not intended for any other purposes. We accept no responsibility to a third party who uses this communication.

We would like to express our appreciation for the co-operation and assistance which we received from the entire finance department during the course of the audit.

We shall be pleased to discuss with you further any matters mentioned in this letter at your convenience.

Yours truly,

Bill Cox, FCPA, FCA
Partner through a corporation
BDO Canada LLP
Chartered Professional Accountants

BC/lcz

cc: Mayor and Council
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
SUBJECT: Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57 Application for Temporary Change to Liquor Primary Club License – 32627 Logan Avenue
ATTACHMENT: Appendix 1 – RCL Application to Liquor Control and Licensing Branch

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the application from Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57 to the British Columbia Liquor Control and Licensing Branch for a Temporary Change to Liquor Primary Club License #152527 for the property located at 32627 Logan Avenue to allow the use of an outdoor tent for the following special events in 2017:
   - June 24, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (Legion Week, Mission Legion’s 90th Birthday)
   - July 1, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (Canada Day Car Rally)
   - November 11, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (Remembrance Day)

   be supported as “no objection” in Part 12 of the application; and

2. That the following comments be included in Part 12 of the application:
   a) **With respect to the potential for noise:** The Royal Canadian Legion is located in an area that is primarily zoned and designated for commercial land uses. Activities undertaken at this location are such that they would not generate excessive noise, even with the event proposed within a tent. In this regard, no adverse impact is anticipated if the application is approved.
   b) **With respect to the potential impact on the community:** Given that the change to the existing license is temporary and would only allow the use of a tent for special event days, no adverse impact on the community is anticipated if the application is approved.
   c) **With respect to views expressed by neighbouring residents:** The views of residents were not sought as part of this application as it is considered to be minor in nature.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to assist the Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57 with the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch (LCLB) application requirement to consult with local governments when applying for a temporary extension to a licensed area.

BACKGROUND:

The Legion is applying to the LCLB for a Temporary Change to Liquor Primary Club License #152527 to allow the use of an outdoor tent for special events scheduled throughout the 2017 calendar year. This is a reoccurring annual application submitted by the Legion, and Councils have supported similar
applications in the past. The outdoor tent has been used for special events since 2005 and no known complaints or issues have been forwarded to the District in response to these events.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
As part of the provincial application process the Legion is required to seek the local government’s comment on their proposal (Part 12 of Appendix 1). The application specifically requests a change to the license to allow service of alcohol in the temporary tent structure during the following special events in 2017:

• June 24, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (Legion Week, Mission Legion’s 90th Birthday)
• July 1, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (Canada Day Car Rally)
• November 11, 2017, 11:00 am -11:00 pm (Remembrance Day)

While the final approval rests with the LCLB, comment in the form of “objection” or “no objection” is required to complete the application process.

The Legion’s property at 32627 Logan Avenue is designated as Commercial in the Official Community Plan and zoned as Commercial Highway Two (CH2). The proposed use is permitted within the CH2 zone. The tent is situated on the western portion of the property.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications associated with this report.

COMMUNICATION:
Council’s decision will be directly communicated to the President of Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57. If approved, a copy of the resolution of support will be provided to the Legion to include with their application to the LCLB.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57 has applied for a temporary change to their Liquor Primary Club License which allows for the serving of alcohol in a temporary tent at 32627 Logan Avenue during special events. This application process occurs annually. As part of the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch requirements to consider the application, the Legion must consult with the local authority. Staff support the application as no issues have been identified with previous temporary permits issued to the Royal Canadian Legion.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer

Reviewed by:

Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
March 10, 2017

The District of Mission
PO Box 20
8645 Stave Lake Street
Mission, BC
V2V 4L9

The Mayor and Councillors:

Please find attached form LCLB023 Application for a Temporary Change to a Liquor License. This application deals with the temporary use of a tent for special events to be held at the Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57 during 2017.

As this application requires local body approval RCL Branch 57 asks that City Council resolve to allow the use of the outdoor tent for special events shown in Part 2 of the application.

Sincerely,

Polly Mann
President
604-826-2331
rcl57@shaw.ca

Attachments
1. LCLB023
2. Plan of extended area
TEMPORARY CHANGE TO A LIQUOR LICENCE
FOOD PRIMARY, LIQUOR PRIMARY, LIQUOR PRIMARY CLUBS & MANUFACTURERS ENDORSEMENTS
Liquor Control and Licensing Form LCLB023

Instructions:
Complete all applicable fields and then submit with payment as outlined in Part 11 of this application form. You may complete this form online and then print. If you have any questions about this application, call the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch (LCLB) toll-free at: 1 866 209-2111. A complete application including the supporting documents must be submitted a minimum of three (3) weeks in advance of your event(s); otherwise your application will not be accepted and will returned to you with the fees.

Applications requesting discretion to policy (see Part 9) must be submitted a minimum of two (2) months prior to your proposed event; otherwise your application will not be accepted and will be returned to you with the fees. LCLB forms and supporting materials referred to in this document can be found at: www.gov.bc.ca/lico regulateationandlicensing

Licensee Information

Licence number: 152527

Office use only
Job No. (C3-LIC)

Type: ☐ Food Primary ☐ Liquor Primary ☒ Liquor Primary Club ☐ Winery

Licensee name (as shown on licence): Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57

Establishment name (as shown on licence): Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57

Establishment Address: 82627 Logan Ave 3B Mission BC V2V 6K4

Street City Province Postal Code

Contact Name: Polly Mann Title/Position: President

( last / first / middle )

Business Tel with area code: 604-826-2331 Business Fax with area code: 604-820-2169

Business e-mail: rcl57@shaw.ca

Business Mail address:
(if different from above):

Street City Province Postal Code

Note: An authorized signing authority of a licensee can appoint a representative to interact with the branch on their behalf by completing form LCLB101 Add, Change or Remove Licensee Representative

Part 1: Temporary Change Requested
Please check the appropriate boxes below. You may complete more than one change section on this form as long as the changes are for the same licence number. Note: Categories noted by an asterisk (*) require local government/First Nations comment.

Type of change requested

☐ Temporary change to hours of sale
- Liquor-Primary and Liquor-Primary Club licences, and manufacturer lounge or special event endorsements – any hours changes*
- Food-Primary licences – requests for hours of sale later than midnight*
- Food-Primary licences – requests for hours of sale before midnight

☐ Temporary patron participation entertainment endorsement*
- Food-Primary licences only

☒ Temporary extension of licensed area
- Liquor-Primary and Liquor-Primary Club licences, and manufacturer lounge or special event endorsements.

☐ Temporary extension of licensed area*
- Liquor-Primary and Liquor-Primary Club licences only (no increase in patron or person capacity)

☐ Temporary location change*
- Food-Primary licenses only (no increase in patron or person capacity)

☐ Other
- Applies to all change requests other than these listed above

Complete Sections
1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12
1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12
1, 2, 3, 10, 11
1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 12
1, 2, 5, 10, 11
1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12
1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 12
1, 2, 8, 10, 11
1, 2, 9, 10, 11
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Part 2: Reason Temporary Change is Requested
Describe event details including who is holding the event, the hours of the event and its purpose:

1. June 24, 2017 11:00 am - 11:00 pm  Legion Week, Mission Legions 90th Birthday
2. July 1, 2017 11:00 am - 11:00 pm  Car Rally
3. November 11, 2017 11:00 am - 11:00 pm  Remembrance Day

All events held by Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57

Date(s) from: (mm/dd/yyyy) ___________________________ To: (mm/dd/yyyy) ___________________________ (inclusive)

Part 3: Temporary Change to Hours of Sale
Fee: $330
Liquor-Primary and Liquor-Primary Club licences, and manufacturer lounge or special event endorsements – any hours changes*

Fee: $330
Food-Primary licences – requests for hours of sale later than midnight*

Fee: $110
Food-Primary licences – requests for hours of sale before midnight (local government/First Nations comment not required)

*Note: These categories (*) require local government/First Nation comment.

Licensees may apply for a temporary change in hours of sale for a limited period, subject to any restrictions within the Liquor Control and Licensing Act, Regulations, branch policies and/or original terms and conditions of licensing.
See Part 2 for more information on obtaining local government/First Nations comment.

Please provide the following information:
Current hours of sale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested hours of sale: (Maximum hours permitted by regulation are between 9:00 am to 4:00 am of the same business day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4: Temporary Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement

(Food-Primary licences only)

Licensees may apply for a patron participation entertainment endorsement for a limited period, subject to any restrictions within the Liquor Control and Licensing Act, Regulations, branch policies and/or original terms and conditions of licensing.

**Note:** This application process requires comment from your local government/First Nation. See Part 12 for more information on this process.

Describe the type of entertainment you are requesting:

Patron participation must end by midnight unless approved by LCLB and local government/First Nations. There are restrictions related to forms of entertainment, sound systems, etc. If you are uncertain about any of the details of your proposal, please consult with licensing staff at LCLB in Victoria (see contact information in Part 11).

Part 5: Temporary Extension of Licensed Area (food-primary licences only)

Fee: $110

This change enables licensees to apply for a temporary extension of their establishment’s licensed areas for a limited period, subject to any restrictions within the Liquor Control and Licensing Act, Regulations, branch policies and/or original terms and conditions of licensing. Approval of this temporary change request permits the licensee to operate only at the capacity on the face of their current licence plus the capacity of the extension area. If in doubt, consult with licensing staff at LCLB in Victoria (see Part 11 for contact info). This application process does not require comment from your local government/First Nation.

Please provide the following information and documents:

- [ ] Current total capacity, including patios (as shown on licence);
- [ ] Identify the area (person/patron as shown on licence) to be extended;
- [ ] Floor plan of the extended area showing how perimeter is defined, dimensions and its physical relationship to existing licensed areas:
  - Floor plan must have occupant load of the extended area marked/stamped on the plans by provincial fire or building authority (or designate) where the extension is indoors or within a permanent structure.
  - Provide proposed capacity of extended area if extension is outside; and
- [ ] Where the extension area is not on property owned or controlled by the licensee, provide written approval for such use from the property owner.

Part 6: Temporary Extension of Licensed Area

(liquor-primary, liquor-primary club licence and manufacturer lounge and special events endorsement only)

Fee: $330

Licensees may apply for a temporary extension of their licensed areas for a limited period, subject to any restrictions within the Liquor Control and Licensing Act, Regulations, branch policies and/or original terms and conditions of licensing. Approval of this temporary change request permits the licensee to operate at the capacity on the face of their current licence plus the capacity of the extension area.

**Note:** This application process requires comment from your local government/First Nation. See Part 12 for more information on this process.

Please provide the following information and documents:

- [ ] Current total capacity, including patios (as shown on licence);
- [ ] Identify the area(s) to be extended;
- [ ] Floor plan of the extended area(s) showing how perimeter is defined, dimensions and its physical relationship to existing licensed areas:
  - Floor plan must have occupant load of the extended area marked/stamped on the plans by provincial fire or building authority (or designate) where the extension is indoors or within a permanent structure.
  - Provide proposed person capacity of extended area(s) if extension is outside; and
- [ ] Where the proposed area is not on property owned or controlled by the licensee, provide written approval for such use from the property owner.
Part 7: Temporary Location Change (liquor-primary and liquor-primary club licences only)  
(No increase in patron or person capacity)

Licensees may apply for a temporary change of location of one or more licensed areas in their establishment, to accommodate special events but this change permits no increase in licensed capacity. Proposed changes must comply with occupant load limitations.

Note: This application process requires comment from your local government/First Nation. See Part 12 for more information on this process.

Current area capacities, as shown on licence:

Area #1  Area #2  Area #3  Area #4  Patio #1  Patio #2

Proposed temporary changes in capacity (no increase in total capacity permitted):

Area #1  Area #2  Area #3  Area #4  Patio #1  Patio #2

Please attach the following documents:

☐ Floor plan of the proposed area(s) showing how perimeter is defined, dimensions and its physical relationship to existing licensed areas.

  • Floor plan must have occupant load marked/stamped on the plans by provincial fire or building authority (or designate), where the extension is indoors or within a permanent structure.
  • Provide proposed capacity of the new area if outdoors.

☐ Where the proposed area is not on property owned or controlled by the licensee, provide written approval for such use from the property owner.

Part 8: Temporary Location Change (food-primary licences only)  
(No increase in patron or person capacity)

Licensees may apply for a temporary change of location of one or more licensed areas in their establishment, to accommodate special events but this change permits no increase in licensed capacity. Proposed changes must comply with occupant load limitations.

Note: This application process does not require comment from your local government/First Nation.

Current area capacities, as shown on licence:

Area #1  Area #2  Area #3  Area #4  Interior lounge

Patio #1  Patio #2

Proposed temporary changes in capacity (no increase in total capacity permitted):

Area #1  Area #2  Area #3  Area #4  Interior lounge

Patio #1  Patio #2

Please attach the following documents:

For food-primary licences:

☐ Floor plan of the proposed area showing how perimeter is defined, dimensions and its physical relationship to existing licensed areas.

  • Floor plan must have occupant load marked/stamped on the plans by provincial building or fire authority (or designate), where the extension is indoors or within a permanent structure.
  • Provide proposed capacity of the new area if outdoors.

☐ Where the proposed area is not on property owned or controlled by the licensee, provide written approval for such use from the property owner.
Part 9: Other

Complete this section if you are requesting a change other than those listed in Part 1, page 1.

Describe your request in detail, using additional pages if required.

If your request requires an exercise of discretion; provide a written submission detailing why a request for discretion should be approved. All documentation to support your request for discretion must be submitted together in one package; the branch will not consider additional materials submitted after a completed application is received. For more information see your licence specific terms and conditions. Requests for discretion should be submitted at least two months prior to the proposed event.

Date(s) from: ______/_____/______ to ______/_____/______ (inclusive) Time(s): ______/_____/______

Part 10: Declaration

My signature below indicates I understand and acknowledge:

All of the information given is true and complete to the best of my knowledge. Section 57(1)(c) of the Liquor Control and Licensing Act states: "A person commits an offence if the person (c) provides false or misleading information in the following circumstances: (i) when making an application referred to in section 12; (ii) when making a report or when required and as specified by the general manager under section 59."

Note: An agent or lawyer acting on behalf of the licensee may not sign the application on behalf of the licensee.

Signature: ________________________________

Authorized signatory of the licensee

Name: Mann, Polly
Position: President
Date: 10/01/2017

This form should be signed by an appropriate individual who has the authority to bind the licensee. The licensee is responsible for ensuring that the individual who signs this form is authorized to do so.

Typically, an appropriate individual will be as follows:

- If the licensee is an sole proprietor, the individual himself/herself
- If the licensee is a corporation, an officer or, in some cases, a director
- If the licensee is a general partnership, one of the partners
- If the licensee is a limited partnership, the general partner of the partnership
- If the licensee is a society, a director or a senior manager (as defined in the Societies Act)

If an authorized signatory has completed the Act, Change or Remove Licensee Representative form (LCLB101) and they have specifically permitted a licensee representative to sign this form on the licensee's behalf, the branch will accept the licensee representative's signature.

Part 11: Application Fees - Payment Options

Total Fee Submitted: $330.00

Payment is by (check (2) one):

☐ Cheque, payable to Minister of Finance (if cheque is returned as non-sufficient funds, a $30 fee will be charged)
☐ Money order, payable to Minister of Finance
☐ Credit card: ☐ VISA ☐ MasterCard ☐ AMEX

☐ I am submitting my application by email and I will call with my credit card information. I will call Victoria Head Office at 250-952-5787 or 1-866-209-2111 and understand that no action can proceed with my application until the application fee is paid in full.
☐ I am submitting my application by fax or mail and have given my credit information in the space provided at the bottom of the page.

Credit Card Information (To be submitted by fax or mail only)

Name of cardholder (as it appears on card):

Credit card number: __________________________ Expiry date: ______/____/____

Signature: ________________________________
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Part 12: Local Government/First Nation Comments

Comments:


Name of Municipality/Regional District/First Nations:

Name (print)                      Phone:                      

Title:                           E-mail:                      

Signature:                       Date:                      

Part 13: What Happens Next?
The temporary change application process:

1. If the requested temporary change(s) require local government/First Nation comment, the applicant must take the completed application form and all required documents to their local government/First Nation and request that the local government/First Nation complete and sign Part 12.
2. The applicant will submit the signed application, all required documents and application fee to the Victoria Head Office (LCLB).

Note: Applicants must ensure they submit their completed application a minimum of three (3) weeks or two (2) months, if it's a request for discretion - see Part 9) before the proposed change. Otherwise, your application will not be accepted and will be returned to you.

3. The LCLB licensing staff will review the application package and advise the applicant by phone, mail or fax, of any information or documents required before the application can be processed.
4. LCLB licensing staff will request comments from the local liquor inspector.
5. If required, the local liquor inspector will work with the applicant on security and related issues.
6. LCLB licensing staff will review the comments from the local government/First Nation (if applicable) and local liquor inspector.
7. LCLB staff will contact the applicant by, fax or mail to let them know whether or not the change has been approved. The applicant will receive LCLB's decision in writing.

The information requested on this form is collected by the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch under Section 26 (a) and (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and will be used for the purpose of liquor licensing and compliance and enforcement matters in accordance with the Liquor Control and Licensing Act. Should you have any questions about the collection, use, or disclosure of personal information, please contact the Freedom of Information Officer at PO Box 9292 STN PROV GVT, Victoria, BC, V8W 9J8 or by phone toll free at 1-866-509-0111.
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture
SUBJECT: Muse Awards

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
1. That $5,000 be designated biennially to support the Muse Awards;
2. That $5,000 to support the 2018 Muse Awards be added to the 2017 budget, with funding from the Gaming Reserve Fund;
3. That the ongoing $5,000 biennial amount, commencing in the 2019 for the 2020 event and carrying on every two years thereafter, be added to the District’s budget with ongoing funding from the Gaming Reserve Fund; and
4. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s approval to provide $5,000 biennially to support the Muse Awards which celebrate and recognize arts and culture achievements in Mission.

BACKGROUND:
The Cultural Resources Commission established the Muse Awards in 2011 to celebrate and recognize the vibrant arts and culture sector in Mission. The Commission felt the sector’s profile needed to be enhanced and the artists celebrated for their achievement. Sports, through the Sports Hall of Fame and volunteers through the Volunteer Awards are recognized, however the arts sector did not have an event or award to recognize their work.

The Cultural Commission volunteers took on the task of hosting the first awards with the support of staff in 2011 and have hosted 4 events since that time. The event is a simple, low key event done for approximately $1,200-1,500 from the Commission budget and complimented with $2,500 – 3,500 of in-kind support.

Prior to the 2016 awards, the Commission decided that they should be held every two years as opposed to annually which was the original intent. This would make the next awards a 2018 event. Further, the Commission felt that a biennial event was a better fit due to cost issues and the ability to maintain a high quality of recipient recognition. There was also healthy discussion amongst the Commission members regarding their capacity to host the event and as to whether it fell within the mandate of the Commission so after the 2016 awards it was agreed that the Commission would explore other options. These included investigating what other communities do, reviewing the Mission volunteer awards program and entering into discussions with the Mission Arts Council. The Commission feels strongly that the event should be continued and enhanced.
On February 15, 2017 the Commission recommended a partnership model between Parks, Recreation & Culture and the Arts Council which incorporates volunteer support from both the Commission and the Arts Council Board.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Staff believe the proposed model between Parks, Recreation & Culture and the Mission Arts Council with volunteer support of the Commission and Board will achieve the goals of celebrating and recognizing the arts sector in Mission. In the past, the Arts Council has hosted a Celebration of the Arts event with limited success and feels by combining these efforts with the Muse Awards that an enhanced, higher profile event which is sustainable can be developed which serves both organizations purposes.

The Parks, Recreation & Culture mandate encompasses Culture, however it is not supported to the same degree as other areas within the Department. Staff rely on outside agencies such as the Mission Arts Council and the Clarke Theatre to provide many of these services. The proposed partnership event supports the mandate and strengthens the relationship with the arts community and Arts Council.

The annual budget of the Cultural Resources Commission is $4,000. When the first Muse Awards were hosted the budget was $5,000 and the Commission was able to absorb the original costs as a result of several donations. With a smaller budget, increasing costs and a desire to more formally recognize the arts and culture community the event is not sustainable with the existing budget. The Commission and staff feel they are not able to properly focus on its other priorities such as Culture Days, Hall of Fame Project, Public Art promotion and continue to support the Muse Awards.

In discussion with the Commission and Mission Arts Council it was felt the best time to host this event would be the Spring. The Muse Awards have been held in both the Spring and Fall over the past few years and upon review it was decided a Spring event was best due to existing organization commitments, to ability to incorporate students and the fact that planning through the summer can be problematic due to holidays and an increase in arts oriented special events.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The joint partnership of the Muse Awards with the Mission Arts Council reinforces Council’s goal to enhance lifestyle opportunities within the District of Mission.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Funding in the amount of $5,000 is requested to support the Muse Awards on a biennial basis. While the majority of the funding will be required in 2018, staff anticipate that some expenditures will be required in 2017 for items such as securing a venue and entertainment and to support the nomination process. The request for funds is being made in 2017, however a portion of the funds will be required to be carried forward into 2018. A similar approach is requested moving forward to provide $5,000 biennially to support the ongoing nature of the event, i.e. funding provided in the year preceding the event to secure the venue well in advance, with any remaining budget funds carried forward to the following budget year when the event will occur.

Funding for this request can be provided from the District’s Gaming Reserve Fund, which currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $300,000. The Gaming Reserve Fund can also provide ongoing funding in the amount of $5,000 biennially to support this event, as there is currently more than $500,000 collected annually from casino revenue cost sharing, and on average approximately $470,000 on an annual basis is currently committed (for the most part, the $470,000 committed amount supports ongoing operating programs such as social development and community grants, and the occasional one-time capital project).
Staff are seeking approval to amend the Financial Plan accordingly.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:

A joint organizing committee between Parks, Recreation & Culture and the Mission Arts Council with representation from the Cultural Resources Commission and the Arts Council Board, will be established for the Muse Awards. The nominations and event itself will be promoted in the community through Parks, Recreation & Culture and Mission Arts Council channels.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

This report is provided to Council seeking $5,000 biennially to support a partnership between Parks, Recreation & Culture and the Mission Arts Council to host the Muse Awards.

SIGN-OFFS:

Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks Recreation and Culture

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: April 3, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture
SUBJECT: 2017 Special Occasion Beer Garden License Requests
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A – 2017 Special Occasion Requests

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
That the 2017 Special Occasion requests from:

- Mission Slo-Pitch;
- Mission Firefighters Charitable Society;
- Mission Folk Music Festival;
- Downtown Business Association;
- Root’s and Blues Festival

be declared Community Special Events for the purposes of securing a Special Event Permit from the BC Liquor Control and Licensing Branch.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s support for the applications to host beer gardens in the District received from the following groups:

- Mission Slo-Pitch;
- Mission Firefighters Charitable Society;
- Mission Folk Music Festival;
- Downtown Business Association;
- Root’s and Blues Festival.

Details of the various events are summarized in Appendix A.

BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission has received applications from five community groups wishing to run outdoor beer gardens this summer in accordance with Alcohol Consumption on Municipal Property Policy RIS.13. In order for the applicant to precede Council must first approve the events and declare them “Community Special Event(s)” so that the organizers may make application for a Special Event Permit from the BC LCLB.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Neither the applicants nor the venues currently hold permanent liquor license and must therefore
apply for a temporary license from the LCLB called a Special Event Permit (SEP).

All of the applicants have a history of holding beer gardens and there have not been any significant complaints related to any previous outdoor beer gardens run by these organizations.

The declaration of the events as “Community Special Events” is the first step toward securing a Special Event Permit. In addition, all groups will be required to provide the following:

- Submit a security plan for the approval of the RCMP as well as the Fire / Rescue Department;
- Provide public liability insurance naming the District as additional insured in an amount of not less than $5,000,000 (five million dollars);
- Submit a complete District of Mission Special Occasion Beer Garden Application form and application fees;
- Agreement to fully comply in every respect to the Special Event Permit rules published by the BC Liquor Control and Licensing Branch; and
- Upon completion of the event, provide the District with a financial statement related to their event. It is understood that the funds raised will go to a charitable organization.

Despite recent changes to provincial legislation, all beer gardens held on DOM property must install a fenced off area to restrict access to those of legal drinking age with valid identification.

The Root’s and Blues festival have not yet secured a partner to operate the beer garden and discussions are ongoing. PR&C staff will advise Council by memo when a partner to operate the beer garden has been secured.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial issues directly associated with the recommendations included in this report. All application fees have been remitted and financial statements will be collected following completion of the event.

COMMUNICATION:

The application will be provided to the RCMP, Fire and Rescue, the BC Liquor Inspector and the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department operations staff. No specific concerns have been noted by these agencies in previous years.

The applicant has been advised that this report will be at the April 3, 2017 Council meeting for consideration.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Staff recommends, based on the conditions and requirements noted herein, that the proposed beer garden events to be hosted by:

- Mission Slo-Pitch;
- Mission Firefighters Charitable Society;
- Mission Folk Music Festival;
- Downtown Business Association;
- Root’s and Blues Festival;

be declared Community Special Events as required under the BC LCLB Special Event Permit as set out by the Province.

SIGN OFFS:

M Sinclair  
Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture

S. Key  
Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
## 2017 Special Occasion Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Dates/Times</th>
<th>Number Beer Garden Attendees</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Proceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Slo-Pitch League</td>
<td>April 29/30, 11am-7pm</td>
<td>125/day</td>
<td>Sports Park</td>
<td>Slo-Pitch Tournament</td>
<td>Minor Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 3/4, 11am-7pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 8/9, 11am-7pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Firefighter’s Charitable Society</td>
<td>June 18, 11am-5pm</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Fraser River Heritage Park</td>
<td>Old Car Sunday</td>
<td>Local charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music Festival</td>
<td>July 21, 5pm-11:30pm</td>
<td>500/day</td>
<td>Fraser River Heritage Park</td>
<td>Music Festival</td>
<td>Mission Folk Music Festival Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 22, 1pm-11:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 23, 1pm-11:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Business Association</td>
<td>Aug 12, 11am-4pm</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Downtown Mission Welton Plaza</td>
<td>Mission Fest</td>
<td>DBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots n’ Blues Festival</td>
<td>Sept 30, 12pm-5pm</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Fraser River Heritage Park</td>
<td>2nd Annual Roots n’ Blues Festival</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management
SUBJECT: Federal Grade Crossing Regulations Update

This report is to update Council on the status of Mission’s public grade crossings as it relates to Transport Canada’s new Canadian Grade Crossing Regulations.

PURPOSE:
This report details the requirements of Transport Canada’s new Canadian Grade Crossing Regulations and Grade Crossing Standards, and updates Council on the District’s position in regards to the new regulations.

BACKGROUND:
On November 27, 2014, Transport Canada published new Grade Crossing Regulations (the Regulations) and Grade Crossing Standards (the Standards) for the purpose of improving safety at federally regulated grade crossings across Canada. The Regulations require that before November 27, 2016, railway companies and road authorities share information regarding existing public grade crossings. They additionally require that before November 27, 2021, all existing grade crossings must meet the Standards as set out in the Regulations.

On February 15, 2016, Council approved $40,000 for safety assessments of the District’s four public grade crossings.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The District of Mission has four existing public grade crossings which are located on:

- Chester Street;
- Dyke Road;
- Nelson Street; and
- London Avenue.

The responsibility for maintenance of these crossings is financially shared by the rail company and the District, however, due to the proximity of the first three crossings to the Provincial Highway, the responsibility for their compliance with the Regulations rests with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI), as indicated in Transport Canada’s Rail Crossing Inventory (accessed on September 22, 2016). The remainder of this report will address only the London Avenue crossing.

Canadian Pacific (CP) rail has created a database to facilitate the sharing of information between the rail company and the road authorities. Both the District and CP provided the requisite information in advance of the November 27, 2016 deadline.

The District engaged AECOM to conduct a detailed safety assessment on the London Avenue crossing to determine compliance with the Regulations and identify deficiencies to be addressed prior to the
November 27, 2021 deadline. AECOM conducted the safety assessment and required survey work on November 1, 2016, and provided the District with the final report on January 4, 2017.

The finding of the safety assessment was that the London Avenue crossing is generally compliant with both Transport Canada’s Grade Crossing Regulations and Grade Crossing Standards; however, it did identify a few minor correctable deficiencies, relating to signage and road markings. As the crossing is compliant with the Regulations, the District has met the requirements for the November 27, 2021 deadline.

A work order has been created for District staff to complete the minor deficiency work. All deficiencies will be corrected in 2017, within existing budgets.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**
This report addresses Council’s Public Safety Goal of ensuring a safe environment for all citizens.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**
As the District needed to assess a single crossing, only $10,000 of the originally funded $40,000 for project 46119 Safety Review Grade Crossing Regulations was required. The remaining $30,000 was not carried forward into the 2017 budget.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

**COMMUNICATION:**
In accordance with the Regulations, District staff has shared the required information with CP. The Mission Traffic and Transit Committee will be informed of the safety improvements at London Avenue crossing.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**
On November 27, 2014, Transport Canada published new Grade Crossing Regulations and Grade Crossing Standards to improve the safety at all federally-regulated grade crossings across Canada. The District has met the November 27, 2016 deadline for information sharing. As the safety assessment has found that the London Avenue crossing is generally compliant with Transport Canada’s Grade Crossing Regulations and Grade Crossing Standards, with only minor deficiency work required, the District’s obligation for the November 27, 2021 deadline has been met as well.

Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator
SUBJECT: Rot Pot Compost Promotional Options

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That, starting in 2018, the annual Rot Pot compost giveaway event be discontinued;
2. That Option 3a, as outlined in the report titled “Rot Pot Compost Promotional Options” from the Environmental Coordinator, dated April 3, 2017, be implemented starting in 2018, which includes:
   a. Rot Pot compost be sold at cost for $25 per tonne ($13.50 per cubic yard) at the Mission Landfill to Mission residents throughout the active gardening season;
   b. Mission residents be given the option of self-loading compost anytime throughout the active gardening season, or having compost machine loaded on up to six scheduled Saturday mornings from March through June at an additional flat loading fee of $5 per load; and
3. That, following 2018, Option 3a be re-evaluated for impacts to taxpayers and potentially be adjusted to Option 3.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend discontinuation of the annual Rot Pot compost giveaway event and propose an alternative that addresses traffic and cost issues.

BACKGROUND:
The annual compost giveaway event was first held in 2012, the year after the Rot Pot’s inception. The intent was to close the loop for residents and reward those who made the effort to separate food waste from garbage. The event is typically held on the Saturday closest to Earth Day (April 22), and runs from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Mission residents may receive up to one free cubic yard of compost for use in their yards and gardens. Participants have the option of having compost loaded into pickup trucks by machine or self-load compost into containers. Access to the event has been provided via the main gate, from where compost customers are separated from scale traffic to minimize inconvenience to other landfill users. Proof of residency is required.

While the event has been well received from the beginning, it has grown significantly in popularity over the years. The associated cost increase comprises the cost of compost, as well as additional staff resources, which had to be augmented from one staff member in 2012 to five in 2016 in order to provide for safe traffic management. Wait times for residents requiring machine loading were typically around one hour.
The current agreement with the compost processor, Dacon Equipment, entitles the District to 100 cubic yards of free compost annually. Additional compost may be purchased by the District at a preferred 2017 rate of $21.72 per tonne (~$11.75 per cubic yard).

Table 1, below, shows the event’s approximate number of participants and cost incurred over the last five years. It should be noted that self-loading participants are not accounted for in the number of residents, but compost tonnages include compost provided to self-loaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonnes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Residents</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compost Cost</td>
<td>$920</td>
<td>$3,120</td>
<td>$3,583</td>
<td>$4,788</td>
<td>$5,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine &amp; Operator Cost</td>
<td>$918*</td>
<td>$918*</td>
<td>$918</td>
<td>$1,048</td>
<td>$823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>$500*</td>
<td>$1,000*</td>
<td>$2,300*</td>
<td>$2,300*</td>
<td>$2,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$2,338</td>
<td>$5,038</td>
<td>$6,801</td>
<td>$8,136</td>
<td>$8,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated

The current budget includes approximately $11,000 for the Rot Pot giveaway event. The 2017 event is advertised in the curbside collection calendar, which went to print in October of 2016, and will therefore proceed as in previous years’. In order to work with changed site conditions and to facilitate traffic flow, event participants will be directed to enter the site through a secondary gate at the northwest corner of the landfill, which is remote from the main gate and should make for easy and safe access.

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:**

Given the potential for further traffic and cost increases in future years, alternatives for making Rot Pot compost available to residents should be assessed. Considerations include whether the event is effective in promoting food waste separation, if the District’s provision of free or inexpensive compost may compete with businesses, whether the system is fair to all taxpayers or leaves room for abuse, and how alternatives may compare in service provision and cost to all taxpayers. In light of the above facts, staff has considered the following alternatives:

**Option 1: Set up a Coupon System with a Private Retailer**

In 2015, due to the event’s popularity and associated traffic issues, staff investigated the possibility of switching to a coupon system, where residents could collect up to one yard of free compost per year from a private retail location at their convenience. Due to transportation, the cost of compost to the District would have increased to $19.95 per cubic yard, which is almost twice that of the current direct-purchase rate, and it would have been difficult to prevent misuse of the coupons. The sole local retailer who was selling Rot Pot compost throughout the season has since discontinued its sale, so if this option were to be pursued, a new supplier would also have to be located.

**Option 2: Provide Regular Opportunities for Free Compost Pickup at the Mission Landfill**

Given that there is currently no private retailer carrying Rot Pot compost who could be disadvantaged by the District’s provision of free Rot Pot compost, the District could offer up to one cubic yard of free Rot Pot compost to each resident at the Mission Landfill on several set dates or during the entire active gardening season. Residents would have to show proof of residency and would have their license plates recorded and entered into a spreadsheet, in order to prevent repeat customers. While this approach would probably be most appreciated by those residents who would take advantage of it, it could put a significant burden on all taxpayers due to the expanded timeframe and would allow for potential system abuse, as well as traffic issues.
Option 3: Provide Regular Opportunities for Compost Pickup at the Mission Landfill at Cost

Being the only source of Rot Pot compost within the District of Mission, the District could opt to sell Rot Pot compost to residents at the Mission Landfill at cost. The 2017 preferred District rate for purchasing Rot Pot compost from the processor is $21.72 per tonne. Compost could be made accessible to residents at a rounded-up rate of $25 per tonne ($13.50 per cubic yard) for ease of cash transactions and to subsidize the cost of restocking the onsite compost pile on an ongoing basis. Residents could self-load Rot Pot compost any day of the active gardening season. This option would increase convenience and expand access to Rot Pot compost at reasonable cost, while minimizing the potential for traffic issues or potential system abuse. This option would not require tracking license plate numbers or material limits, and it would not present any cost burden to Mission taxpayers.

Option 3a: Include Several Machine-loading Events from March through June

In addition to providing continuous opportunity for self-loading compost (Option 3, above), the District could decide to offer a number of machine-loading events on Saturday mornings from March through June. Machine-loading events should be limited to mornings, in order to not interfere with regular landfill traffic during busy times on weekends. The at-cost compost fee of $25 per tonne would still apply. There would be an added cost of approximately $600 per event for machine and operator time, which likely would not be fully covered by the number of customers expected on any given day. However, in keeping with the user-pay principle, event customers could be charged a flat fee of $5 per load for machine-loading, which would still keep the overall cost reasonable.

The overall impact of Option 3a on Mission taxpayers remains to be determined, but is expected to be minimal and result in an overall budget savings. The cost of six annual machine-loading events is $3,600. Based on the approximately 500 machine-loaded customers received annually in recent years, it is reasonable to expect up to $2,500 in loading fee revenue to partially offset the costs. Both the number of machine-loading events and the flat fee should be re-evaluated after the first year.

For 2018, staff recommend Option 3a, in order to be able to evaluate the actual cost of machine-loading events to taxpayers, if any, and to determine whether to adjust the number of events or the flat fee, or whether to limit Rot Pot compost accessibility to Option 3. The costs for Option 3a, combined with selling compost at-cost instead of free giveaways, result in a net savings in the waste management budget as compared to the current giveaway event, while increasing service levels in that residents have five additional days available to have a machine load their compost.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The financial implications are discussed in the Discussion section of this report. Option 3a, which is recommended, is expected to result in a net savings in the waste management operating budget of between approximately $5,000 and $7,000 annually as compared to the current giveaway event.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:

The format of Rot Pot compost distribution in 2018 and beyond will be advertised in the curbside collection calendar, in the Mission City Record, on the City Page, on the District’s website and via social media.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The District’s annual Rot Pot compost giveaway event, which has been held at the Mission Landfill since 2012, has grown from 166 participants the first year to 520 participants in 2016. Further growth of the event would become challenging in terms of traffic management and cost. While the 2017 event (on April 22) was included in the curbside collection calendar and will proceed as previous years’, staff recommend switching to an at-cost Rot Pot compost distribution program at the Mission Landfill that will expand accessibility to the product, while spreading out traffic and placing no or little financial burden on taxpayers. Staff recommend Option 3a with the caveat that both the number of machine-loading events and the flat fee be re-evaluated after the first year.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by:
Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: April 3, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Dave Heyes, Manager of Forestry Business
SUBJECT: Telus Communication Site Powerline Access Agreement
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix A – Telus Compensation and Logging Agreement

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
That the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the Telus Compensation and Logging Agreement attached to the Manager of Forestry Business’s report dated April 3, 2017.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to inform Council of Telus’s plan to provide a powerline right of way through TFL 26 and to recommend the agreement for compensation for the timber and other considerations.

BACKGROUND:
Telus is in the process of installing a communication site on Red Mountain. They require a powerline to the site which goes through the TFL removing 3.6 ha from the TFL (approximately 2,000m3). Telus is proposing to deliver the timber to road side for the District to sell through their normal channels. In addition Telus will also enter into a road use agreement, provide compensation for permanent loss of timber, reimburse for silviculture investments made to date, re-establish the Arduum recreation trail, and dispose of all debris associated with logging.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Telus would like to develop the communications site on Red Mountain as soon as possible given the winter conditions and pending approvals from the Provincial government (FLNRO). Staff have developed an agreement including a standard clause to ensure proper insurance coverage for any contractors employed by TELUS as well as to spell out specific terms relating to:

1. Licence to cut; Telus is to apply to the province for an Occupant Licence to cut so that the timber removed does not go against the TFL 26 annual allowable cut or have stumpage owing to the crown by Mission. Telus is to deliver roadside timber cut to District specifications. The District will be responsible for the trucking and sorting of the logs and Telus will be responsible for debris clean up. A conservative estimate of the net revenue to the District from the sale of logs is $70,000.

2. Telus to pay road maintenance in the amount of $7,500 during the construction phase. Subsequent to construction Telus will pay $2,000/yr. or less under a shared road maintenance agreement.

3. Telus will reimburse for previous silviculture investments of $2,772.90
4. Telus will pay a one-time compensation for loss of productive forest land of $4,668.30.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The estimated one time revenue from the agreement is $84,941.20. In addition Telus will contribute $2,000 annually to road maintenance costs.

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Telus, in the process of installing a communication site on Red Mountain, needs to construct a powerline right of way through TFL 26 which will result in the removal of approximately 2,000 m³ of timber. Telus has agreed to compensate the District of Mission in excess of $84,000 for timber, road use, and silviculture reimbursement. Staff support entering into the agreement.

SIGN-OFFS:

Dave Heyes, Manager of Forestry Business

Reviewed by:
Bob O’Neal, Director of Forestry

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
Appendix A Telus Compensation and Logging Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT dated for reference the 15th day of March, 2017

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION
8645 Stave Lake Street
Mission, BC
V2V 4L9

(hereinafter called the "District")

AND:

TM Mobile Inc. (no.A0056593)
3-4355 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC
V5G 1J9

(hereinafter called “TELUS”)

OF THE FIRST PART

OF THE SECOND PART

BACKGROUND

The District is the holder of Tree Farm Licence No. 26, being an Agreement entered into under Part 3 of the Forest Act;

TELUS wishes to build a communications site and construct a 10m right of way for the purposes of installing powerlines to the communications site on Red Mt. within Tree Farm Licence 26.

The Parties wish to enter into this Agreement to set out the terms and conditions upon which TELUS will provide logging services to the District in respect of the Licence as well as compensation for services provided by the district.

AGREEMENTS

The Parties agree as follows:

PART 1

INTERPRETATION AND DURATION

1.1 Scope and Amendment. This Agreement is comprised of:

a. These General terms and Conditions;
b. Attached Schedule A – Scope of Work;
c. Attached Schedule B - Rates and Lands;

Except for the Rates, the District may, from time to time, by written notice to TELUS and subject to this Agreement, make reasonable changes to Schedule A or Schedule B to accommodate changing practices or unforeseen circumstances. Any other changes to the Agreement must be in writing and must be agreed to by both Parties.
1.2 Term. The Term of this Agreement will commence on March 15, 2017 and will end at completion of construction, after which time a *Shared Road Maintenance Agreement* will come into effect.

**PART 2**

**CONTRACTOR SERVICES AND DISTRICT OBLIGATIONS**

2.1 Services of TELUS. TELUS will provide all equipment, materials, supplies, labour and accommodation necessary to perform, and will perform, the Work described in Schedules A and B at the Rates described in Schedule B. TELUS will, at its own expense, obtain all permits and licences necessary to perform the Work.

2.2 Reasonable Care. TELUS, his servants, agents and employees will exercise all reasonable care, diligence and skill in the performance of the Work and will cooperate closely and in full harmony with the Director of Forest Management, or other designate of the District and other Contractors employed by the District.

2.3 Compliances. TELUS will perform the Work, and will ensure that its Sub-Contractors, agents and employees perform the Work, in accordance with:

   a. The Forest Legislation;
   b. The District's approved Forest Stewardship Plan for TFL 26;
   c. The terms of applicable Occupant Licence to Cut and other Licence documents;
   d. The terms of applicable road permits, special use permits and other permits and licences relevant to the Work;
   e. All lawful directions, guidelines and other requirements of the Forest Service and other government agencies;
   f. All lawful directions of the District consistent with this Agreement;
   g. The Operating Specifications set out in Schedule A;
   h. The Workers' Compensation Act and regulations; and
   i. All other federal, provincial, regional and municipal laws, bylaws, rules and regulations.

2.4 Environmental Compliance. Without limiting the application of paragraph 3.5, TELUS will comply with the Forest Legislation, *Waste Management Act* and *Environmental Management Act* of British Columbia and the *Fisheries Act* and *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* of Canada, with all lawful directions of governmental authorities and with the District's reasonable directions for the protection of the environment.

2.5 Prime Contractor. Without limiting TELUS’ obligations under subparagraph 3.5(h), TELUS hereby unconditionally agrees to become the “prime Contractor” for purposes of Part 3 of the *Workers Compensation Act* on behalf of the District in respect of any “multiple-employer workplace” associated with TELUS’ operations under this Agreement for so long as this Agreement is in effect. TELUS represents to the District that it has reviewed, and is familiar with, the *Workers Compensation Act* and the *Occupational Health and Safety Regulation* made pursuant to the Act (the “Regulation” for purposes of this paragraph), and that it is qualified to serve as the “prime Contractor” in respect of any “multiple-employer workplace” associated with TELUS' operations under this Agreement in accordance with s.20.1A of the Regulation. TELUS covenants that it will immediately advise the District if, for any reason, it becomes unqualified to serve as the “prime Contractor” in accordance with s.20.1A of the Regulation. In this paragraph, the terms “prime Contractor” and “multiple-employer workplace” have the same meanings that are given to those terms under Part 3 of the *Workers Compensation Act*.

2.6 Investigations and Contraventions. TELUS will advise the District of any investigations by, or notices from, any government authority with respect to the Work and of any offences or contraventions TELUS may have committed including contraventions or offences under the Forest Legislation, *Fisheries Act, Waste Management Act*, and other laws of British Columbia or Canada whether committed while performing the Work under this Agreement or otherwise.

2.7 Inspection. The District may, at its sole and absolute discretion, undertake inspections of the TELUS’ performance of the Work at any time, and any such inspection may be conducted by the District’s employees, or by any other employee appointed by the District and whose interests are not in conflict with the interest of TELUS.
PART 3
CURTAILMENT, SUSPENSION AND WORK ADJUSTMENT

3.1 Suspension. TELUS will suspend its operations under this Agreement when directed by the District for any reason whatsoever, or upon receipt of direction from any governmental authority.

3.2 Adjustment to Amount of Work. Where TELUS has been directed to suspend its operations under this Agreement by the District or government authority, the District is not liable to TELUS in respect of such suspension and is not obliged to provide TELUS with Work in substitution for work TELUS would have performed during such suspension if the suspension was for Bona Fide Business and Operating Reasons or the result of a direction from a government authority.

PART 4
STATUS OF CONTRACTOR AND RELATED OBLIGATIONS

4.1 Independent Contractor. TELUS and any Sub-Contractor engaged by TELUS pursuant to this Agreement are independent Contractors and not partners, employees or agents of the District. TELUS and any Sub-Contractor are employers for the purposes of the Workers’ Compensation Act, the Employment Standards Act, the Income Tax Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Canada Pension Act and for the purposes of any other legislation affecting employment.

4.2 Sub-Contractors. TELUS will be responsible to the District for any acts or omissions of those Sub-Contractors employed by TELUS while performing the Work or while on the Lands. TELUS will provide the District with copies of all contracts between TELUS and its Sub-Contractors upon request by the District. TELUS will bind each of its Sub-Contractors to the terms of this Agreement to the extent to which such terms are applicable to the services to be performed by the respective Sub-Contractors.

4.3 Contractor Expenses. TELUS will promptly pay, and will ensure that its Sub-Contractors promptly pay, all charges for labour, materials, equipment and services used or contracted for by TELUS and its Sub-Contractors in the performance of the Work.

4.4 Liens. TELUS will pay all of its liabilities arising from its operations that might constitute a lien upon the Lands, the Timber or other assets of the District immediately upon such liabilities becoming due. If a lien is made or threatened to be made against the Lands, the Timber or other assets of the District as a result of the activities of TELUS or any of TELUS’ Sub-Contractors, TELUS will take steps and make payments, including the granting of Security or payment into court, as are necessary to remove the lien or prevent the lien being made.

4.5 Workers’ Compensation. TELUS will be registered as an independent firm under the Workers’ Compensation Act and will, upon execution of this Agreement, provide the District with proof of registration.

PART 5
TITLE, DELIVERY AND RISK

5.1 Title. Where TELUS is required to cut or handle Timber under this Agreement, title to all Timber cut or handled will be and remain with the District and will not pass to TELUS at any time. TELUS will not permit or cause any Security interest or any other charge whatsoever in the Timber to be granted to or taken in favour of any person.

5.2 Lost or Damaged Timber. If any Timber is lost, wasted or destroyed as a result of the negligence or wilful act of TELUS, TELUS will indemnify the District for the entire loss or damage sustained by the District in connection with such loss, waste, or destruction including, without limitation, any stumpage, royalty or penalty payable by the District under the Licence in respect of that Timber.
PART 6
SCALING, STUMPAGE AND RECORDS

6.1 Scaling and Stumpage. TELUS will:
   a. Apply for all permits, licences, and timber marks
   b. Provide the District with timber mark stamp hammer(s) (ONE) in accordance with the issued Licence.
   c. Pay all stumpage that may be charged with respect to such Timber
   d. Pay for all waste and residue above 10m³/ha for log grades U and above (current 2nd growth benchmark) billed at the prevailing rate left within the right of way only.

6.2 Records. The District will cause all Timber delivered under this Agreement to be scaled by a qualified government licensed scaler according to law by either official scale by weight or by any other method agreed upon by the Parties. The District will keep records of all Timber produced under this Agreement and will provide those records to TELUS when requested.

6.3 Marking. Prior to removing Timber from the Lands, the District will mark that Timber with stamp marks or other markers as may be required by the Forest Service.

PART 7
RATES AND PAYMENTS

7.1 TELUS will pay the District at Rates set forth in Schedule B.

PART 8
FOREST FIRES

8.1 Compliance and Prevention. TELUS will comply with the Forest Legislation and the District’s fire preparedness plan, including reporting fires and undertaking initial fire suppression as defined in the Wildfire Act and Wildfire Regulation and will take all precautions required under the Wildfire Act and Wildfire Regulation or by the District or the Forest Service to prevent fires. TELUS will not start or permit any open fires on the Lands except as permitted under the Forest Legislation and will take every reasonable precaution to prevent the escape of any fire.

8.2 Fighting Fires. TELUS will utilize all of its labour and suitable equipment employed by it on the Lands to fight all fires:
   a. Caused by TELUS or its Sub-Contractors anywhere on the Licence;
   b. Within the Lands, or any other Lands on which the District holds an interest near the Lands, regardless of cause; and
   c. Anywhere, when reasonably requested by the District to do so.

8.3 Liability for Costs. Where:
   a. A fire is caused by TELUS, or by any person working for or engaged by TELUS; and
   b. TELUS, or any person working for or engaged by TELUS; negligently permits the escape of a fire whether or not it is caused by TELUS.

TELUS will be responsible for its own costs in fighting the fire. In all other cases, the District will pay TELUS for its services in fighting the fire in accordance with the Rates paid by the Forest Service for wages and equipment rental for firefighting, except to the extent that TELUS has been reimbursed for those services by the Forest Service or by a third Party.

8.4 Indemnity for District Costs. Where TELUS, or any person working for or engaged by TELUS, negligently or wilfully:
   a. Causes a fire; or
   b. Permits the escape of a fire, whether or not caused by TELUS;

TELUS will indemnify the District for any loss, cost or liability incurred by the District in respect of the fire.
8.5 Contractor Employees. Any employee or Sub-Contractor of TELUS engaged in fighting a fire will, at all times, remain an employee or Sub-Contractor of TELUS and will not become an employee or Contractor of the District.

PART 9
EXISTING ROADS AND IMPROVEMENTS

9.1 Use of Roads. The District will obtain permits and licenses required for the use of all roads and bridges on the Lands. TELUS may use the roads and bridges on the Lands for the purpose of doing the Work on the following conditions:
   a. The use is non-exclusive;
   b. The use is at the sole risk of TELUS;
   c. TELUS will comply with the District’s directions regarding the use, including hours of use, locking of gates and closure;
   d. TELUS will keep roads and bridges it is using clear of debris and other obstructions resulting from TELUS’ operations;
   e. TELUS acknowledges that the District has made no representation to TELUS as to the condition of roads and bridges on the Lands or as to their suitability for TELUS’ operations.

PART 10
RELEASE AND INDEMNITY

10.1 Representations. TELUS acknowledges that the District has made no representations to TELUS about the nature of the Lands, the quality or quantity of Timber on the Lands, the difficulty of the Work or this Agreement generally, all of which matters have been investigated by TELUS prior to executing this Agreement. Execution of this Agreement by TELUS is an absolute release of the District from any claim that TELUS may have in respect of those matters.

10.2 Release. TELUS releases the District, its officers, employees, agents and servants (collectively for this paragraph 10.2 referred to as the “District”) from any liability, whether in tort, contract or otherwise, in respect of any loss suffered by TELUS arising out of the Work or the use of any of the Lands or other District assets by TELUS or any other person.

10.3 Indemnity. TELUS will indemnify the District, and its officers, employees, agents and servants against any liability or loss incurred by the District, and arising out of the acts or omissions of TELUS, or any of its Sub-Contractors or invitees, or of employees of any of them. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing the Indemnitor acknowledges that it will indemnify and hold harmless the Indemnitee for:
   a. Any charges it may have to pay for damage or assessments relating to negligence, error or omission of the TELUS’ logging and communication site services as may be required by the terms and conditions of the tree farm Licence, cutting permit or the Forest Act and Regulations;
   b. Penalties assessed against the District under the Forest Legislation where such penalties are attributable to the fault or neglect of TELUS; and
   c. Any fines, costs, charges or expenses incurred by the District including legal expenses on a solicitor and Client basis arising from any action taken by authorities pursuant to the Fisheries Act of Canada or pursuant to the Waste Management Act of British Columbia or pursuant to any other legislation of Canada or British Columbia in respect of the activities of TELUS.
PART 11
INSURANCE

11.1 Coverage and Policy. Liability Insurance

TELUS and any sub-Contractor The Contractor will, by the commencement of the Term, obtain and, thereafter throughout the Term, maintain the insurance required by this Part (the “Insurance”).

TELUS and any sub-Contractor will ensure the Insurance includes the following coverages to not less than each relevant minimum limit specified below on a per occurrence basis:

(a) Comprehensive General Liability Insurance and Property Damage Insurance: min. $5,000,000.00
(b) Motor Vehicle Insurance: min. $2,000,000.00
(b) Forest Fire Fighting Insurance: min. $1,000,000.00

TELUS and any sub-Contractor will ensure the Insurance protects the District, its officials, employees, agents and contractors and subcontractors not within the Contractor’s Workforce from claims that may arise directly or indirectly out of the operations of the Contractor and the Contractor’s Workforce in respect of this Agreement, the Work and the Contractor’s Operations.

PART 12
SAFETY

12.1 TELUS shall develop, maintain, implement and supervise for the duration of the contract, a comprehensive safety program that shall effectively incorporate and implement all safety precautions required by all applicable laws, ordinances, rules, regulations and orders and general operation practices for the safety of persons or property, including any general safety rules and regulations under Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act, the Workplace Hazardous Waste Materials Information System, or other Occupational Health and Safety legislation or regulations that may be applicable.

12.2 TELUS is deemed the “Prime Contractor” for the purposes of all applicable occupational health and safety laws, including Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act, and TELUS is responsible for filing any documents necessary to comply with Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act, including, but not limited to, a notice of project. TELUS shall comply, and shall ensure that all Sub-Contractors and Other Contractors comply with all requirements with the Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act and any other occupational health and safety Laws, applicable to the Project, the Work or to the Worksite.

12.3 Prior to commencing the Work and as a condition of receiving payment on Substantial Completion and on Completion, TELUS shall provide the Owner with satisfactory written evidence of compliance by TELUS with all requirements under Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act, including payments of assessments due under it to Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act. Without limiting the foregoing, the Owner’s Representative may at any time require TELUS to provide evidence of compliance with all requirements under Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act, or payment of assessments due under it to Work Safe BC’s Compensation Act, or both.

12.4 When required to do so by the Owner, TELUS shall provide the Owner with evidence of its compliance of any or all its Sub-Contractors.

12.5 TELUS will have a safety program acceptable to Work Safe BC’s Compensation board and will ensure that all Work Safe BC’s board safety rules and regulations are observed during performance of this Contract, not only by TELUS but by all Sub-Contractors, Workers, material men and others engaged in the performance of this Contract.
12.6 TELUS will provide only professional personnel who have the qualifications, experience and capabilities to perform the Work.

PART 13
NOTICES

13.1 Notices. All notices under this Agreement will be in writing, and will be deemed to be given if received by hand or sent by email or fax as follows:

IF TO THE DISTRICT:

District of Mission
8645 Stave Lake Street
P.O. Box 20
Mission, BC V2V 4L9
Attention: Director of Forestry
Telephone: 604-820-3762
Fax: 604-826-8633
Email: forestry@mission.ca

IF TO TELUS:

TM Mobile Inc.
3-4355 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC
V5G 1J9
Attention: Real Estate Manager

Phone: 778-871-8585
Email: debra.pankratz@telus.com

Hand delivered notices will be deemed to have been received upon delivery. Faxed or emailed notices will be deemed received if confirmed by telephone or return email. If not confirmed by telephone or return email, they will be deemed delivered 72 hours after the time of sending.

13.2 Inurement. This Agreement will inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the Parties and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors and permitted assigns.

13.3 Waiver. The failure of either Party at any time to require strict performance by the other Party of any provisions of this Agreement will in no way affect the first Party's rights under this Agreement to enforce that provision, nor will any such waiver of any breach of any provision of this Agreement be held to be a waiver of any succeeding breach of such provision or waiver of any other provision.

13.4 Time of Essence. Time will be of the essence in this Agreement.

13.5 Governing Law. This Agreement will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of British Columbia.

13.6 Entire Agreement. This Agreement, together with its Schedules, and any amendments of this Agreement constitute the entire Agreement between the Parties with respect to the matters dealt within it.

13.7 Invalidity. If any one or more of the provisions in this Agreement are invalid or unenforceable, the validity and enforceability of the remaining provisions contained in this Agreement will not in any way be affected or impaired.

13.8 Clean Worksite. TELUS will be responsible to maintain a clean Worksite concurrent with all phases of the Work. The District will charge TELUS twenty dollars for each piece of garbage that is found during the regular inspections of the Worksite. This charge will only apply to TELUS’ waste material such as used containers, boxes, bags, and used detonators. The intent of this clause is to ensure that TELUS properly disposes of all waste materials on a regular basis.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Parties hereto have executed this Agreement. By DISTRICT OF MISSION per:

_________________________________
Mayor

_________________________________
Corporate Officer

Date: _____________________________

By TELUS, per:

__________________________________
Authorized signatory

__________________________________
Print name and position

Date: _____________________________
1. **Scope of Work – TFL26**

The Scope of Work shall be as outlined in the attached documents. It is intended that the Work so described is complete in that typographical errors or omissions will not impart a partial or incomplete aspect to the Work. Any such situation should be brought to the immediate attention of the District prior to start of work.

**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION:** Powerline routing and communication site location as per RKTG Consulting Engineer’s drawing dated Feb 2015 as shown below:
POWERLINE RIGHT OF WAY and HARVESTING

Right-of-way is to be maintained at a maximum width of 10m, unless otherwise required to address a safety hazard. The District should be notified in all instances where falling outside a 10m right-of-way is required.

Damage (rubbing, scarring, pushing, breakage) to standing timber outside of the specified right-of-way is to be kept to a minimum.

TELUS will keep all stumps to a maximum of 30cm above ground, unless required to address a safety hazard.

TELUS will obtain a bucking specification sheet from the District and either deck timber whole tree length or buck into lengths in accordance with the bucking sheet.

Power poles and lines are required to be installed on the uphill side of roads, where discussed at on-site reviews with RKTG in 2015, to allow for future forestry operations and safe passage by harvesting equipment.

Excavated or bladed skid trails are ONLY permitted under the 10m designed right of way. No other excavated or bladed skid trails are permitted outside of the designed right of way, unless authorized by the District.

TIMBER DISPOSAL: TELUS will complete all harvesting services required to deck timber for collection by a self-loading logging truck (must be decked within 15 feet maximum distance from driveable road surface).

The District retained the right to sell all recovered timber as compensation for the project, to be marked with TELUS’ Occupant Licence to Cut issued timber mark. At no time will timber be removed under the District’s timber mark(s), nor accrue against the District’s Annual Allowable Cut.

ROAD USE AND MAINTENANCE EXPECTATIONS: Under the compensation amount paid, the District will provide grading, cross ditch seasonal deactivation/reactivation, ditchline maintenance, danger and hazard tree removal, rock fall removal, roadside brushing, gate and lock maintenance, surfacing and culvert maintenance annually. Requirements for construction use beyond one year will require renegotiation.

SILVICULTURE: While the compensation agreement covers the costs for clearing existing forestry plantations for a width of 10m, any damage or clearing of trees beyond a 10m right of way requires additional compensation for tree stock, planting, and surveys at a rate of $1.30/tree (stock and planting), and 2 surveys @
$250/survey.

**SPECIAL MEASURES FOR STREAM MANAGEMENT:** Machines may not cross any stream (whether running or dry) unless a drainage structure has been installed (culvert or wood box culvert). It is a requirement that silt fencing and other siltation mitigation measures must be installed and/or maintained during active operations where water or drainage/seepage is located. Culvert or other crossings can be removed or maintained upon completion of harvesting of the right of way.

**STREAM CLEANING:** Steam cleaning of large woody debris, introduced as a result of timber harvesting activities is required concurrent with harvesting.

**INVASIVE PLANTS:** TELUS must not introduce and or cause the spread of invasive plants.

**RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE:** The powerline right of way crosses directly over the Arduum recreation trail, and the archery course managed by the Mission and District Rod and Gun Club. Trail closure notifications must be installed and maintained during all active operations (at each trailhead). Notifications should include closure timelines and monitored regularly to ensure public safety.

Upon completion of harvesting and powerline construction, the Arduum recreation trail and archery course access must be returned into as good or better condition that existed prior to the start of construction.

If TELUS requires long term access through the length of the powerline for maintenance purposes, it is suggested that a long term recreation trail be built concurrent with construction such that it can become a hiking feature (example: Coquitlam Crunch).

**Safety Procedures for access through the District Rod & Gun Club:** Proper safety procedures must be followed when access is required through the District Rod and Gun Club on branch RE100. Contractors, sub-contractors, and Telus employees must stop at the bottom and top of the pistol range and beep their horn to notify users of the pistol range before driving through this section of road.

**FIRE HAZARD ABATEMENT AND DEBRIS MANAGEMENT:** TELUS is responsible for fire hazard abatement associated with logging debris within the right of way. At no time should logging debris be placed in adjacent forestry silviculture plantations.

Roadside debris NOT associated with District’s bucking waste or trim will require fire hazard abatement by TELUS. The District will be responsible for all waste and fire hazard abatement associated with roadside decked timber.

**WASTE AND RESIDUE:** TELUS is responsible for payment to the Crown of waste and residue under the terms of their Occupant Licence to Cut for all material within the right-of-way and communication site. The District is responsible for payment to the Crown of bucking waste associated with road side log decks.
SCHEDULE B – RATES

A. RATES

As agreed by TELUS’ Agent Mike Hedberg, Hedberg and Associates Consulting Ltd. on February 17, 2017, TELUS agrees to pay the following compensation rates to the District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance – Construction Period (Powerline right of way preparation, pole and line installation, communication site preparation and construction)</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance – Post Construction (annual light duty use shared road maintenance agreement) Rate will be adjusted if additional parties co-locate on tower, share powerline and access. Negotiated Annually.</td>
<td>$2,000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Compensation for Previous Silviculture Investments</td>
<td>$2,772.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Compensation for Permanent Loss of Productive Forest Land</td>
<td>$4,668.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for Existing Timber</td>
<td>Per Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation in the event of damage to silviculture plantations $1.30/tree (stock and planting), 2 surveys @ $250/survey</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are to be amounts prior to the addition of any other applicable federal or provincial sales taxes, which are not shown here but are to be included on any later invoice(s) where required.

Waste and residue over 10m³/ha for log grades U and above will be required to be paid by the TELUS at the prevailing Rate as indicated in a statement of adjustments to be provided by the District upon completion of waste billing.
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: March 23, 2017

To: Deputy Corporate Officer

I hereby request permission to appear as a delegation before District of Mission Mayor and Council with reference to the following topic: (attach additional pages and supporting material as required)

The erection of a $20,000 Rotary funded electronic score baord inside of Rotary Sport Park.

Preferred meeting date for delegation: April 3, 2017

Alternative meeting date for delegation: April 3, 2017

Angel Elias & Brad Reminek
Name(s) of presenter(s)

Rotary Club of Mission Mid-Day
Name of group/organization (if applicable)

Are you requesting any financial or in-kind assistance from Council? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If yes, provide details of requested assistance (including financial amounts, if applicable):

Have you spoken with District staff about this request? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what was the result? unknown

The deadline for submission of the request, including any presentation or supporting material, is 4:30 p.m. on the Monday preceding the date of the meeting. Once the delegation request has been approved, presenter(s) will be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes to present at the agreed upon meeting. Presenter(s) are limited to discussing only the above topic during the delegation.

All or a portion of this meeting may be audio/video recorded, live-streamed and archived on the District of Mission website. Council is unable to hear issues addressing a concern after a public hearing has been held, or if the issue is outside the jurisdiction of the legal authority of the District. The District of Mission reserves the right to refuse any delegation request.

Information provided on this form will be published and made available for public viewing. Please submit a separate document with your contact information.
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: March 27, 2017
To: Deputy Corporate Officer

I hereby request permission to appear as a delegation before District of Mission Mayor and Council with reference to the following topic: (attach additional pages and supporting material as required)

Cell Tower proposal for 8020 Ayama St, Mission

Preferred meeting date for delegation: April 3, 2017
Alternative meeting date for delegation: April 3, 2017

Kim Kakkoske Name(s) of presenter(s)
Missoula Sports Park Neighbors Name of group/organization (if applicable)

Are you requesting any financial or in-kind assistance from Council? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If yes, provide details of requested assistance (including financial amounts, if applicable):

Have you spoken with District staff about this request? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what was the result? Directed by District staff to apply to appear as a delegation at Council meeting.

The deadline for submission of the request, including any presentation or supporting material, is 4:30 p.m. on the Monday preceding the date of the meeting. Once the delegation request has been approved, presenter(s) will be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes to present at the agreed upon meeting. Presenter(s) are limited to discussing only the above topic during the delegation.

All or a portion of this meeting may be audio/video recorded, live-streamed and archived on the District of Mission website. Council is unable to hear issues addressing a concern after a public hearing has been held, or if the issue is outside the jurisdiction of the legal authority of the District. The District of Mission reserves the right to refuse any delegation request.

Information provided on this form will be published and made available for public viewing. Please submit a separate document with your contact information.
That May 1 to 7, 2017 be proclaimed “Mental Health Week”

District of Mission Council Resolution - April 3, 2017

WHEREAS the Canadian Mental Health Association has designated May 1-7, 2017 as Mental Health Week; and

WHEREAS Centennial Place Clubhouse and Bootstrap Consulting (as well as other social service representatives) are hosting a panel discussion “Building Mental Wellness in Mission” event on May 4th, 2017 at 11:00 a.m. at Riverside College. The purpose of this panel discussion is to bring awareness to the community about mental wellness; and

WHEREAS Centennial Place and the Mission Mental Health Substance Use Advisory Committee (MMHSUAC) are holding “Medication Education”, a public presentation on May 3rd, 2017 at 5:00 pm at the Mission Leisure Center. The purpose of this presentation is to shed light on common medications and the effects they have; and

WHEREAS Centennial Place is welcoming the greater community to participate in various activities between May 1-7th, and hosting an Open House & 6 Year Anniversary event on May 5th between 11-2 pm at Centennial Place. The purpose is to showcase Centennial Place and the services it provides to the community; and

WHEREAS the District of Mission supports Mental Health initiatives, community diversity and the inclusion of all groups in the spirit of community

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the District of Mission hereby proclaims May 1 to 7, 2017 as

Mental Health Week

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this 3rd day of April, 2017

______________________________  __________________________________________________
MAYOR RANDY HAWES  CORPORATE OFFICER
Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 464 and 466 of the Local Government Act, a Public Hearing will take place in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 3, 2017 to consider the following proposed bylaws:

1. **DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDING BYLAW 5622-2017-4052(47) (OCP16-001-Analytical Consulting Ltd.)**

The purpose of the Bylaw is to amend the OCP designation, of the subject properties, from Urban Residential - Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact to facilitate the development of up to twenty-nine (29) residential lots.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Official Community Plan 4052-2008 for the following legally described properties:

- Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007 Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197
- Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762 Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP5990
- Parcel Identifier: 029-781-124 Lot A Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan EPP57129

from Urban Residential - Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact.

The locations of the subject properties are 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and are shown on the following maps:

2. **DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5623-2017-5050(232) (R16-010-Analytical Consulting Ltd.)**

The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision, of the subject properties, resulting in up to twenty-nine (29) lots of a minimum 465 square metre (5,005 square feet) lot size allowing for secondary dwelling use on some lots.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

- Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007 Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197
- Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762 Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP5990
- Parcel Identifier: 029-781-124 Lot A Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan EPP57129

from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and are shown on the following maps:


The purpose of the Bylaw is to amend (discharge) Land Use Contract (LUC) No. 455-1975 registered to the lot identified as PID 004639561 on the map.

This bylaw proposes to amend (discharge) Land Use Contract 455-1975 of the property legally described as:

- Parcel Identifier: 004-639-561 Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876

The location of the subject property is 32290 Lougheed Highway (PID 004639561) and is shown on the following maps:


The purpose of the Bylaw is to rezone three lots from Urban Residential (R558) to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone. No development is contemplated at this time. Further development of the site shall require a subsequent development application to the District.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

- Parcel Identifier: 004-639-561 Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876
- Parcel Identifier: 004-639-570 Lot 4, Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8282
- Parcel Identifier: 004-639-596 Lot 5, Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8282

from the Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway and are shown on the following maps:

5. **DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 6636-2017-5050(241) (R16-034 - Tiegen & Toor)**

The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the subject properties resulting in up to a maximum of 36 lots of a minimum 372 square metre (4,004 square foot) lot size.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

- Parcel Identifier: 009-384-481 Lot 3 Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16442
- Parcel Identifier: 013-373-919 Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 12862) of Parcel “A” (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District
- Parcel Identifier: 007-791-062 Parcel “A” (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 Except: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 12952), New Westminster District

from the Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue and are shown on the following maps:
6. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5635-2017-5050(240) (R16-043 – Pankratz)
The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into two (2) lots of a minimum 372 square metre (4,004 sq.ft.) lot size.
This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:
Parcel Identifier: 001-621-467
Lot 30 District Lot 165 Group 3 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24829
from the Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone.
The location of the subject property is 7297 Wardrop Street and is shown on the following maps:

7. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5638-2017-5050(243) (R16-047– Pankratz)
The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house on the subject property.
This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:
 Parcel Identifier: 010-205-403
 Lot ”D” Section 34 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16754
 from the Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to the Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone.
The location of the subject property is 33759 Ferndale Avenue and is shown on the following maps:

8. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5632-2017-5050(238) (R16-048 – Redekop Investments Group)
The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into 2 single family lots fronting onto Wren Street, each a minimum of 465 square metres (5,005 sq. ft.) lot size, and 1 duplex lot fronting onto Teresocki Crescent, with a minimum of 558 square metre (6,006 sq. ft.) lot size.
This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:
Parcel Identifier: 010-500-103
Lot 1 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 19303
from the Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone.
The location of the subject property is 7354 Wren Street and is shown on the following maps:

9. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5633-2017-5050(239) (R16-050 – Civic Consultants)
The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject properties into approximately twenty (20) lots of a minimum 372 square metres (4,004 square feet) lot sizes and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on proposed lots that back onto a lane.
This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:
Parcel Identifier: 018-332-684
Lot B Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP11194
Parcel Identifier: 005-742-561
Lot 1 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377
Parcel Identifier: 002-177-455
Lot 2 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377
from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone.
The locations of the subject properties are 32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue and are shown on the following maps:

Copies of the proposed bylaws and reports relevant to these bylaws may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, 8645 Slave Lake Street, Mission, BC, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24th, 2017 to Monday, April 3rd, 2017. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “Public Meeting Information”. For further information regarding these bylaws, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748.
At the Public Hearing, persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by these proposed bylaws will have the opportunity to be heard.
Should you have any comments or concerns you wish to convey to Council and you cannot attend the meeting, please submit in writing to the Corporate Officer by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, March 31, 2017.
You may forward your submission by:
• Mailing or delivering to the Corporate Officer’s Office, P.O. Box 20, 8645 Slave Lake Street, Mission, BC, V2V 4L9
• Faxing: 604-826-1363 (Attn: Corporate Officer)
• E-mail: info@mission.ca with PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS as the subject line

Please note Submissions that are subject of a public hearing, public meeting or other public processes will be included, in their entirety, in the public information package and will form part of the public record. Council shall not receive further information or submissions after the conclusion of the Public Hearing.
Following the Public Hearing portion of the meeting, council may consider advancing bylaws forward for additional readings.

Michael Younie
Corporate Officer
Dated at Mission, BC
this 21st day of March, 2017.

www.mission.ca
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

FILE: 3310-16
P2016-015 OCP16-001 R16-010 DP17-003 DV17-005

March 21, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Official Community Plan OCP16-001, Rezoning R16-010, Development Permit DP17-003 & Development Variance Permit Application DV17-005 (Analytical Consulting Ltd.) – 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on Monday, April 3, 2017 and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

1. DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDING BYLAW 5622-2017-4052(47) (OCP16-001-Analytical Consulting Ltd.)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to amend the OCP designation, of the subject properties, from Urban Residential - Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact to facilitate the development of up to twenty-nine (29) residential lots.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Official Community Plan 4052-2008 for the following legally described properties:

Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007 Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197

Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762 Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

Parcel Identifier: 029-781-124 Lot A Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan EPP57128

from Urban Residential - Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact.

The locations of the subject properties are 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and are shown on the following maps.

2. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5623-2017-5050(232) (R16-010-Analytical Consulting Ltd.)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision, of the subject properties, resulting in up to twenty-nine (29) lots of a minimum 465 square metre (5,005 square feet) lot size allowing for secondary dwelling use on some lots.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007 Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197

Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762 Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590
from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and are shown on the following maps:

![Map 1]

The purpose of the development permit is to provide conformity to the Official Community Plan guidelines respecting building form, landscaping, signage and parking.

The purpose of the development variance permit is to reduce the lot widths for the proposed lots 1, 19 and 20 by varying the district of Mission Zoning bylaw 5050-2009 Section 601, C. Lot Area by:

a.) reducing the lot depth for proposed Lot 1 from 25 metres (82.02 feet) to 9.0 metres (29.52 feet); and,

b.) reducing the width at the front lot line for proposed Lots 19 and 20 from 14.0 metres (45.93 feet) to 6.0 metres (19.86 feet).

A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3, 2017. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Michael Younie, Corporate Officer, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

Marcy Bond
MANAGER OF PLANNING

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Marcy Bond, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Amendment (OCP16-001) and Rezoning (R16-010) to facilitate the development of properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street to create up to twenty-nine (29) compact residential lots

ATTACHMENTS:
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Conceptual Lot Layout and Road Configuration
- Appendix 4 – Alternative Lot Layout and Road Configuration
- Appendix 5 – Official Community Plan designation
- Appendix 6 – Map identifying Lots Zoned to allow Secondary Dwellings
- Appendix 7 – Engineering Department Comments
- Appendix 8 – Community Stormwater Detention Facility
- Appendix 9 – DCC Servicing Agreement
- Appendix 10 – Dalke Pond and Lot Layout on Aerial photo
- Appendix 11 – Development Variance Permit
- Appendix 12 – Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street
APPLICANT: Analytical Consulting Ltd.
OCP: This application is not in conformance with the current OCP designation of Urban Residential – Compact Cluster.

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 27, 2016
LOCATION: Cedar Valley
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the development applications for the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and identifies the necessary amendments to the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaws that would allow subdivision of the lands into approximately twenty-nine (29) compact single-family residential lots with some allowances for secondary dwellings.

Staff support the applications moving forward to first readings of the bylaws and as such have listed the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amending Bylaws under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also support the development variance permit application, which will be listed for Council consideration under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amending Bylaw.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3rd, 2017.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That, upon due consideration of Section 475 of the Local Government Act, consultations go forward in accordance with Policy LAN 47, and that persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultation referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of that section of the Act;

2. That the Mayor and the Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the Development Cost Charge Agreement as attached to the staff report from the Senior Planner dated March 20, 2017.

BACKGROUND

In mid 2015, Analytical Consulting Ltd (the developer), representing BC Company 1030502 B.C. Ltd., (a consortium of property owners), began preliminary discussions with the District’s Development Services Department regarding a proposal to develop the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street (Appendix 2).

Although the land use designation of these properties envisioned higher density urban residential development, limitations in stormwater servicing require that any development of these lands provide for either an independent private stormwater system on site or wait until the expansion of the area’s municipal community stormwater facility is completed. Given that both the District and the developer have an interest in these lands to be serviced by a community stormwater management facility, support for an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment was provided on the basis the developer initiate the preliminary steps toward the construction of the community stormwater facility.

After considerable work by the developer and staff to prepare a conceptual plan of subdivision that met a number of competing interests, including future development opportunities and servicing objectives of the area, the application to amend the District’s OCP and Zoning Bylaws for these properties were submitted. Approval of the amendments by Council would both facilitate subdivision of the subject lands to create up to twenty nine (29) fee-simple single family lots under a combination zoning of Residential Compact 465 Zone and the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone and initiate the design work needed for the construction of the community stormwater system.

While the road and lot configuration for the development (as shown in Appendix 3) are considered conceptual due to ongoing negotiations with a contiguous property owner (8566 Nottman Street) and continued investigations into the viability of a new community storm water management facility
directly north of Dalke Avenue, the amendments to the OCP and Zoning Bylaws as presented are supportable as any subsequent changes to the lot configuration would still need to be bylaw compliant.

Appendix 4 indicates an alternative and preferred road and lot configuration that would be considered should the developer’s negotiations with the contiguous property owners be successful.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to develop the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street to create up to twenty-nine (29) single-family compact residential lots. To allow subdivision of these lands, approval to amend the parent properties’ OCP designation from Compact Cluster Residential to Urban Residential Compact is needed along with approval of a corresponding rezoning from Suburban Residential (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone. A Development Variance Permit is also sought by the developer to reduce lot widths for proposed Lots 19 and 20 and lot depth for proposed Lot 1 within the development. The variances are supported by staff as they would allow for the most practical and efficient lot and road configuration possible.

As the development involves the creation of compact residential lots, the issuance of an Intensive Residential Development Permit is required to ensure that the form and character of the dwellings within the development are consistent with the guidelines in the OCP. It is noted that approval of Intensive Residential Development Permits has been delegated to the Director of Development Services and that no approval from Council is required for the issuance of such permits provided they are consistent with applicable bylaws and policies.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The site consists of three properties totaling 1.28 hectares (3.17 acres). The site is located within the Cedar Valley area of Mission and within Phase I of the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan. The site is directly east of Nottman Street and between Dalke Avenue at the north and Cherry Avenue at the south (Appendix 2).

There is currently a dwelling on each property, two of which will be removed as part of the subdivision where one will be retained as it falls within the proposed lot boundaries of Lot 16. It is noted that this particular lot is approximately double the lot width and area of the lots proposed within this development and therefore would allow for further subdivision should the house be removed in the future.

The development site is relatively flat with few trees that would warrant retention. While this area is known for its high water table, there are no watercourses or environmentally sensitive areas identified on the Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan for this site.

BYLAWS COMPLIANCE

Official Community Plan Bylaw 4050-2008

The development site and surrounding properties are designated Compact Cluster Residential in the OCP. The Compact Cluster Residential designation within the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan envisions strata developments intended to manage stormwater on development sites independently. The built form under this designation could take a variety shapes and forms including but not limited to multiple-family townhouse, compact single-family with or without carriage homes and/or garden cottages under bare-land strata tenure.
The OCP land use designations are shown on Appendix 5.

While the change to the land use designation from Compact Cluster Residential to Urban Residential Compact would not result in any real tangible differences in the design of housing in the neighbourhood, the applicant’s rationale for requesting an amendment to the OCP designation is on their assessment that the current real estate market demand for single-family housing is more favourable for fee-simple type tenures than strata tenures. Unlike strata developments, fee-simple type developments consist of privately held parcels fronting public roads and do not have the benefit of shared common lands of a strata development which could be used to manage shared delivery and maintenance obligations of a private stormwater management system.

To facilitate a fee-simple residential development, the applicant has been working with District engineering staff to prepare an area wide storm water management strategy that will ultimately provide for a community stormwater facility that will service a broader area beyond that of the development site. As such staff are supportive of the proposed OCP change from Compact Cluster Residential to Urban Residential Compact. The details of the stormwater management strategy are outlined later in this report.

Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009

The proposal is to rezone the properties from Suburban Residential (S36) Zone to a combination zoning of Residential Compact 465 (RC465) and Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zones (RC465s). Both target zones would allow the creation of up to twenty-nine (29) single family lots, some of which allowing secondary dwellings in the form of secondary suites or coach and garden cottages where possible. The minimum lot size for these zones is 465 square metres or approximately 5,005 square feet.

Specifically, the developer is requesting that twenty-three (23) of the twenty-nine (29) lots be zoned to allow for a secondary dwelling unit. Appendix 6 identifies the lots that could accommodate a secondary dwelling. While the secondary dwelling use allowance will likely take the form of a secondary suite within the dwelling in the majority of the lots proposed, some of the larger lots in this development could accommodate either a detached coach house or garden cottage. The principal dwelling on those lots allowing a detached secondary dwelling would be restricted to a two storey main entry type home (i.e., living space and kitchen on the main floor) by way of a restrictive covenant registered on title. The restriction on dwelling type would minimize the possibility of an additional secondary suite within the principal dwelling as could be the case with a basement entry home. The developer has also agreed to the registration of a restrict covenant that will required those lots zoned to allow a secondary dwelling to be constructed to “suite ready” including the provision of a parking space for the secondary dwelling.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING AND SERVICING

Although the immediate neighbourhood consists of larger suburban lot acreages, the area is designated to allow for more compact residential development with the installation of full municipal services.

Proposed Lot Layout and Road Configuration

Appendix 4 identifies the preferred road and lot configuration as it achieves the maximum lot yield for the immediate area and reduces the amount of road construction required for this development. However, the developers have provided an acceptable alternative plan of subdivision as they have not been able to come to an agreement with the contiguous property owner of 8566 Nottman Avenue to secure a servicing corridor across this property.
**Municipal Services within the Development**

The Engineering Department comments are attached as Appendix 7. From an Engineering point of view, there are no servicing requirements that need to be installed prior to the adoption of the zoning amending bylaw.

**Municipal Services beyond the Development**

Fee simple urban residential developments rely on the availability of municipal services, and in particular, municipal storm sewer. In Cedar Valley, stormwater management is by far the greatest challenge to complete the build-out of the area. The existing detention pond at the corner of Dalke Avenue and Nottman Street was constructed as a temporary stormwater detention facility and was slated to be released once the community stormwater detention facility (identified as the D3 site as shown on Appendix 8) was brought online.

To advance the construction of the D3 project and allow the development to proceed under fee-simple residential lot tenure, the developer has agreed to undertake the engineering design works needed to determine the viability of the D3 site as a stormwater management facility for the entire catchment area as shown on Appendix 8.

There is a need to complete hydrological and environmental analyses to evaluate what design is best. Given that there are minimal funds in the Cedar Valley Stormwater Development Cost Charges (DCC) reserve account and that it is more efficient for the developer to undertake the design work, the developer has requested that they complete the design work on behalf of the municipality and receive DCC credits at the time of subdivision approval.

Staff have prepared the attached agreement (Appendix 9) outlining what DCC credits would be applied and the conditions that would need to be met. Should the design work confirm that the facility can be constructed on the D3 site; staff will prepare a subsequent agreement for Council’s consideration that would provide further DCC credits (and possibly other credits including any community amenity contribution received for this development) to enable the developer to complete the construction of the facility on behalf of the municipality.

The new stormwater management facility will be designed to manage all rainwater for the area as shown on Appendix 8, including the area currently serviced by the existing detention pond located at the corner of Dalke Avenue and Nottman Street.

Once the new facility is fully functional, it is recommended that the existing Dalke Pond facility site be decommissioned and the land it encumbered be sold for the purposes of residential development. Appendix 10 identifies the location of the Dalke pond, with the lot layout over the aerial photo. The developer has indicated that they wish to purchase the land from the District to incorporate it into the developable area of their proposed development site. While the conceptual plan of subdivision has envisioned this transaction, the sale of these lands will be brought forward for Council consideration. While the land will be sold at market value, the value of the land will be reflective of the significant decommissioning and reclamation works required to bring this land to its ultimate development potential.

**Tree Retention**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant 2 trees per lot. The total number of trees required will be based on the final lot yield. In addition, the applicant is required to replace any significant tree (trees having a caliper of 0.2 metres or greater) that will be removed, except for those trees within the proposed municipal infrastructure necessary to complete the development.

Due to the size of the lots and road configuration, it is anticipated that five (5) of the seven (7) significant trees within the development site will require removal. The two trees that are to remain
must be protected with snow fencing during the construction phase as per LAN 32 Tree Policy.

PARKS AND TRAILS (Section 510 of the Local Government Act, and the Parks and Trails Master Plan)

No parkland designation has been identified within the development site. The Parks Recreation and Culture Department is recommending that given the proposal to use the open space block north of Nottman for storm water detention purposes an effort should be made to develop a walking loop through the area/around the we areas to connect to local sidewalks and trail north of the block. A portion of the cash in lieu funding could be requested as a voluntary contribution to enhance this recreational opportunity. This opportunity will be brought forward for Council’s consideration in a subsequent report.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP17-003

Compact residential development on lands designated Urban Compact – in Cedar Valley require an “Intensive Residential Development Permit”. This designation establishes guidelines for the form and character of intensive residential development by facilitating a higher standard of building design, housing, alternative site compatibility and site aesthetics that promote the important quality of a vibrant residential neighbourhood. The applicant is required to register a covenant in combination with the Development Permit to ensure that the buildings constructed meet the Guidelines as outlined in the OCP.

Approval of Intensive Residential Development Permits are delegated to the Director of Development Services. As such, no approval from Council is required.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DVP17-005 (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

To allow for the lot yield, road and lot configuration, the application requires bylaw relaxation for lot width for proposed Lots 19 and 20 and lot depth relaxation for proposed Lot 1, as described on Appendix 6.

Specifically, the development variance permit seeks to vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 as follows:

Section 601, C. Lot Area 1. by:

a) Reducing the width at the front lot line for proposed Lot 19 from 14.0 metres (45.93 feet) to 6.0 metres (19.86 feet); and

b) Reducing the width at the front lot line for proposed Lot 20 from 14.0 metres (45.93 feet) to 6.0 metres (19.86 feet).

C) Reducing the lot depth for proposed Lot 1 from 25 metres (82.02 feet) to 9.0 metres (29.52 feet).

Staff support the variances as they are considered relatively minor and will not have a significant impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. The flexibility in this regard will allow for a lot layout that achieves a more efficient and equitable subdivision and road configuration that would be possible without the variances.

COMMUNITY AMENITY CONTRIBUTION (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities)

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $ 2,815 (per new residential lot created) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs.
on the District to fund new or expand facilities and/or amenities within the community. While the contribution is a direct cash contribution based on the overall lot yield achieved by the developer, these monies could be used to assist towards the construction of the community stormwater management facility if Council deems such construction a community benefit. This option will be presented to Council in a subsequent report.

COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted two (2) development notification signs on the site describing the proposed development of the lands. Provided a public hearing date is determined by Council, the signs will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e., date, time and place). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 152 metres (500 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages

A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.

Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act.

A notice of the Development Variance Permit shall be mailed or otherwise delivered in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act.

Policy LAN.47 - Official Community Plan (OCP) Referral

Based on Lan.47, the only organization which will require a referral for the OCP amendment is school District #75.

REFERRALS

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 7.

Parks, Recreation and Culture

The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objection to the project and offers the following comments as attached to Appendix 11.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING

The Final Reading of the OCP and Zoning Amending Bylaws will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Any requirements received from external agencies regarding the proposed OCP amendment;

2. The community amenity contribution that has been volunteered in the amount of $2,815 per new lot is received;

3. The servicing requirements, as outlined in Appendix 8, have been addressed to the satisfaction of the District Engineer; and

4. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.
INFORMATIONAL NOTES

1. Approval of Development Variance Permit DV17-005 will be considered as part of the same Council agenda as the adoption of the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amending Bylaws is considered;

2. In accordance with Section 510 of the *Local Government Act* and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash in lieu to subdivision file S16-010; and

3. Street naming bylaw will be presented in a subsequent report to Council and considered as part of the same Council agenda as the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amending Bylaws are considered.

SIGN-OFFS:

Marcy Bond, Senior Planner

Reviewed by:
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
**Appendix 1**

Information for Corporate Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address</th>
<th>PID</th>
<th>Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8554 Nottman Street</td>
<td>017-711-762</td>
<td>Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28, Township 17,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Westminster District Plan LMP3590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8540 Nottman Street</td>
<td>009-242-007</td>
<td>Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35466: Section 28, Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17, New Westminster District Plan 23197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8590 Nottman Street</td>
<td>029-781-124</td>
<td>Lot A, Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan EPP57128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Property: 8540, 8554, 8590 Nottman St
Owner: 1030502 BC Ltd
Applicant: Tony Miniaci
Analytical Consulting
Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Urban Residential - Compact Cluster
DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF:

1) LOT 1 PLAN LMP3590
CXC APPROVED: 11TH MAY 1983
PLANNING AUTHORITY: 012-211-130

2) LOT 2 EXCEPT PART SUBDIVIDED BY PLAN 35446; PLAN 23197
CXC APPROVED: 11TH MAY 1983
PLANNING AUTHORITY: 012-211-130

3) LOT A PLAN EPP57128
CXC APPROVED: 1ST AUGUST 1983
PLANNING AUTHORITY: 012-211-130

4) LOT 31 PLAN BCP26697
CXC APPROVED: 11TH MAY 1983
PLANNING AUTHORITY: 012-211-130

all of SECTION 28 TOWNSHIP 17 NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT
Two Storey/Coach S - Zone Lots 10, 11, 16, 28, 29.

Two Storey Lot 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 19, 20.

Basement Entry S - Zone Lots 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.
CIVIC ADDRESS: 8540, 8554, & 8590 Nottman Street

CURRENT ZONE: S36  PROPOSED ZONE: RC465

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Nottman Street. No further upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Nottman Street to be extended to the site.
The extent of upgrades required to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Nottman Street to be extended to the site.
The extent of upgrades required to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Nottman Street provides paved access (open gravel shoulder and roadside ditches) to the site.
As per District of Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985, Urban Compact OCP land use
designation, curb & gutter, sidewalk and ornamental street lighting will be required.
The extent of upgrades required to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

OTHER COMMENTS:
The applicant currently has an OCP amendment application for consideration by council
(OCP16-001) to amend the designation from Urban Residential–Compact Cluster to Urban
Residential Compact. Compact cluster requires the development to be stratified to manage
storm water onsite whereas Residential Compact does not.

Offsite storm water detention for an Urban Residential Compact development would therefore
require further study and engineered design. To be addressed at the time of subdivision.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to third reading.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT made the _____ day of ________, 2017

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION
P.O. Box 20
8645 Stave Lake Street
Mission, BC V2V 4L9

(the "District")

OF THE FIRST PART

AND:

1030502 B.C. LTD.
206 – 33119 South Fraser Way
Abbotsford BC V2S 2B1

(the "Developer")

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS:

A. The District has adopted the Cedar Valley Area Stormwater Management Plan Update (Urban Systems 2007) and stormwater detention Pond D3 ("Detention Facility") is proposed to be constructed on the District owned land ("Land") described in Schedule A to this Agreement;

B. The cost of constructing the Detention Facility is included within the District’s Development Cost Charge Bylaw 5214-2011;

C. The District does not have capital funds in its reserves for design and construction of the Detention Facility at this time;

D. The Developer has proposed a development ("Development") that requires the construction of the Detention Facility to manage the Development’s stormwater;

E. The Developer wishes to proceed with designing ("the Design") the Detention Facility and determining whether the Detention Facility can be constructed on the Land;

F. As permitted under the Local Government Act, the Developer wishes to secure Development Cost Charge credits ("DCC Credits") to cover the Developer’s costs of preparing the Design of the Detention Facility, such DCC Credits not to exceed the DCC payable for the Detention Facility in Development Cost Charge Bylaw 5214-2011; and

G. The District is prepared to issue such DCC Credits according to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.
NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSES that in consideration of the premises and covenants contained herein and sum of $10.00 now paid by the Developer to the District, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

1. DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES (DCCs)
   a. The estimated DCCs for the Development are $624,726.76 and are detailed in Schedule B.
   b. The estimated DCCs that can be directly related to the design and construction of the Detention Facility are the Cedar Valley Drainage DCCs in the amount of $153,973.40 as noted in Schedule B.

2. DESIGN ELEMENTS ELIGIBLE FOR DCC CREDITS
   a. A list of the works and services that are eligible for DCC Credits under this Agreement is provided in Schedule C.

3. PAYMENT OF DCC CREDITS
   a. The District agrees to provide DCC Credits for the cost of the Design to the Developer up to a maximum of $82,800 not including applicable taxes. For certainty, taxes paid by the Developer under this Agreement will be eligible for DCC Credits provided the Developer has not received tax rebates for those paid taxes.
   b. The District will reimburse any DCC Credits under this section at the time the Approving Officer approves the Development should that approval be granted; and
   c. The request for payment of DCC Credits by the District to the Developer must be in writing and must be accompanied by official invoices from service providers to the Developer and receipts showing all payments made by the Developer.

4. DELIVERABLES
   a. The Developer will ensure that the Design is completed by a qualified professional who certifies that the Detention Facility can be constructed in accordance with the goals and objectives of the Cedar Valley Area Stormwater Management Plan Update;
   b. The Developer will provide the District with drawings, reports and renderings for the Design in a format acceptable to the District for the purposes of tendering the construction of the Detention Facility within 30 days of being completed by the Developer.

5. TERM
   a. The Term of this Agreement commences on the 1st day of January 2017 and expires on the 31st day of December, 2017 unless earlier terminated under this Agreement or unless another term is otherwise agreed to in writing by both parties.
6. INDEMNIFICATION

a. The Developer indemnifies the District, its elected officials, appointed officers, employees, contractors, sub-contractors and agents from and against all lawsuits, damages, losses, costs, expenses, liabilities or fees which the District may incur by reason of the use or occupation of the Land by the Developer or the carrying on upon the land of any activity in relation to the Developer's use or occupation of the Land and in respect of any loss, damage or injury sustained by the Developer, or by any person while on the Land for the purpose of doing business with the Developer or otherwise dealing with the Developer, or by reason of non-compliance by the Developer with Laws or by reason of any defect in the Land, including all costs and legal costs, assessed on a solicitor and client basis, and disbursements and this indemnity shall survive the expiry or sooner determination of this Agreement.

b. For the purposes of section 6(a) "Developer" includes any assignee, licensee or sub-licensee of the Developer.

c. The Developer releases the District, its elected officials, appointed officers, employees, contractors, sub-contractors and agents from and against all claims, lawsuits, damages, costs, expenses, losses, liabilities or fees (including fees of a solicitor on a solicitor and own client basis) which the Developer may incur, suffer or alleged by reason of the use of the Land by the Developer or the Developer's directors, officers, employees, contractors, sub-contractors, agents and invitees. This release shall survive the expiry or sooner determination of this Agreement.

7. NOTICES

a. Notices

   i. Each notice sent pursuant to this Agreement ("Notice") shall be in writing and shall be sent to the relevant Party at the relevant address, facsimile number or e-mail address set out below. Each such Notice may be sent by registered mail, by commercial courier, by facsimile transmission, or by electronic mail.

   ii. The Contact Information for the parties is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT OF MISSION</th>
<th>DEVELOPER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Younie</td>
<td>Tony Miniaci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 20</td>
<td>Analytical Project Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8645 Stave Lake Street</td>
<td>34424 Rockridge Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission, BC V2V 4L9</td>
<td>Mission, BC V2V 7N3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: 604-820-3798; Fax: 604-820-3715</td>
<td>Tel: 604-850-4854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:myounie@mission.ca">myounie@mission.ca</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:analyticalconsulting2013@gmail.com">analyticalconsulting2013@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii. Each Notice sent by electronic mail ("E-Mail Notice") must show the e-mail address of the sender, the name or e-mail address of the recipient, and the date and time of transmission, must be fully accessible by the recipient, and unless receipt is acknowledged, must be followed within twenty-four (24) hours by a true copy of such Notice, including all addressing and transmission details, delivered (including by commercial courier) or sent by facsimile transmission.

iv. Subject to section 7a(v) through 7a(vii) each Notice shall be deemed to have been given or made at the following times:

1. if delivered to the address (including by commercial courier), on the day the Notice is delivered;

2. if sent by registered mail, seven (7) days following the date of such mailing by sender;

3. if sent by facsimile transmission, on the date the Notice is sent by facsimile transmission; or

4. if sent by electronic mail, on the date the E-Mail Notice is sent electronically by e-mail by the sender.

v. If a Notice is delivered, sent by facsimile transmission or sent by electronic mail after 4:00 p.m., or if the date of deemed receipt of a Notice falls upon a day that is not a Business Day, then the Notice shall be deemed to have been given or made on the next Business Day following.

vi. Notice given by facsimile transmission in accordance with the terms of this section a will only be deemed to be received by the recipient if the sender's facsimile machine generates written confirmation indicating that the facsimile transmission was sent.

vii. If normal mail service, facsimile or electronic mail is interrupted by strike, slow down, force majeure or other cause beyond the control of the parties, then a Notice sent by the impaired means of communication will not be deemed to be received until actually received, and the party sending the Notice shall utilize any other such services which have not been so interrupted or shall personally deliver such Notice in order to ensure prompt receipt thereof.

viii. Each Party shall provide Notice to the other Party of any change of address, facsimile number, or e-mail address of such Party within a reasonable time of such change.

8. TERMINATION

a. If the Developer is in breach of this Agreement, and if the default continues after the giving of notice by the District to the Developer, then the District may terminate this Agreement and the rights of the Developer with respect to the Agreement shall lapse and be absolutely forfeited.
b. Either party of this Agreement may, at their sole discretion, exercise an early termination clause, subject to giving the other party of this Agreement sixty (60) days’ prior notice of pending termination.

9. REGULATIONS

a. The Developer must:

i. Comply promptly at its own expense with the statutes, regulations and bylaws applicable to the Land or the Developer’s use of the Land and other requirements of an association of fire insurance underwriters or agents, and all notices issued under them that are served upon the District or the Developer; and

ii. Indemnify the District from all lawsuits, damages, loss, costs or expenses that the District may incur by reason of non-compliance by the Developer with legal requirements or by reason of any defect in the Land or any injury to any person or damage to any personal property brought on to the Land. The Developer is responsible for any damage to the Land occurring while the Developer is exercising its rights under this Agreement.

b. The obligations of the Developer under section 9 shall survive the expiry or earlier termination of this Agreement.

10. NO COMPENSATION

a. The Developer is not entitled to compensation from the District for any loss, including economic loss, or injurious affection or disturbance resulting in any way from the termination of the Agreement.

b. The Developer is not entitled to compensation from the District for any loss, including economic loss, or injurious affection or disturbance resulting from the District of Mission Council or the District’s Approving Officer not approving the amendment to the Official Community Plan, the rezoning or subdivision of land related to the Development as the case may be.

11. MISCELLANEOUS

a. The Developer warrants and represents that it has authority to enter into this Agreement, taken all corporate steps necessary to authorize this Agreement and to authorize the execution of this Agreement by the person on behalf of a group or organization and warrants and represents to the District that the Developer has sufficient power, authority, and capacity to bind the group or organization with his or her signature.

b. The execution and delivery of this Agreement, and the completion of the transactions contemplated by this Agreement, if any, have been duly and validly authorized by all necessary corporate action of the Developer, and this Agreement constitutes a legal, valid and binding obligation of the Developer, enforceable against the Developer in accordance with its terms.
c. In consideration of being granted the use of the Land, the Developer agrees to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Agreement and, if the Developer represents a group or organization, the Developer agrees to inform all responsible persons associated with the group or organization of the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

d. Waiver of any default by a party is not a waiver of any subsequent default.

e. The Agreement is personal to the Developer and the Developer may not assign its interest to any other person without the written consent of the District, which consent may be withheld by the District in its sole discretion.

f. Each schedule to this Agreement is an integral part of this Agreement as if set out at length in the body of this Agreement.

g. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.

h. Nothing in this Agreement commits the District or the Developer to construction of the Detention Facility nor is any guarantee or certainty that additional DCC Credits will be provided beyond what is considered in this Agreement for the Design only.

i. The Developer’s access to the Land will under all circumstances be viewed as temporary only for the purposes of this Agreement and will not create nor be deemed to create any property interest in favour of the Developer in the Land.

j. The Developer acknowledges and agrees that, by granting this Agreement, the District is not accepting any responsibility for the Developer’s use of the Land. The Developer shall use best efforts to cause a minimum of obstruction and inconvenience in the Land.

12. INTERPRETATION

a. That when the singular or neuter are used in this Agreement they include the plural or the feminine or the masculine or the body politic or corporate where the context or the parties require.

b. The headings to the clauses in this Agreement have been inserted as a matter of convenience and for reference only and in no way define, limit or enlarge the scope or meaning of this Agreement or any provision of it.

c. That this Agreement must enure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective heirs, executors, successors, administrators and permitted assignees.

d. This Agreement must be construed in accordance with and governed by the laws applicable in the Province of British Columbia.

e. All provisions of this Agreement are to be construed as covenants and agreements as though the word importing covenants and agreements were used in each separate paragraph.
f. A provision in this Agreement granting the District a right of approval must be interpreted as granting a free and unrestricted right to be exercised by the District in its discretion.

g. The Agreement is not assignable.

h. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and no understanding or agreement, oral or otherwise, exists between the parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement except as expressly set out in this Agreement and this Agreement may not be modified except by subsequent agreement in writing between the parties.

13. COUNTERPARTS

a. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts each of which will be deemed to be an original and all of which together will constitute one and the same agreement. A counterpart signed by a party and transmitted by facsimile or electronically in PDF format will have the same effect as a counterpart originally signed by such party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have set their hands and seals as of the day and year first above written.

DISTRICT OF MISSION
by its authorized signatories

Randy Hawes, Mayor

Michael Younie, Corporate Officer

Developer by its authorized signatories

Name:

Name:

Name:
SCHEDULE A
Description of the Land

Legal Description: Township 17, Section 28, Plan BCP26897
SCHEDULE B
Estimated Development Cost Charges for the Development

Scope of development:
- 28 single family compact lots
- Within Cedar Valley (DCC Bylaw Area “B”)

### Table of Applicable Development Cost Charges for the Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Cost per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads-all areas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,051.98</td>
<td>57,455.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional sewage treatment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,313.30</td>
<td>120,722.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional water supply</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,711.22</td>
<td>131,914.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvercreek Parkway Parkland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>716.44</td>
<td>20,060.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley roads</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,407.66</td>
<td>67,414.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley drainage</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5,499.05</td>
<td>153,973.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley sewer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>545.83</td>
<td>15,283.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley water</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,228.97</td>
<td>34,411.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley environmentally sensitive parkland acquisition</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>710.07</td>
<td>19,881.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley environmentally sensitive parkland development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>127.15</td>
<td>3,560.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>624,726.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule C
**Authorized Works and Costing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design*</td>
<td>$45,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Consulting Services</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Engineering Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeological Engineering Services</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Services</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Services</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$82,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST &amp; GST**</td>
<td>$9,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,736</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scope of work and cost as per attached Wedler Engineering estimate

** GST not payable if Developer receives GST rebate
DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV17-005

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: 1030502 BC Ltd.
33456 South Fraser Way, Abbotsford, BC V2S 2B5

as the registered owner (hereinafter referred to as the Permittee) and shall only apply to ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the Municipality of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and more particularly known and described as:

Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007
Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197

Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762
Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

Parcel Identifier: 017-711-771
Lot 2 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

1. The said lands are zoned RC465 pursuant to “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009” as amended.

2. “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw” as amended is hereby varied in respect of the said lands as follows:
   (a) Reducing the required width at the front Lot line for proposed Lot 19 from 14.0 metres to 6.0 metres and for Lot 20 from 14.0 metres 6.0 metres
   (b) Reducing the lot depth for proposed Lot 1 from 25.0 metres to 9.0 metres along the west property boundary.

3. This Permit does not constitute a subdivision approval or a building permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. [Click here to type resolution number] passed by the Council on the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month] , [Click here to type year] .

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Development Variance Permit is hereby issued by the Municipality signed by the Mayor and the Corporate Officer the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month] , [Click here to type year]

___________________________
Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

___________________________
Michael Younie,
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV17-005
SUBDIVISION APPLICATION COMMENTS

DISTRICT OF MISSION - PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Referral Date: January 3, 2017

Subject Properties: 8540, 8554 & 8590 Nottman Street

Legal Descriptions:
8540 Nottman St. - Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007 Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197

8554 Nottman St. - Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762 Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

8590 Nottman St. - Parcel Identifier: 017-711-771 Lot 2 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

File Number: S16-010

# of Proposed Lots: 30 lots

The Parks and Recreation staff have reviewed this proposal and don't have any concerns related to the proposal. The development is within walking distance of Lightburn Park, which is small but will satisfy the needs of small children and parents. Given the proposal to use the open space block north of Nottman for storm water detention purposes an effort should be made to develop a walking loop through the area / around the wet areas to connect to local sidewalks and trails north of the block. A portion of the cash in lieu funding should be requested as a voluntary contribution to enhance this recreational opportunity.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: Jan 3/2017
March 22, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: CORRECTION TO ADDRESS, Item #2 - Public Hearing Notification

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject properties located at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 3, 2017 and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaws.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

1. DISTRICT OF BYLAW 5626-2017 AMENDING LAND USE CONTRACT 455-1975 (LUC17-001-Cavas)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to amend (discharge) Land Use Contract (LUC) No. 455-1975 registered to the lot identified as PID 004639561 on the map.

This bylaw proposes to amend (discharge) Land Use Contract 455-1975 of the property legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 004-639-561
Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876

The location of the subject property is 32290 Lougheed Highway (PID 004639561) and is shown on the following maps:

2. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5625-2017-5050(233) (R16-030 - Cavas)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to rezone three lots from Urban Residential (R558) to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone. No development is contemplated at this time. Further development of the site shall require a subsequent development application to the District.
This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

Parcel Identifier: 004-639-561
Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876

Parcel Identifier: 004-639-570
Lot 4, Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8282

Parcel Identifier: 004-639-596
Lot 5, Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8282

from the Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway and are shown on the following maps:

A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3 2017. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Ken Bourdeau, Planner, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Discharge of Land Use Contract (LUC) 455-1975 and the Rezoning of the properties located at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 - OCP designation and Zoning map
Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments
Appendix 5 – Land Use Contract 455-1975
CIVIC ADDRESS: 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway
APPLICANT: Sam Cavas
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Commercial OCP designation
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 27, 2016
LOCATION: Mission Core - Lougheed Highway Commercial Area
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to discharge Land Use Contract (LUC) 455-1975 and to rezone the subject properties to Commercial Highway Two Zone (CH2), and identifies the necessary Zoning Bylaw amendment.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Bylaw amendment under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3, 2017.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Sam Cavas, on behalf of the property owner Project Mission Landing Inc..

The property owner owns four adjacent lots in the Lougheed Highway Commercial Area. Three of the lots are the subject of this application: 32290 Lougheed Highway (which consists of 2 lots) and 32336 Lougheed Highway. The fourth lot (32352 Lougheed Highway) is not part of this application, as it’s already zoned CH2. Appendix 2 shows the location of the four lots.

The application proposes to rezone all three subject properties from Urban Residential R558 Zone to Commercial Highway Two Zone (CH2) and to discharge an existing Land Use Contract (LUC) that is registered on title for two of the lots (32290 Lougheed Highway). Appendix 3 shows the existing OCP designation and Zoning.

No development is complemented at this time and any development of the site in the future would require further development applications, including a development permit for building form and character.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject properties are approximately 1.29 hectares (3.2 acres) in area and are located in the Lougheed Highway Commercial Area. The subject properties front Rai Avenue to the north and the Canadian Pacific Railway right-of-way to the south. The northern half of the lots are relatively flat and are developed with a commercial building that is currently vacant, but previously contained a Building Supply Store (Rona). The southern half of the lots are undeveloped and have steep slopes that are heavily forested with mature trees.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan (OCP)

The subject properties are designated Commercial in the OCP. The proposed rezoning to CH2 conforms to the OCP, specifically Policy 3.2.3 which provide[s] for commercial uses that serve the local and regional population in regional shopping centre locations and in highway commercial areas on a site-by site basis. Limit strip retail and large warehouse retail businesses to existing commercial use areas.

Land Use Contract (LUC) and Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

From 1973 to 1979, provincial legislation allowed the District to enter into Land Use Contracts with property owners. LUCs were zoning, development permits, subdivision layout approval and servicing agreements all contained within one document. In a case where a property is the subject of a LUC, the LUC supersedes the underlying zoning, if any exists.
In May 2014, the Province adopted legislation to terminate all LUCs by no later than June 30, 2024 and directed Municipalities to have underlying zoning in place by June 30, 2022.

If the LUC was to expire in 2024, the underlying R558 Zone would come into effect. As the building has been vacant for a period of more than 6 months, the property would not be deemed a non-conforming use and as a result, the existing permitted use (retail lumber and hardware business) would not be entitled to legally non-conforming status.

**Ministry of Environment (MoE) Comments**

Correspondence received from MoE advises a detailed site investigation is required to determine the extent of possible contamination on the site; however, the proponent received a release from MoE that delays the requirement for a site investigation. In part, the MoE release states “the Ministry is prepared to provide the necessary release so that the District of Mission may proceed with approval of the zoning application the requirement for a site investigation is not extinguished by this release and this outstanding requirement will suspend the approval of future applications for the site identified in section 40 of the [Environmental Management Act](#).”

Council may proceed with the Rezoning application with the understanding that the MoE requirement for a detailed site investigation, required under section 7(1) of the Contaminated Site Regulation, is not required at this time; however, any further development applications may not proceed until the MoE detailed site investigation requirements have been satisfied.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends discharging the LUC and rezoning the properties to CH2 because:

- the LUC limits the property to one use (retail lumber and hardware business) which is contrary to the Commercial OCP designation which calls for a wider variety of uses.

- the property has been vacant for more than 6 continuous months, as a result if the LUC was to expire in 2024 without any action by the District, the property would not be eligible for non-conforming status, as per Section 528 of the [Local Government Act](#), and the R558 zone would apply. This means the only permitted use would be one Single Family Dwelling and various accessory uses.

- the property has been used for commercial purposes for over 40 years, and could be considered a historic use.

- the purpose of the CH2 Zone is to provide for a broad range of businesses to serve the general retail, office, service and auto-oriented shopping needs of the community that are located along the Provincial Highway corridors (Highway #7 and Highway #11) and located within the Commercial [OCP designation] area only.

**COMMUNICATION:**

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties
within a radius of 152 metres (500 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the *Local Government Act*

3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

**REFERRALS:**

**Engineering**

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project, as there is no development proposed at this time. Engineering comments are available in *Appendix 4*. 
REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:
The Final Reading of the amending bylaw(s) will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Approval from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI).
2. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw, including the Public Hearing.

SIGN-OFFS:

Ken Bourdeau, Planner

Reviewed by:

Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32290 Lougheed Highway
PID: 004-639-561
Legal: Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876

Civic Address: 32290 Lougheed Highway
PID: 004-639-570
Legal: Lot 4 Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8282

Civic Address: 32336 Lougheed Highway
PID: 004-639-596
Legal: Lot 5, Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17, Township, New Westminster District Plan 8282
Appendix 2

Subject Property: 32290 Lougheed Highway (PID: 004639561, 004639570), & 32336 Lougheed Highway

Owner: Delesalle Holdings Ltd
Applicant: Daniel McIntyre (Delesalle Holdings Ltd)

Zoning: Land Use Contract, R558, CH2
OCP Designation: Commercial
Appendix 3

Official Community Plan (OCP) Land Use

Legend
- Commercial
- Institutional
- Parks Recreation and Natural Open Space
- Urban Compact - Multiple Family

Mission
32290, 32336, 32352 Lougheed Highway

File: P2016-054

Drawn by: H.L. Date: 12/19/2016
CIVIC ADDRESS: 32290, 32336 & 32352 Lougheed Highway

CURRENT ZONES: 32290 Lougheed Highway (Parcels 1 & 2) – Land Use Contract
32336 Lougheed Highway – Land Use Contract
32352 Lougheed Highway – CH2 (no change)

PROPOSED ZONES: 32290 Lougheed Highway (Parcels 1 & 2) – CH2
32336 Lougheed Highway – CH2

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Rai Avenue. No upgrades required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Rai Avenue and via sanitary main infrastructure that bisects the properties. No upgrades required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Rai Avenue. No upgrades required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Rai Avenue provides paved access to the site. No upgrades are required.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to third reading.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development
Engineering & Projects
Appendix 5

DISTRIBUTION OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 455 - 1975

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mission Builders Market Limited.

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the Municipal Act the Council may, by by-law, amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has, by Development Area No. 15 By-Law No. 246 - 1973, declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

"The whole of the areas within the boundaries of the Municipality which is divided into zone designations and all of the zones as designated by "The District of Mission Zoning By-Law No. 91 - 1971" and amendments thereto, save and except those areas described in the following By-Laws:

Development Area No. 3 By-Law No. 95 - 1971
Development Area No. 4 By-Law No. 108 - 1971
Development Area No. 5 By-Law No. 109 - 1971
Development Area No. 7 By-Law No. 141 - 1971
Development Area No. 8 By-Law No. 142 - 1971
Development Area No. 9 By-Law No. 143 - 1971
Development Area No. 10 By-Law No. 144 - 1972
Development Area No. 11 By-Law No. 145 - 1972
Development Area No. 15 By-Law No. 155 - 1972
Development Area No. 16 By-Law No. 156 - 1972
Development Area No. 17 By-Law No. 159 - 1972
Development Area No. 19 By-Law No. 211 - 1972

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the Municipal Act for a Land Use Contract to develop a building supply market within the said Development Area:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 1st day of November, 1971, with respect to the said application:

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:-

1. This By-law may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-Law No. 455 - 1975".

2. It shall be lawful and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mission Builders Market Limited, for the construction of a building supply market upon land known and described as:

Lot 29, North West Quarter, Township 17, Plan 40876, New Westminster District

3. The Mayor and the Clerk of the District of Mission are hereby authorized to sign, seal and deliver a Land Use Contract on behalf of the District of Mission, and to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 5th day of October, 1975.
READ A SECOND TIME this 6th day of October, 1975.
READ A THIRD TIME this 6th day of October, 1975.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 7th day of October, 1975.

[Signatures]

I HEREBY CERTIFY the above to be a true and correct copy of "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-Law No. 455 - 1975".

[Signature]
Appendix 5

DISTRICT OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 455 - 1975

OCT 3 1975

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mission Builders Market Limited:--

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the Municipal Act the Council may, by by-law, amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has, by Development Area No. 15 By-Law No. 246 - 1975, declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

"The whole of the areas within the boundaries of the Municipality which is divided into zone designations and all of the zones as designated by "The District of Mission Zoning By-Law No. 91 - 1971" and amendments thereto, save and except those areas described in the following By-Laws:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Area No.</th>
<th>By-Law No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the Municipal Act for a Land Use Contract to develop a building supply market within the said Development Area:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 1st day of November, 1971, with respect to the said application:

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:--

1. This By-law may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-Law No. 455 - 1975".

2. It shall be lawful and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mission Builders Market Limited, for the construction of a building supply market upon land known and described as:--

Lot 20, North West Quarter, Township 17, Plan 40876, New Westminster District

3. The Mayor and the Clerk of the District of Mission are hereby authorized to sign, seal and deliver a Land Use Contract on behalf of the District of Mission, and to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 4th day of October, 1975.
READ A SECOND TIME this 6th day of October, 1975.
READ A THIRD TIME this 6th day of October, 1975.
RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 7th day of October, 1975.

[Signatures]

I HEREBY CERTIFY the above to be a true and correct copy of "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-Law No. 455 - 1975".
LAND USE CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 8th day of October, 1975.

BETWEEN:-

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation, duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, of Box 20, Mission City, British Columbia.

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

AND:

MISSION BUILDERS MARKET LIMITED,
7104 Vedder Road,
Sardis, B.C.

(hereinafter called "THE DEVELOPER")

OF THE FIRST PART

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the Municipality, pursuant to Section 702 A of the "Municipal Act", may, notwithstanding any by-law of the Municipality, or Section 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act", enter into a land use contract containing such terms and conditions for the use and development of land as may be agreed upon with a developer, and thereafter the use and development of the land shall be in accordance with the land use contract:

AND WHEREAS the "Municipal Act" requires that the Municipal Council consider the criteria set out in Section 702 (2) and 702A (1) in arriving at the terms, conditions and consideration contained in a land use contract:

AND WHEREAS the Developer has presented to the Municipality a scheme for use and development of the within described lands and premises that would be in contravention of a by-law of the Municipality or Sections 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act" or both, and has requested that the Council of the Municipality enter into this contract under the terms, conditions and for the consideration hereinafter set forth:
AND WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, having given due consideration to the criteria set forth in Section 702 (2) and 702A (1) of the "Municipal Act", have agreed to the terms, conditions and consideration herein contained;

AND WHEREAS if the land is within a radius of one-half mile of the intersection of a controlled access highway and another highway, the approval of the Minister of Highways to the terms hereof must be obtained;

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both acknowledge that the Council of the Municipality could not enter into this agreement, until the Council hold a public hearing in relation to this agreement and considered any opinions expressed at such hearing, and unless Council by by-law approved the Municipality entering into this contract.

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that in consideration of the premises and the conditions and covenants hereinafter set forth, the Municipality and the Developer covenant and agree as follows:

1. The Developer is an owner of those lands and premises situate, lying and being in the DISTRICT of MISSION, in the Province of British Columbia, and being more particularly known and described as:

   Lot 29, North West Quarter, Township Seventeen, Plan 40876 - N.W.D.

   (hereinafter called "THE LAND")

2. The Developer has obtained the consent of all persons having a registered interest in the land as set out in the schedule preface the consents to the use and development set forth herein which consents are attached hereto.
3. The land, including the surface of water, and any and all buildings and structures erected thereon, theretofore or therein shall be used for the purpose specified in Schedule "A" hereto and for none other.

4. No building or structure shall be constructed, reconstructed, altered, moved or expanded upon the land except in compliance with the specifications and the plot plan set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

5. No sign shall be erected upon the land or any building structure thereon except those shown on the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

6. Off street parking and loading spaces shall be provided, located and constructed in accordance with the plan set out in Schedule "C" hereto.

7. All buildings and structures shall be constructed strictly in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

8. All landscaping, surface treatments, fences and screens shall be constructed, located, provided and maintained in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

9. All utilities, including water, sewer, gas, telephones and electricity, shall be placed, provided and constructed in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "E" hereto.

10. All highways, bridges, lanes and walkways, including drainage, surfacing, curbs, gutters, street lighting, boulevards and street signs shall be provided, located and constructed in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "F" hereto.
11. All works, public space, playgrounds or other recreation facilities, to be dedicated by subdivision plan or otherwise provided, shall be provided, constructed and developed in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "A" hereto.

12. No land shall be subdivided except in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "C" hereto.

13. Except as specifically provided in Schedule "I" hereto, the entire cost of the development of the land including the provision of all services and the provisions and construction of the items set out in paragraphs 6 to 11 hereof shall be paid for by the Developer.

14. All works and services, buildings, structures, pipes and fixtures and development constructed, placed or carried out upon property that is now, or by this contract becomes vested in the Municipality or located upon highways required to be dedicated, shall, upon acceptance by the Municipality in writing, become the property of the Municipality free and clear of any claim by the Developer or any person claiming through the Developer and the Developer shall save harmless the Municipality from any such claim.

15. Except as provided in Schedule "J" hereto, the Municipality shall, from the date of acceptance, become solely responsible for the operation, upkeep and maintenance of any works and services and any building, structure, pipes and fixtures of development accepted by it pursuant to paragraph 14 hereof, but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to or require the Municipality to operate, maintain or repair such works and services, buildings, structures, pipes, fixtures or development in any manner or to any extent different from its obligations in relation to similar works, services, buildings, structures, pipes, fixtures or developments constructed by it out of its general municipal funds.
16. The Developer shall provide the Municipality with the security set out in Schedule "K" hereto to guarantee performance hereof.

SCHEDULE

17. The Developer shall carry out the work and construct, locate, provide and develop the structures, buildings, works, services, developments and facilities according to the times set out in Schedule "K" hereto.

17A. The Developer hereby agrees to pay to the Municipality the sum of $________ at the time the Developer makes application for a building permit on the said land for the Municipality's own use absolutely which amount or any part thereof is not refundable.

17B. Upon execution of this contract by the Developer, the Developer shall pay the sum of $________ to the Municipality for the Municipality's own use absolutely which amount or any part thereof is not refundable.

17C. In the event of breach by the Developer of any of the terms of this contract continuing after 60 days notice thereof has been given to the Municipality by the Developer by prepaid post to the address of the Developer as shown in this contract the Municipality may at its option cancel this contract and any monies paid by the Developer to the Municipality shall be forfeited and the Developer agrees to execute such documents and do such things whatsoever necessary to cancel this contract and its registration at the appropriate Land Registry Office.

REGISTRATION

18. This agreement shall be construed as running with the land and shall be registered in the Land Registry Office by the Municipality pursuant to the provisions of Section 702A (4) of the "Municipal Act".
PREAMBLE 10. Whenever the singular or masculine is used herein, the
same shall be construed as meaning the plural, feminine or body
corporate or politic where the context or the parties so require.

20. This agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be
binding upon the parties hereto and their respective heirs, executors,
administrators, successors and assigns.

A public hearing on this agreement was held the

2nd day of AUGUST, A.D. 1971.

This agreement was approved on the 1st day of

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties to this agreement have
hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above
written.

THE CORPORATE SEAL OF

was affixed in the present of:

(Signature)

(Signature)

THE CORPORATE SEAL of the
DISTRICT OF MISSION was
affixed in the presence of:-

(Signature)

MAYOR

(Signature)

CLERK
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 1st day of October, 1975, at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, CALVIN NEETZ, whose identity has been proved by the evidence on oath of, who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the PRESIDENT of Mission Builders Market Ltd., and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as PRESIDENT of the said Company, and affixed the seal of the Company to the said instrument, that he was first duly authorized to subscribe his name as aforesaid, and affix the said seal to the said instrument, and that such corporation is legally entitled to hold and dispose of land in the Province of British Columbia.

IN TESTIMONY whereof I have hereunto set my Hand and Seal of Office, at Mission in the Province of British Columbia, this 1st day of October one thousand seven hundred and seventy five.

[Signature]

A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia.
A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.

AFFIDAVITY OF WITNESS

Province of British Columbia To Wit:

I, of the
of the Province of British Columbia, make oath and say:

1. I was personally present and did see the within instrument duly signed and executed by
   the part thereto, for the purposes named therein.

2. The said instrument was executed at

3. I know the said part, and that of the full age of nineteen years.

4. I am the subscribing witness to the said instrument and am of the full age of sixteen years.

Sworn before me at
in the Province of British Columbia, this day of 19

[Signature]

A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia.
A Commissioner for taking Affidavits within British Columbia.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 8th day of October, 1975, at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, DONALD F. WEST (whose identity has been proved by the evidence on oath of...), who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the DEPUTY CLERK of the DISTRICT of Mission, and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as DEPUTY CLERK of the said DISTRICT and affixed the seal of the DISTRICT to the said instrument, that he was first duly authorized to subscribe his name as aforesaid, and affix the said seal to the said instrument, and that such corporation is legally entitled to hold and dispose of land in the Province of British Columbia.

IN TESTIMONY whereof I have hereunto set my Hand and Seal of Office, at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, this 8th day of October, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-five.

[Signature]
A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia. A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.

AFFIDAVIT OF WITNESS

Province of British Columbia.

To Wit:

1. Of the
   of
   make oath and say:
   1. I was personally present and did see the within instrument duly signed and executed by the part thereto, for the purposes named therein.

2. The said instrument was executed at

3. I know the said part , and that

4. I am the subscribing witness to the said instrument and am of the full age of sixteen years.

Sworn before me at
in the Province of British Columbia, this day of , 19

[Signature]
A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia. A Commissioner for taking Affidavits within British Columbia.
LAND USE CONTRACT

CONSENT

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that, ____________________________

of ____________________________, being the holder of a charge by way of ____________________________,

registered at the Land Registry Office at ____________________________, under number ____________________________

against all and singular that certain parcel of tract of land and premises being in the ____________________________, in the Province of British Columbia and known and described as ____________________________

in consideration of the sum of ONE DOLLAR ($1.00) hereby agrees and consents to the registration of a Land Use Contract made between the registered owner of the said lands and the ____________________________

dated the _______ day of ___________ A.D. 19___________

against the aforementioned lands in priority to the said charge in the same manner and to the same effect as if it had been dated and registered prior to the said charge.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED at ____________________________

British Columbia, this ______ day of ___________ 19___________
in the presence of: ____________________________

Name ____________________________

Address ____________________________

Occupation ____________________________
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE OF PERSONS HAVING A REGISTERED INTEREST
IN THE LAND WHERE CONSENTS ARE REQUIRED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NATURE OF CHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "A"

Schedule of permitted land use.

Erection of a retail lumber and hardware business, plus storage of lumber, bricks, plywood and related building materials. An additional area to be constructed to Municipal approval may be erected at the rear of the present building, size to be determined by Market Conditions at a later date.
Appendix 5

LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "A"

Plot Plan and Specifications:

Site Area = 219,000 square feet = 300 x 730 average

Yards front = 60 ft. setback from frontage road on Lougheed
rear = 620 ft. setback from rear lot line
side = 56 ft. setback from west interior lot line
124 ft. setback from east interior lot line

Site Coverage = 5760 sq. ft. = 48' x 120'
Possible future extension of building at rear of present structure.

Height of Buildings and Structures

maximum = 26 feet
minimum

Floor space ratio

Minimum floor area

Number of units

Lougheed

Plan

Frontage Rd
Parking - 24

Future addition possible at rear of building making total size 92 x 120'

Lumber Storage Area
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "C"

Off Street Parking:
Total area = 1830 sq. ft. = 20' x 370'
Number of Spaces = Thirty Seven (37)
Size of Spaces = 9' x 20'
Surfacing = Asphalt
Lighting = Floodlighting on front of building
Signs = Nil
Access = from frontage road on Lougheed Highway

Plan

Off Street Loading:
Total area = 70,000 square feet
Size of Area = 300 x 240
Location = at rear of building
Surfacing = dust free material
Lighting
Signs
Access

Plan
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "DP"

Signs: To requirements of District of Mission Sign By-law No. 451-1968

Types

Location

Design

Size

Plan

Buildings & Structures:

Plans

Specifications

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:

Plans

Specifications - Area surrounding building to be landscaped and maintained in neat and tidy manner.
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "E"

Utilities: NOT APPLICABLE

Water
Sewer
Gas
Telephone
Electricity
Plans
Specifications
Locations
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "F"

Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways and Drainage:

30 foot frontage road to be constructed to gravelled stage

Paving, Curbs and Gutters:

Plans

Specifications

Street Lighting:

Plans

Specifications

Boulevards:

Plans

Specifications

Signs:

Plans

Specifications

Drainage:
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "G"

Subdivision Plans: NOT APPLICABLE

Parcels:
Area
Shape
Dimensions
Highways:
Dimensions
Location
Alignment
Gradient
Appendix 5

LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "H"

Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities: NOT APPLICABLE

Construction
Location
Size
Development
Furnishing
Plans
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "F"

Development and Service to be provided or paid for by the

Municipality  NIL
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "J"

Works and Services to be Maintained and Operated by the Developer. NIL
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "A"

Performance Security:  
Performance Bond:  
Mortgage:  
Certified Cheque:  
Other:  

Amount:  
NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "L"

Item to be Provided: Constructed
Located, Developed:

Building supplies complex
and other items as in this
Contract stipulated

Date of Completion:
September 30, 1972.
March 21, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Rezoning R16-048, Development Permit DP16-034 & Development Variance Permit Application DV17-001 (Redekop Investments Group) – 7354 Wren Street

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 7354 Wren Street, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on Monday, April 3, 2017 and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

**DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5632-2017-5050(238) (R16-048 – Redekop Investments Group)**

The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into 2 single family lots fronting onto Wren Street, each a minimum of 465 square metres (5,005 sq. ft.) lot size, and 1 duplex lot fronting onto Terepocki Crescent, with a minimum of 558 square metre (6,006 sq. ft.) lot size.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:

- **Parcel Identifier:** 010-500-103
  - Lot 1 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 19303

from the **Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone** to **Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone** and **Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone**.

The location of the subject property is **7354 Wren Street** and is shown on the following maps:
The purpose of the development permit is to provide conformity to the Official Community Plan guidelines respecting building form, landscaping, signage and parking.

The requested variance is for the proposed duplex lot and seeks to vary Section 603 Residential Multiple Unit Zones, Part C. Lot Area, Subsection 1 of the Zoning Bylaw, by reducing the minimum depth of an RT465 lot from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 21.5 metres (70.5 feet).

A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3, 2017. The information is also available on our website at [www.mission.ca](http://www.mission.ca) by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Michael Younie, Corporate Officer, or email [info@mission.ca](mailto:info@mission.ca) by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email [planning@mission.ca](mailto:planning@mission.ca).

Yours truly,

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning and Development Variance Permit Application to facilitate a 3-lot subdivision

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
- Appendix 4 – Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan
- Appendix 5 – Site Plan for Proposed Development Variance Permit
- Appendix 6 – Building Envelope for Proposed Duplex Site
- Appendix 7 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 7354 Wren Street

APPLICANT: Redekop Investments Group
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Compact – Multiple Family OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: January 19, 2017
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a three (3) lot subdivision on the property located at 7354 Wren Street and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amendment Bylaw 5632-2017-5050(238) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also support the development variance permit application, which will be listed for Council consideration under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3, 2017.

SUMMARY:

Rezoning, subdivision and development variance permit applications have been received from Redekop Investments Group, applicant, for the property located at 7354 Wren Street (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to ResidentialCompact 465 (R465) Zone and Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to facilitate a three (3) lot subdivision, as shown in Appendix 3.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is approximately 1,960 square meters (0.48 acres) in size and is located in Mission’s urban area on Wren Street, north of Hillcrest Avenue. The property is designated Urban Compact – Multiple Family in the District’s Official Community Plan (OCP) and is within the R558 Zone. The property is developed with a single family dwelling. The property fronts onto two roadways, Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent. Driveway access is currently provided off of Wren Street. The applicant has indicated that the existing home is to be demolished. The subject property is relatively flat and does not contain any watercourses as indicated from the District’s mapping system.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Urban Compact – Multiple Family in the OCP and are zoned R558. The proposal for a rezoning to the RC465 Zone and RT465 Zone, as shown in Appendix 4 would accommodate the future subdivision of land into three (3) lots. The proposed RC465 Zone allows for lot sizes of a minimum 465m² (5,005 ft²) while the proposed RT465 Zone requires a minimum 558m² (6,006 ft²) in area if it is being developed for a duplex.

The OCP encourages a variety of infill residential developments. The proposed rezoning conforms to Section 2.3 Housing Choice and Quality and Section 2.4 Infill Residential of the OCP, which both support single family homes on smaller lots. The proposed rezoning is also supported by Policy 2.5.3 which allows for duplexes as a form of affordable housing through innovative housing forms.

Compact single-family residential lots and duplexes are considered to be an intensive residential development with the design managed through a Development Permit Area. An Intensive Residential Development Permit will be required for the proposed lots to manage the form and character of the development. The Intensive Residential Development Permit is delegated to staff for approval.
Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within a mature neighbourhood in Mission’s urban area. The surrounding lands are designated Urban Compact – Multiple Family in the OCP. Lands north of the subject property are within the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone. Lands to the south and east are within the R558 Zone, while the property to the west is within the Urban Residential Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone. Although the subject property is located in a mature neighbourhood, there has been some infill in the area in recent years, including the creation of four lots directly to the north within the RC465s Zone.

Servicing:

Municipal water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer are available on Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent. As such, no upgrades are required.

Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent provide paved access to the proposed lots.

Tree Retention:

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of six (6) trees, two (2) trees for each of the three (3) lots created. This condition will be met as part of the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater) that will be removed except as permitted within LAN. 32.

Parks and Trails:

The subject property is located in close proximity to Kinsmen West Park, which is approximately 925 metres to the north.

Community Amenity Contribution (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities):

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $8,445 ($2,815 per new unit) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

The application seeks to vary one Zoning Bylaw regulation in order to facilitate the subdivision. The requested variance is for proposed Lot C and seeks to vary Section 603 Residential Multiple Unit Zones, Part C. Lot Area, Subsection 1 of the Zoning Bylaw, by reducing the minimum depth of an RT465 lot from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 21.5 metres (70.5 feet), as shown in Appendix 5.

The lot is irregular in shape as the proposed north property line for Lot C completes the construction of the cul-de-sac at the termination of Terepocki Crescent. The Zoning Bylaw defines “lot depth” as the shortest distance within the lot between the front lot line and the rear lot line. As such the shortest distance happens to be 21.5 metres (70.5 feet) but the lot also reaches a maximum depth of 30.15 metres (98.9 feet). The proposed lot greatly exceeds the minimum width and would allow for a suitable duplex site as shown in Appendix 6.

Proposed Lot C exceeds the Zoning Bylaw in all other aspects of the Lot Area, as outlined in the table below. The applicant has also submitted a site plan that shows the building envelopes without any further variances to the setbacks, as shown in Appendix 6. As such, staff support the variance to
reduce the lot depth of the proposed lot as it facilitates the creation of two additional residential units and utilizes an oversized lot which would otherwise not have any potential to be created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RT465 Zone (duplex)</strong></td>
<td>558 square metres</td>
<td>16.0 metres</td>
<td>30.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6,006 square feet)</td>
<td>(52.5 feet)</td>
<td>(98.4 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Lot C</strong></td>
<td>658 square metres</td>
<td>27.78 metres</td>
<td>21.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7,083 square feet)</td>
<td>(91.1 feet)</td>
<td>(70.5 feet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNICATION:**

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted two (2) development notification signs on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties within a radius of 152 metres (500 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the *Local Government Act*

3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

**REFERRALS:**

**Engineering**

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project. Including the development variance permit, subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in *Appendix 7*.

**Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI)**

A referral to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) is necessary given the development site’s proximity to the Lougheed Highway.

**REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:**

The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve;

2. The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s (MoTI) approval of the Zoning Amending Bylaw is received; and
3. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw and Public Hearing submissions.

SIGN-OFFS:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 7354 Wren Street

PID: 010-500-103

Legal: Lot 1 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 19303
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 7354 Wren Street
Owner & Applicant: Redekop Investments Group Inc. No. BC 1086734
Zoning: R558
OCP Designation: Urban Compact - Multi Family
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4

Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan

Legend

- Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Urban Residential 558 Zone to Residential Compact 465 Zone
- Shaded area to be rezoned from Urban Residential 558 Zone to Residential Two Unit Zone
Appendix 5

Proposed Development Variance Permit

Reduction of lot depth from 30 m to 21.5 m.
**Appendix 6**

Building Envelope for Proposed Duplex Site (provided by applicant)
Appendix 7

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 7354 Wren Street

CURRENT ZONE: R558  PROPOSED ZONE: RC465 & RT465

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent.
No upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent.
No upgrades are required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent.
No upgrades are required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Wren Street and Terepocki Crescent provide paved access to the proposed lots.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, this application may proceed to adoption.

Prepared by:  
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:  
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:  
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
March 21, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

**Re: Public Hearing Notification**

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 32554, 32596 and 32598 Cherry Avenue, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at **7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 3, 2017** and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

```
DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5633-2017-5050(239) (R16-050 – Civic Consultants)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject properties into approximately twenty (20) lots of a minimum 372 square metres (4,004 square feet) lot sizes and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on proposed lots that back onto a lane.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

- Parcel Identifier: 018-332-684
  Lot B Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP11194

- Parcel Identifier: 005-742-561
  Lot 1 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377

- Parcel Identifier: 002-177-455
  Lot 2 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377

from the **Suburban 36 (S36) Zone** to **Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone** and **Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone**.

The locations of the subject properties are **32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue** and are shown on the following maps:
```
A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3, 2017. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Wesley Woo, Planner, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application and Street Naming to facilitate a 20 lot subdivision
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning Plan
Appendix 4 – Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan
Appendix 5 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue

APPLICANT: Civic Consultants
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Residential – Compact OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 14, 2017
LOCATION:
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the street naming and development application to rezone 32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue to facilitate a 20 lot subdivision and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5633-2017-5050(239) and Street Naming Bylaw 5634-2017 under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3, 2017.

SUMMARY:

Rezoning and subdivision applications have been received from Civic Consultants, applicant, for the properties located at 32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject properties from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone to facilitate a 20 lot subdivision, as shown in Appendix 3.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject site is approximately 1.2 hectares (3.0 acres) in size and is located in the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan area on Cherry Avenue, west of Cedar Street. The properties are developed each with a single family dwelling and various accessory buildings. The applicant has indicated that the existing structures are to be demolished with the development. The land is relatively flat and no watercourses are indicated from the District’s mapping system.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject properties are currently designated Urban Residential - Compact in the OCP and are zoned S36. The proposal for a rezoning to the RC465 Zone and RC372s Zone, as shown in Appendix 4 would accommodate the future subdivision of the land. The proposed RC465 Zone allows for lot sizes of a minimum of 465m² (5,005 ft²). The proposed RC372s Zone allows for lot sizes of a minimum 372 m² (4,004 ft²) and secondary dwelling units in the form of a secondary suite, coach house or garden cottage. The proposed rezoning to the RC372s Zone would only be for lots which back onto a lane, allowing for rear coach houses or detached garages as well as street parking at the front.

The proposed rezoning conforms to the OCP to provide for a variety of residential lifestyle options in Mission.

Compact single-family residential lots are considered to be an intensive residential development with the design managed through a Development Permit Area. An Intensive Residential Development Permit will be required for the proposed lots to manage the form and character of the development. The Intensive Residential Development Permit is delegated to staff for approval.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within the Cedar Valley neighbourhood. The surrounding lands to the east, west, and north are designated Urban Residential – Compact in the OCP. Although there has
been ongoing development of single family dwellings in the vicinity, lands directly west and north of
the subject site remain as suburban lots due to various challenges such as the topography and
servicing of the land. The land directly east of the subject site is developed with a single family
dwelling. Cherry Hill Elementary School is located directly south of the subject site.

Street Naming (Policy STR.28 Street Naming):
In accordance with Council Policy STR.28, street naming of one new road is required. As shown on
Appendix 3, staff recommend that the road running north-south be named Breakey Street in
honour of World War I veteran Henry Leopold Breakey, who was a 2nd Lieutenant in the 102nd
Battalion of the Royal Air Force. The westerly extensions of Lissimore Avenue and McQuarrie Lane
are also required to facilitate this development. The associated Street Naming Bylaw will address
the naming of the proposed new north-south street and the proposed westerly extensions of Lissimore
Avenue and McQuarrie Lane.

Servicing:
Municipal water and storm sewer are available on Cherry Avenue. As such, no upgrades are required.
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Cherry Avenue and is to be extended to the site. The extent
of upgrades required will be addressed at the time of subdivision. Cherry Avenue provides paved
access (open gravel shoulder) to the site. Curb and gutter, sidewalk, and ornamental street lighting
will be required at the time of subdivision. The extent of any road upgrades will be addressed at the
time of subdivision.

Tree Retention:
In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be
required to plant a total of 40 trees, two trees for each lot created. This condition will be met as part of
the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any
significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater) that will be removed except in the areas
defined as building envelope and driveways.

Parks and Trails:
The subject properties are located in close proximity to a neighbourhood park. Griner Park is
approximately 575 metres to the east of the subject properties. The pedestrian walkway currently
accessed from Cherry Avenue to Cherry Hill Elementary School will be maintained with the
development of the subdivision.

Community Amenity Contribution (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities):

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $47,855
($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the
District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

COMMUNICATION:

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has
posted two (2) development notification signs on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e.
date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties
within a radius of 152 metres (500 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act.

3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

REFERRALS:

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 5.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve; and

2. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw and Public Hearing submissions.

SIGN-OFFS:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Insert Comments.
### Appendix 1

**Information for Corporate Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address</th>
<th>PID</th>
<th>Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32554 Cherry Avenue</td>
<td>018-332-684</td>
<td>Lot B Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP11194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32596 Cherry Avenue</td>
<td>005-742-561</td>
<td>Lot 1 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32598 Cherry Avenue</td>
<td>002-177-455</td>
<td>Lot 2 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 32554, 32596, 32598 Cherry Avenue

Owner: 1068115 BC Ltd
Inc No. BC1068115

Applicant: Civic Consultants
John Haavisto

Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Urban Residential Compact
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning Plan

Rezoning from the S36 Zone to the RC465 Zone

Rezoning from the S36 Zone to the RC372s Zone
Appendix 4

Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan

Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 Zone to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling Zone

Shaded area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 Zone to Residential Compact 465 Zone
Appendix 5

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

March 7, 2017

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32554, 32596, 32598 Cherry Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: S36  PROPOSED ZONE: RC465 & RC372s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Cherry Avenue. No further upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Cherry Avenue to be extended to the site. The extent of upgrades required to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Cherry Avenue. No further upgrades are required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Cherry Avenue provides paved access (open gravel shoulder) to the site. As per District of Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985, Urban Compact OCP land use designation, curb & gutter, sidewalk and ornamental street lighting will be required at the time of subdivision. The extent of upgrades required to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

OTHER COMMENTS:

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to third reading.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
March 21, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Rezoning R16-043 & Development Variance Permit Application DV16-021 (Mani) – 7297 Wardrop Street

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 7297 Wardrop Street, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on Monday, April 3, 2017 and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

**DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5635-2017-5050(240) (R16-043 – Mani)**

The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into two (2) lots of a minimum 372 square metre (4,004 sq.ft.) lot size.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:

- Parcel Identifier: 001-621-467
- Lot 30 District Lot 165 Group 3 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24829

from the **Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone** to **Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone**.

The location of the subject property is **7297 Wardrop Street** and is shown on the following maps:
The purpose of the development variance permit is to:

a.) reduce the minimum lot depth of the north lot line of the proposed lot 1 from 30.0m (98.4 ft) to 13.984m (45.88 ft).

b.) reduce the rear yard setback for the proposed lot 2 from 7.5m (24.6 ft) to 1.2m (3.94 ft) and the exterior side yard setback from 3.0m (9.8 ft) to 0.51m (1.67 ft).

A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3, 2017. The information is also available on our website at [www.mission.ca](http://www.mission.ca) by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Michael Younie, Corporate Officer, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a 2-lot subdivision at the property located at 7297 Wardrop Street

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
- Appendix 4 – Draft Development Variance Permit DV16-021
- Appendix 5 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments
- Appendix 6 – BC Hydro Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 7297 Wardrop Street

APPLICANT: Asvind S Mani

OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Compact – Multi Family OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 22, 2016

LOCATION:
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to rezone 7297 Wardrop Street to RC372 Zone to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision, and to identify the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw. Issuance of development variance permit to reduce the lot depth of proposed lot ‘1’ is required.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3, 2017.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Asvind Mani for the property located at 7297 Wardrop Street (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Residential Compact Zone (RC372) to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision, as shown in Appendix 3.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is 913.1m² (9828.53 ft²) in size and is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Wardrop Street and Fraser Crescent. The subject property is currently developed with a single family dwelling which the applicant proposes to retain. The land slopes from north to south and there are no trees or watercourses identified on the property.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan:

The property is designated Urban Compact – Multi Family in the OCP and is zoned RT465. The rezoning to RC372 Zone conforms to the OCP specifically Policy 2.4.3. Foster infill development by considering alternative housing developments that are planned compatibly with existing neighbourhoods and that make optimal use of developable land.

Neighbourhood Character:

The property is located in the Mission Core area. The property to the west is developed with a multi-family residential development. Directly to the east is a BC Hydro High Voltage line located within the Wardrop Street road right-of-way. Access to proposed ‘lot 1’ is under the high voltage line. The properties to the north, south and east are developed with single family dwellings.

Zoning Bylaw Compliance & Development Variance Permit DV-021:

The applicant proposes to vary three sections of the Zoning Bylaw to facilitate the subdivision application. One variance related to lot dimension for Proposed lot ‘1’ and two variances to allow the existing dwelling to be retained on Proposed lot ‘2’. The variances are:
The Planning Department does not generally support such large variances; however, in this case, the variances are supportable because it facilitates in-fill development in an area with a number of constraints, including:

- adjacent multi-family development that prevents lot assembly and subsequent orderly lot development;
- a parent lot that’s irregularly shaped;
- a dwelling on the parent lot that does not meet the Zoning Bylaw requirements;
- BC Hydro ‘limit of approach’ requirements from High-Voltage power lines adjacent to the proposed lots.

Staff believe that while proposed lot 1 is unconventional in shape, in that it is wider than it is deep, this use of the land to accommodate one additional lot Zoned RC372 is the highest and best use.

Draft Development Variance Permit DV17-021 is shown in Appendix 4.

**Tree Retention:**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of four trees, two trees for each of the two lots created. This condition will be met as part of the subdivision approval. The property does not have any significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater). As a result, there is no requirement to retain existing trees.

**Community Amenity Contribution** (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities):

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $2,815 ($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

**COMMUNICATION:**

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties within a radius of 152 metres (500 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the *Local Government Act*. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RC 372 Zone</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 - New Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum - Lot Depth (North Lot line)</td>
<td>30.0m (98.4 ft.)</td>
<td>13.984 (45.88 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 - Existing Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft.)</td>
<td>1.2m (3.94 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>3.0m (9.8 ft.)</td>
<td>0.51m (1.67 ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

REFERRALS:

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 5.

BC Hydro

BC Hydro has no objection to the application provided the property owner obtains written permission from them prior to constructing anything within 10m of the transmission lines. The applicant has supplied written permission which states no objection to the proposed subdivision provided that the minimum ‘limit of approach’ from powerlines is maintained (Appendix 6). Additional correspondence states the minimum ‘limit of approach’ is 3.0m; however, BC Hydro recommends an additional 2.5m, for a total of 5.5m.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve.
2. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

SIGN-OFFS:

Ken Bourdeau, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
CAO Reviewed.
## Appendix 1

### Information for Corporate Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address:</th>
<th>7297 Wardrop Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID:</td>
<td>001-621-467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>Lot 30 District Lot 165 Group 3 Section 20, Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 7297 Wardrop Street
Owner & Applicant: Asvind S Mani
Zoning: RT465
OCP Designation: Urban Compact - Multi-Family
Appendix 3

SKETCH PLAN SHOWING PROPOSED SUBDIVISION OF
LOT 30 DL 165 G 3 SEC 20 TP 17 NWD PLAN 24829

SCALE 1 : 250
DISTANCES ARE IN METRES

LEGEND
×D  Denotes spot elevation
CB  Denotes catch basin
FH  Denotes fire hydrant
GU  Denotes guy wire
MH  Denotes manhole
PP  Denotes power pole
WV  Denotes water valve

DERIVATIONS
Elevations are in metres and are derived from
District of Mission Geodetic Benchmark NB-47A (fire hydrant at north cap nut)
located at the intersection of Wardrop and 2nd Avenue.
Elevation = 23.138

Property Line definition is according to field survey
and land title office records.

PARCEL "A"
(Plan with bylaw filed 36114) of
LOT 9 PLAN 9880

FRASER CRESCENT
PLAN 16441

PREPARED BY: DARRYL J. MITCHELL, BCLS
8TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2014

District of Mission
ARVIND MANI
7297 WARDROP STREET

AXIS LAND SURVEYING LTD.
B.C. & CANADA LANDS SURVEYORS
101, 32855 VENTURA AVENUE
ABBOTSFORD, B.C. V2S 6A3
T: 604-853-2700 F: 604-853-2719
FILE: A 48119
DWG: 4819-9-SUB-SKETCH
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DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV17-002

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: Asvind S Mani
32809 Lougheed Highway, Mission, BC V2V 1B1

as the registered owner (hereinafter referred to as the Permittee) and shall only apply to ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the Municipality of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and more particularly known and described as:

Parcel Identifier: 001-621-467
Lot 30 District Lot 165 Group 3 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24829

1. The said lands are zoned Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone pursuant to “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009” as amended.

2. “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw” as amended is hereby varied in respect of the said lands as follows:

   (a) To vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 505-2009, Section 601, Part C. Lot Area, Subsection 1, by reducing the minimum lot depth from 30.0m (98.4ft.) to 13.984m (45.88ft.) for proposed lot ‘1’ and;

   (b) To vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 505-2009, Section 601, Part D. Setbacks, Subsection 1, by reducing the minimum rear yard setback from 7.5m (24.6 ft.) to 1.2m (3.94 ft.) for the existing dwelling on proposed lot ‘2’ and;

   (c) To vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 505-2009, Section 601, Part D. Setbacks, Subsection 1, by reducing the minimum exterior side yard setback from 3.0m (9.8 ft.) to 0.51m (1.67 ft.) for the existing dwelling on proposed lot ‘2’.

3. This Permit does not constitute a subdivision approval or a building permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. [Click here to type resolution number] passed by the Council on the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month], [Click here to type year].

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Development Variance Permit is hereby issued by the Municipality signed by the Mayor and the Corporate Officer the [Click here to type year] day of [Click here to type year], [Click here to type year].
Appendix 4

Draft Development Variance Permit DV16-021

Randy Hawes,  
MAYOR

------------------------------------------------------

Michael Younie,  
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV17-021
CIVIC ADDRESS: 7297 Wardrop Street

CURRENT ZONE: RT465  PROPOSED ZONE: RC372

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Wardrop Street and Fraser Crescent.
No upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Wardrop Street and Fraser Crescent.
No upgrades are required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Wardrop Street and Fraser Crescent.
No upgrades are required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Wardrop Street and Fraser Crescent provide paved access to the site.
No upgrades are required.

OTHER COMMENTS:

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to third reading.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
February 17, 2017

32809 Lougheed Hwy
Mission, BC V2V 1B1

Attention: Mani Asvind

RE: Development Application for 7297 Wardrop Street, Mission (the “Property”)

BC Hydro’s works do not physically cross the Property, but are adjacent to the Property, within road allowance.

BC Hydro wishes to ensure that building permits do not get issued that allow for encroachment of buildings into the safety clearance zones required around existing bare utility conductors. Accordingly, the following comments are for the property owner's information:

1. It is the responsibility of the Architect and Electrical Engineer of Record (EEOR) to ensure compliance with the Canadian Electrical Code (CEC), Canadian Safety Association (CSA) and WorkSafe BC (WSBC). The CEC, CSA and WSBC stipulate minimum clearances of powerlines and equipment from buildings for safety and safe working clearances (Limits of Approach).

2. If the developer or property owner wishes to relocate BC Hydro’s existing powerline and/or works, BC Hydro will work with the developer or property owner to find a solution satisfactory to all parties involved.

Please contact me by telephone at 604-543-1592 or email at mackenzie.wells@bchydro.com if you have any questions.

Yours truly,
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority
By:

Mackenzie Wells,
Property Coordinator
Property Rights Services
March 21, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Rezoning Application R16-034 & Development Permit Application DP16-023
(Tiegen & Toor) – 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 3, 2017 and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5636-2017-5050(241) (R16-034 – Tiegen & Toor)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the subject properties resulting in up to a maximum of 36 lots of a minimum 372 square metre (4,004 square foot) lot size.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described properties:

Parcel Identifier: 009-384-481
Lot 3 Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16442

Parcel Identifier: 013-373-919
Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 12952) of Parcel “A” (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District

Parcel Identifier: 007-791-062
Parcel “A” (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 Except: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 12952), New Westminster District

from the Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue and are shown on the following maps:
The purpose of the development permit is to provide conformity to the Official Community Plan guidelines respecting building form, landscaping, signage and parking.

A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3, 2017. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching "upcoming public hearing".

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Marcy Bond, Senior Planner, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

Marcy Bond
MANAGER OF PLANNING

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Marcy Bond, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application R13-034 for the properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue to facilitate the creation of up to 36 single family lots under the Residential Compact RC372 zone.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Conceptual Plan of Subdivision
- Appendix 4 – Topography and Watercourse Map
- Appendix 5 - Street Naming
- Appendix 6 - Engineering Department Comments
- Appendix 7 – Mission Fire/Rescue Service Comments
- Appendix 8 – Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue
APPLICANT: Jason Tiegen & Gary Toor
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Compact Multiple Family OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 27, 2017
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the rezoning application for the properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue and identifies the necessary amendments to the Zoning Bylaw to allow for up to thirty-six (36) single family lots under the proposed Residential Compact 372 (RC372) zone.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw and associated Street Naming Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3, 2017.

SUMMARY

A development application has been received from Analytical Consulting on behalf of the property owners Gary Toor and Jason Tiegen. The application relates to the development of the properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue (Appendix 2). The application includes the proposal to rezone the properties to allow for up to thirty-six (36) compact single-family lots with a minimum lot size of 372 square metres (4004 square feet). The conceptual plan of subdivision is provided as reference in Appendix 3.

Specifically, the rezoning application seeks to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by rezoning the properties from:

- Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC723) zone.

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the properties’ Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Urban Compact – Multiple Family.

Development permits are required as part of this application; the first is an Intensive Residential Development Permit and the second is a Geotechnical Hazard Lands Development Permit; both of which are approved by the Director of Development Services and as such do not require Council approval.

While it is understood that there may be additional variances required to the Zoning Bylaw and the Subdivision Control Bylaw with respect to the ultimate lot and road configuration, the developer is still working on completing and submitting outstanding information required to finalize the subdivision plan. Once all of the information is received and reviewed by staff, a subsequent report may be provided to Council to address any additional variances the developer is requesting. That being said, the general lot and road configuration is supported by staff.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The site consists of three properties totalling approximately 3.50 hectares (8.66 acres). The development site is located at the east terminating end of Prentis Avenue (Appendix 2). There are currently three dwellings on the property, all of which will be removed as part of the development.

The property has varying topography, with some steep slopes and one watercourse at the north end of the property as shown on Appendix 4.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009):

The subject properties are currently zoned Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone which have a minimum lot size requirement of 0.7 hectares (1.72 acres). Considering the properties’ OCP designation of Urban...
Compact-Multiple Family, the applicant proposes to rezone the entire site to the Residential Compact (RC372) 372 Zone, which is consistent with the OCP designation and will allow for lots with a minimum size of 372 square metres (4,004 square feet). As noted, the rezoning is to allow subdivision of the properties into approximately thirty-six (36) fee simple single family lots (Appendix 4).

The RC372 Zone states, “where possible all RC372 zoned lots should be developed with Detached Garages with access from a lane”. While staff encourage the development of lanes on lots zoned RC372, there are certain situations where lanes may not be appropriate. The installation of lanes for this development site would be a challenge due to configuration of the development site, topography, environmental encumbrances, and the location of the development at the terminus of a road which has no future road connectivity nor further development potential of the lands beyond.

To offset the relaxation on having to provide lanes, the developer offered that a majority of the lots would be no less than 14 metres wide. The conceptual plan of subdivision shows that twenty-seven (27) of the thirty-six (36) lots have widths of no less than 14 metres wide; the required lot width under the RC372 zone is 12 metres. Those lots that are not 14 metres wide meet the lot width requirement of the RC372 zone and are large oversized lots under the RC372 zone. The increased width of the lot is important to note as this would allow for adequate fronting garages where otherwise a lane would have addressed this concern.

Buildings must also be setback 6.0 metres (19.68 feet) from the established Stream Side Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA). If building envelope setbacks of 6.0 metres are not achievable, then the developer will require development variance permit approval for this relaxation.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Character

Although the surrounding properties are designated as Urban Compact-Multiple Family in the OCP, the location of the development site, at the end of Prentis Avenue, combined with the topography and watercourse isolates this development from other lands to the north designated Urban Compact-Multiple Family.

Access

Prentis Avenue provides the only access into the development site. An internal road within the development will to be constructed with a cul-de-sac at each end of the development.

Road Alignment

The existing Prentis Avenue road dedication and the new extension of Prentis Avenue road dedication do not appear to align according to the conceptual plan of subdivision. The road configuration and alignment will need to be addressed to the satisfaction of the District Engineer and the Approving Officer prior to subdivision approval. If any variances are required to the subdivision control bylaw this would necessitate a development variance permit for Council’s consideration.

Servicing

The Engineering Department comments are attached as Appendix 6 and detail the specific requirements as part of this application. However, there are other servicing concerns are highlighted as follows:
**Sewer Capacity**

As part of the development application, the Engineering Department required the developer to investigate the capacity of the sanitary sewer system for the development. The modelling undertaken for the sanitary sewer system determined that any development beyond the creation of thirty-six (36) single family lots would trigger approximately $2.3 million worth of upgrades to the downstream sanitary sewer system.

The proposed lot configuration has taken into account the servicing capacity limits of the site. Thus, there is no opportunity for allowing secondary dwelling units in this development at this time. As well, no rezoning to allow for secondary dwelling units will be considered by Council until such time as the downstream sanitary sewer service has been upgraded. The developer has agreed to the registration of a Section 219 restrictive covenant registered on the title of each lot, prohibiting future rezoning to allow secondary dwelling units until such time that the downstream sanitary sewer service has been ungraded.

**Sidewalks**

As part of a negotiated agreement with the developer, they will be extending the sidewalks from the east side of Prentis at the Heritage Park School all the way into the proposed development at the new proposed terminus of Prentice Avenue.

**Environmental Protection**

There is one water course located within the development site, at the north end of the property, at the bottom of a steep ravine. The developer has submitted a Riparian Area Assessment report identifying a 10 metre wide SPEA setback to protect the watercourse. The SPEA will be protected with a Section 219 covenant and signage.

**Geohazard Hazard Assessment**

Due to the steep topography of the site, a Landslide Hazard Assessment will be required as part of subdivision. The assessment report must address whether the lots with slope greater than 33% are safe for the use intended and whether the lots with slopes greater than 33% are meeting the lot area, width and depth requirements as per the zoning bylaw. If any of these requirements cannot be achieved, then a development variance permit will be required. The landslide hazard assessment will need to identify a safe building envelope on each lot prior to approval of the subdivision.

**Tree Retention**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, where a development involves the creation of ten (10) or more lots the tree retention/replanting proposals must be reported to and approved by Council.

Pursuant to LAN 32, a subsequent report to council will be required for approval of the tree retention and replanting proposal.

**STREET NAMING** (Policy STR.28 – Street Naming)

That in accordance with Section 39 of the Community Charter and Council Policy Street Naming STR.28, a bylaw be prepared to provide a name for one road extension and one new internal road as shown on Appendix 5 as follows:

1. Road extending off of Prentis Avenue as the logical extension of Prentis Avenue;
2. Road intersecting with Prentis Avenue extending east and west be named Tooley Place.

Tooley Place is named after John and Ellen Tooley. John and Ellen Tooley were long-time residents of Mission. John Tooley was born in 1878 and died in 1948. Ellen was born in 1858 and died in 1933.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP16-023

Compact residential development on lands designated Urban Compact – Multiple Family require an “Intensive Residential Development Permit”. The OCP establishes guidelines for the form and character of intensive residential development by facilitating a higher standard of building design, housing alternative, site compatibility and site aesthetics that promote the important quality of a vibrant residential neighbourhood.

The applicant is required to register a covenant to ensure that the proposed residential buildings meet the adopted Intensive Residential Development Permit Guidelines, as outlined in the OCP.

Intensive Residential Development Permits are delegated to the Director of Development Services, thus, no approval from Council is required.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

As there is outstanding information related to the road and lot configuration, staff are unable to determine if additional variances would be required to facilitate the development. Once all of the information has been submitted and reviewed, staff will determine if variances permits need to be considered and approved by Council.

COMMUNITY AMENITY CONTRIBUTION (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities)

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $2,815 per new lot or unit to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development. Provided a public hearing date is determined by Council, the sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e., date, time and place). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 152 metres (500 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages

A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.

Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act.
REFERRALS

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 6.

Mission Fire/Rescue Service

The Mission Fire/Rescue Service has no objection to the project subject to the completion of the requirements outlined in Appendix 7.

Parks, Recreation and Culture

The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objection to the proposed rezoning of the lots on Prentis Avenue. The comments from the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department are attached as Appendix 8.

However, the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has indicated that there are a number of details that need to be addressed related to trail access and potential conflicts with the existing Crown land trials and the need to develop a future trail access from Prentis Avenue.

The developer will be required to work with the Planning Department and the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department to address these concerns as part of the subdivision approval process. This may necessitate the need for an additional report to Council.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING

The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. The community amenity contribution that has been volunteered in the amount of $2,815 per new unit or lot is received.

2. The servicing requirements, as outlined in Appendix 6, have been addressed to the satisfaction of the District Engineer.

3. Any other requirements resulting from Council's consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

SIGN-OFFS

Marcy Bond, Senior Planner

Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed..
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 33904 Prentis Avenue
PID: 013-373-919
Legal: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 12952) of Parcel “A” (Reference Plan 6080) North West quarter Section 22 Township 17, New Westminster District

Civic Address: 33880 Prentis Avenue
PID: 009-384-481
Legal: Lot 3, Section 22, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 16442

Civic Address: 33930 Prentis Avenue
PID: 007-791-062
Legal: Parcel “A” Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter, Section 22, Township 17, Except: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 12592), New Westminster District
Appendix 2

Applicant: Jason Tiegen & Gary Toor
Subject Property: 33880 Prentis Avenue
Owner: Chutter Developments Ltd
Subject Property: 33904 Prentis Avenue
Owner: Barry Hammond & Gillilan Pender
Subject Property: 33930 Prentis Avenue
Owner: 512602 BC Ltd
Zoning: RR7
OCP Designation: Urban Compact - Multi Family
CIVIC ADDRESS: 33880, 33904, & 33930 Prentis Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: RR7   PROPOSED ZONE: RC372

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Prentis Avenue and is to be extended to the site.
The extent of upgrades required is to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Prentis Avenue and is to be extended to the site.
The extent of upgrades required is to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Prentis Avenue and is to be extended to the site.
The extent of upgrades required is to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Prentis Avenue provides paved access (open gravel shoulder) to the site.
As per District of Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985, Urban Compact OCP land use designation, curb & gutter, sidewalk and ornamental street lighting will be required at the time of subdivision.
The extent of upgrades required is to be addressed at the time of subdivision.

OTHER COMMENTS:

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to third reading.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
To: Monica Stuart  
From: Assistant Fire Chief, Odenbach  
Date: September 30, 2016  

Subject: 33880, 33904, 33930 Prentis Avenue, Mission B.C.

Fire Department Access to Buildings:

Under section 9.10.20.3 of the BC Building Code access to a building must be provided by means of a roadway, or yard, the design and location of such roadway or yard, shall take into account connection with public thoroughfares, weight of fire fighting equipment, width of roadway, radius of curves, overhead clearances, location of hydrants, location of fire department connection and vehicular parking.

Appendix A. - A-3.2.5.6.(1) Fire Department Access Route:

The design and construction of the fire department access routes involves the consideration of many variables, some of which are specific in the requirements of the code. All these variables should be considered in relation to the type and size of fire department vehicles available in the municipality or area where the building will be constructed. It is appropriate, therefore, that the local fire department be consulted prior to the design and construction of access routes.

Appendix A. - A-9.10.20.3.(1) Fire department Access Route Modification:

In addition to other considerations taken into account in the planning of fire department access routes, special variation could be permitted for a house or residential building that is protected with an automatic sprinkler system. The sprinkler system must be designed in accordance with the appropriate National Fire Protection Association (NFPA 13 & 13R) standard and there must be assurance that water supply pressure and quantity are unlikely to fail. The considerations could apply to buildings that are located on the sides of hills and are not conveniently accessible by roads designed for fire fighting equipment and also to infill housing that are located behind other buildings on a given property.

Other than the items noted above the Fire Department has no further comments.

Blaine Odenbach  
Assistant Fire Chief  
Emergency Planning/Fire Prevention  
Mission Fire/Rescue Service  
604-302-0300
REZONING & SUBDIVISION APPLICATION COMMENTS

DISTRICT OF MISSION PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Original Referral Date: September 26, 2016

Subsequent Referral Date: March 2, 2017

Subject Properties: 33880, 33904, 33930 Prentis Avenue

Legal Descriptions:

(33880 Prentis) Parcel Identifier: 009-384-481
Lot 3 Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16442

(33904 Prentis) Parcel Identifier: 013-373-919
Parcel "One" (Reference Plan 12952) of Parcel "A" (Reference Plan 6090) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District

(33930 Prentis) Parcel Identifier: 007-791-062
Parcel "A" (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 Except: Parcel "One" (Reference Plan 12952), New Westminster District

File Number: S16-029

# of Proposed Lots: 36 lots

The Parks, Recreation & Culture Department have no objections to the proposed rezoning of the lots on Prentis as circulated. There are however a number of details that need to be addressed related to trail access and potential conflicts with the existing Crown land trails and the need to develop a future trail access from Prentis Avenue.

Signed: __

Date: March 7, 2017
March 21, 2017

Dear Owner/Occupant:

**Re: Public Hearing Notification**

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 33759 Ferndale Avenue, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. on **April 3, 2017** and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

**DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5638-2017-5050(243) (R16-047-Pankratz)**

**The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house on the subject property.**

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:

- Parcel Identifier: 010-205-403
- Lot “D” Section 34 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16754

from the **Rural 16 (RU16) Zone** to the **Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone**.

The location of the subject property is **33759 Ferndale Avenue** and is shown on the following maps:
A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, March 24, 2017 to Monday, April 3, 2017. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Wesley Woo, Planner, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: March 20, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Heidi Lam, Planning Technician
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house at the property located at 33759 Ferndale Avenue
ATTACHMENTS:
   Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
   Appendix 2 – Location Map
   Appendix 3 – Site Plan of the Proposed Coach House
   Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33759 Ferndale Avenue
APPLICANT: Douglas Pankratz
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Rural Residential OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: March 1, 2017
LOCATION:
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details an application to rezone the property located 33759 Ferndale Avenue to allow for a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 3, 2017.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Douglas and Jennifer Pankratz, property owners, seeking to allow the construction of a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house at 33759 Ferndale Avenue. To authorize the coach house, a rezoning of the property from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone is required.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is approximately 4047 m² (1 acre) in size, and is located west of Stave Lake Street and north of Ferndale Avenue in the Ferndale area (Appendix 2). The property is designated Rural Residential in the District’s Official Community Plan (OCP) and is zoned RU16 Zone. As a secondary dwelling is not a permitted use in the RU16 Zone, a rezoning to the RR7s Zone is required.

The property is currently developed with a single family dwelling in the southwest corner of the site. The proposed coach house would be located to the northwest side of the single family dwelling (Appendix 3).

PLANNING ANALYSIS:

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The applicant proposes to rezone the property to RR7s Zone to allow for a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house. The Site Plan for the proposed coach house indicates a floor space of 110 square metres (1,184 square feet) which falls within the maximum allowable floor space for a secondary dwelling in a Rural Residential Zone. The Inspection Services Division will ensure that the proposed secondary suite meets all of the BC Building Code requirements, including fire separation, during the building permit review and plan check process.

The proposed rezoning conforms to Section 2.3 Housing Choice and Quality and Section 2.4 Infill Residential, which both support single family residences with secondary dwelling units such as a coach house. The OCP also supports secondary suites as it provides affordable and rental housing within the District.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within a rural residential neighbourhood comprised mostly of single family dwellings. Lands surrounding the property are all within the RR7 Zone, and are designated Rural Residential within the OCP.

It is believed that the rezoning of this property to allow for a coach house will have little or no impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. Typically, complaints that arise from secondary dwelling relate to inadequate off-street parking. This proposal meets the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning
Bylaw.

Servicing:
No municipal sanitary service is available to the property. The property owner will be required to provide confirmation from a Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioner (ROWP) that an onsite sewage treatment system can be installed to accommodate all discharge from the coach house.

Municipal water is available on Ferndale Avenue. The property owner has requested for a connection to municipal water for the proposed coach house and the Engineering Department has no objection.

COMMUNICATION:
In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:
1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e., date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties within a radius of 500 metres (1,640 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.
2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act
3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

REFERRALS:
Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the project as outlined in Appendix 4.

REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING
Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:
1. Any requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including public hearing; and
2. Confirmation that a septic system can be installed to service the proposed coach house.

SIGN-OFFS:

Heidi Lam, Planning Technician

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 33759 Ferndale Avenue

PID: 010-205-403

Legal: Lot “D” Section 34 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16754
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 33759 Ferndale Avenue
Owner: Douglas & Jennifer Pankratz
Applicant: Douglas Pankratz
Zoning: RU16
OCP Designation: Rural Residential
Appendix 3

Site Plan of the Proposed Coach House
Appendix 4
Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

March 1, 2017

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33759 Ferndale Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: RU16  PROPOSED ZONE: RU16s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water service is available on Ferndale Avenue.
Connection to the municipal system is not required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
No municipal sanitary services are available.
The applicant must provide a report from a septic engineer stating that the existing or proposed septic field can accommodate the proposed development.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
No municipal storm services are available. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Ferndale Avenue provides paved access to the site. No upgrades are required.

OTHER COMMENTS:
According to the draft plan submitted May 3, 2016; it appears as though the existing septic field may prevent access to the proposed location of the coach home. Should the applicants require a new driveway connection on to Ferndale Avenue, they must apply for it and will be subject to provisions of Highway Access Bylaw 1705-1987.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to adoption once the sanitary requirements have been met.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
Minutes of the Joint Shared Services Committee meeting held January 19, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 530 of Abbotsford City Hall

JSSC Members Present: Councillor Plecas (Mission) (Chair); Mayor Braun (Abbotsford); Councillor Barkman (Abbotsford); Councillor Hamilton (Mission); Councillor Hinds (Mission); Councillor Siemens (Abbotsford)

Council Present: Councillor Alexis (Mission)

Staff Present: City Manager – G. Murray (Abbotsford); Chief Administrative Officer – R. Poole (Mission); General Manager, Engineering and Regional Utilities – P. Sparanese (Abbotsford); Director of Engineering and Public Works – T. Kyle (Mission); Director, Utility Operations – T. Henry; (Abbotsford); Director, Infrastructure Planning – P. Irani (Abbotsford); Acting Director of Finance – K. Basatia (Abbotsford); Director of Finance – K. Boland (Mission); Senior Engineering, Drainage and Wastewater – S. Chiu (Abbotsford); Water Quality & Resource Coordinator – A. Peters (Abbotsford); Manager, Water Supply – J. McAuley (Abbotsford); Engineering Hydraulic Network Specialist – J. Cowburn (Abbotsford); Director of Development Services – D. Sommer (Mission); Manager of Environmental Services – B. Azevedo (Mission); and Administrative Manager – R. Brar (Abbotsford)

Public Present: 8

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Councillor Plecas was elected as the Chair of the Joint Shared Services Committee for 2017 and Councillor Barkman for 2018.

Councillor Barkman was elected as the Vice-Chair of the Joint Shared Services Committee for 2017.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

.1 Minutes of the November 10, 2016 Meeting

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Mayor Braun, that the minutes of the Joint Shared Services Committee meeting held November 10, 2016, be adopted.

JSSC 01-2017

CARRIED.

3. PRESENTATIONS

None.
4. **DELEGATIONS**

.1 S. Chan, Manager of Engineering and Infrastructure, Fraser Valley Regional District, regarding FVRD/Hatzic Lake Service Area Request (5600-01/Joint)

S. Chan, Manager of Engineering and Infrastructure, Fraser Valley Regional District presented a powerpoint presentation regarding FVRD/Hatzic Lake Service Area request; Project Background; Water System Overview; and Next Steps.

Moved by Mayor Braun, seconded by Councillor Hinds, that the delegation of S. Chan, Manager of Engineering and Infrastructure, Fraser Valley Regional District, regarding FVRD/Hatzic Lake Service Area Request and Report No. JSSC 068-2016 dated November 25, 2016 from the Engineering Hydraulic Network Specialist, regarding the request for Water Local Service Agreement for Hatzic Lake East, be received for information; (1) the Abbotsford Mission Water and Sewer Commission approve a water connection to the Regional system and direct staff to draft and execute an acceptable water local service agreement (agreement) between the Abbotsford Mission Water and Sewer Commission and the Fraser Valley Regional District; and (2) the agreement be forwarded to the individual Councils for approval.

**JSSC 02-2017**

CARRIED.

5. **BUSINESS OUT OF MINUTES**

None.

6. **REPORTS**

.1 **TRANSIT**

None.

.2 **RECYCLING**

None.

.3 **ABBOTSFORD MISSION WATER AND SEWER COMMISSION**

.1 Bi-monthly JAMES Plant Report – November/December 2016 (5500-90)

Moved by Councillor Barkman, seconded by Councillor Hinds, that Report No. JSSC 069-2016, dated December 6, 2016, from the Director, Utility Operations, regarding Bi-monthly JAMES Plant Report - November/December 2016, be received for information.

**JSSC 03-2017**

CARRIED.
2 Bi-monthly Water Report – November/December 2016 (5600-00)


JSSC 04-2017 CARRIED.

3 Financial Statements – November 2016 (1830-01)

Moved by Councillor Barkman, seconded by Mayor Braun, that Report No. JSSC 070-2016, dated December 8, 2016, from the Acting Director, Finance (Abbotsford), regarding Financial Statements - November 2016, be received for information.

JSSC 05-2017 CARRIED.

4 Update on the Amendment Application for the Bevan Avenue Wells Environmental Certificate (5600-30)

Moved by Mayor Braun, seconded by Councillor Siemens, that Report No. JSSC 063-2016 dated January 4, 2017 from the Water Quality & Resource Coordinator, regarding the Update on the Amendment Application for the Bevan Avenue Wells Environmental Certificate, be received for information.

JSSC 06-2017 CARRIED.

5 Sewer Savvy – Follow-up (5550-00)

Moved by Councillor Barkman, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, that Report No. JSSC 065-2016, dated November 22, 2016, from the Senior Engineer, Drainage and Wastewater, regarding Sewer Savvy – Follow-up, be received for information.

JSSC 07-2016 CARRIED.

7 NEW BUSINESS

None.
8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Hinds, that the January 19, 2017, JSSC meeting, be adjourned. (9:27 a.m.).

**JSSC 08-2017**

**CARRIED.**

_Councilor Danny Plecas_,
JSSC Chair

_Certified Correct:
Peter Sparanese_,
UMC Chair
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5644-2017-5050(247)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission
Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5644-2017-5050(247)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 8351 McTaggart Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 029-981-328
      Lot 58 District Lot 476 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan
      EPP66405
      from Urban Residential 669 (R669) Zone to Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of ___, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRIBUTION OF MISSION

BYLAW 5622-2017-4052(47)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, adopt one or more community plans for one or more areas;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council deems it desirable and in the public interest to further amend the Official Community Plan Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5622-2017-4052(47)]."

2. "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) redesignating the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and legally described as:

      Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762
      Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

      Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007
      Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35466: Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 23197

      Parcel Identifier: 029-781-124
      Lot A, Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan EPP57128

      from Urban Residential Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact; and

   b) amending the official community plan maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017

COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF SECTION 477 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT given this 20th day of March, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING held this _ day of ___, 2017

READ A SECOND TIME this _ day of ___, 2017

READ A THIRD TIME this _ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5623-2017-5050(232)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5623-2017-5050(232)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 009-242-007 Lot 2 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 35446; Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23197
      Parcel Identifier: 017-711-762 Lot 1 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590
      Parcel Identifier: 017-711-771 Lot 2 South Half of the North West Quarter Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP3590

      from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone, as shown on Appendix A attached to and forming part of this bylaw; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR
MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5625-2017-5050(233)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the properties located at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 004-639-561
      Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876

      Parcel Identifier: 004-639-570
      Lot 4 Except Part on SRW Plan LMP24377, Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8282

      Parcel Identifier: 004-639-596
      Lot 5, Except Part on SRW Plan LMP 24377, Section 17, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 8282

      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
WHEREAS Council of the District of Mission, under Section 137 of the Community Charter, has the power to amend or repeal bylaws;

AND WHEREAS Council of the District of Mission, under Section 546 of the Local Government Act, has the power to amend, modify or discharge Land Use Contracts;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission did, on the 7th day of October, 1975 enact a bylaw cited as "District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 455-1975";

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5626-2017”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and Mission Builders Market Limited, for the property legally described as:

   Parcel Identifier: 004-639-561
   Lot 29 Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 40876

   is hereby discharged.


READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017

READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING HELD this ___ day of ___, 2017

READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017

APPROVED BY THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE this ___ day of ______, 2017

ADOPTED THIS ___ day of ___, 2017

__________________________  ______________________________
RANDY HAWES, MAYOR       MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5632-2017-5050(238)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission
Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5632-2017-5050(238)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 7354 Wren Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 010-500-103
      Lot 1 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 19303
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone for the western portion of the property; and
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone for the eastern portion of the property, as shown on Schedule A attached to and forming part of this bylaw; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE A

Legend

- Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Urban Residential 558 Zone to Residential Compact 465 Zone
- Shaded area to be rezoned from Urban Residential 558 Zone to Residential Two Unit Zone
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5633-2017-5050(239)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5633-2017-5050(239)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

a) rezoning the properties located at 32554, 32596 and 32598 Cherry Avenue and legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 018-332-684
Lot B Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP11194

Parcel Identifier: 005-742-561
Lot 1 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377

Parcel Identifier: 002-177-455
Lot 2 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 59377

from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone for the western and southern portions of the properties; and

from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone for the north-eastern portions of the properties, as shown on Schedule A attached to and forming part of this bylaw; and

b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017

READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of __, 2017

READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of __, 2017
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR           MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE A

Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 Zone to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling Zone

Shaded area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 Zone to Residential Compact 465 Zone
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5635-2017-5050(240)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5635-2017-5050(240)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 7297 Wardrop Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 001-621-467
      Lot 30 District Lot 165 Group 3 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24829
      from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5636-2017-5050(241)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5636-2017-5050(241)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the properties located at 33880, 33904, and 33930 Prentis Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 009-384-481
      Lot 3 Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 16442
      Parcel Identifier: 013-373-919
      Parcel "One" (Reference Plan 12952) of Parcel "A" (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 New Westminster District
      Parcel Identifier: 007-791-062
      Parcel "A" (Reference Plan 6080) North West Quarter Section 22 Township 17 Except: Parcel "One" (Reference Plan 12952), New Westminster District
      from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR                     MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide
the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning
Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public
interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS
AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw
   5638-2017-5050(243)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended
   by:

   a) rezoning the property located at 33759 Ferndale Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 010-205-403
      Lot “D” Section 34 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
      16754
      from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2017
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2017
DISTRICT OF MISSION

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY
BYLAW 5560-2016

A Bylaw for the administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

WHEREAS, a local government:

a) must designate a person or group of persons as the head of the municipality for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act; and

b) may set any fees the municipality requires to be paid under section 75 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1.0 CITATION

This Bylaw may be cited as the "District of Mission Freedom of Information Bylaw 5560-2016".

2.0 DEFINITIONS

2.1 The definitions contained in schedule 1 of the Act shall apply to this Bylaw.

2.2 In this Bylaw:


“Applicant” means a person requesting a record under section 5 of the Act.

“Commercial Applicant” means a person requesting a record under section 5 of the Act for the purpose of doing business and whose primary purpose is connected with or engaged in commerce.

“Coordinator” means the person designated in section 3.2 of this Bylaw as the Information and Privacy Coordinator.

“Council” means the current Mayor and Council Members of the District.

“District” means the District of Mission.

“Request” means a written request under section 5 of the Act.
3.0 ADMINISTRATION

3.1 The Council shall designate the Corporate Officer to be the Head for the purposes of the Act.

3.2 The Council shall designate the Deputy Corporate Officer to be the Information and Privacy Coordinator.

4.0 POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR

4.1 The Coordinator must perform the duties and exercise all the functions of the Head under the Act as summarized in section 5 of this Bylaw.

4.2 The Coordinator must comply with an order of the Information and Privacy Commissioner whose powers are outlined in section 42 to 44 of the Act.

4.3 The Coordinator must refuse to disclose information to an Applicant if the disclosure is prohibited or restricted by or under another act.

5.0 RESPONDING TO REQUESTS

Duty to Assist Applicants

5.1 The Coordinator shall make every reasonable effort to assist Applicants and respond to Requests, without delay, in an open, accurate and complete manner.

Contents of Response

5.2 a) The Coordinator shall provide a response to the Applicant which includes information as to whether or not the Applicant is entitled to access the record, or part of the record, and, if applicable, where, when and how access will be given.

b) If the Applicant is not entitled to access the record the Coordinator will provide the reasons for the refusal and the provision of the Act upon which the refusal is based. The Coordinator will also provide their name, title, business address and business telephone number and advise the Applicant they may ask for a review of the decision under section 52 of the Act.

Means of Access to Requested Information

5.3 If the Act allows the Applicant access to the requested record, or part of the requested record, the Coordinator may provide:

a) a photocopy of the record, or part of the record, if requested by the Applicant;

b) a copy of the record, or part of the record, saved to CD or DVD, if requested by the Applicant; or

c) an opportunity to examine the record, or part of the record, if requested by the Applicant or if the record cannot reasonably be copied.
Notification

5.4 The Coordinator:
   a) must give written notice to the third party and the Applicant if he intends to give access to a record that contains information that may be excepted from disclosure under section 21 or 22 of the Act; and
   b) may give written notice to a third party if he does not intend to give access to a record that contains information excepted from disclosure under section 21 or 22 of the Act.

Public Interest

5.5 As per section 25 of the Act, the Coordinator must, without delay, disclose to the public, to an affected group of people or to an Applicant, information:
   a) about a risk of significant harm to the environment or to the health or safety of the public or a group of people, or
   b) the disclosure of which is, for any other reason, clearly in the public interest.

6.0 FEES

6.1 An Applicant making a Request for a record shall pay the District the applicable fees as set out in Schedule 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Regulation, B.C. Reg. 155/2012, O.C. 491/2012 for the purposes of:
   a) locating, retrieving and producing the record;
   b) preparing the record for disclosure;
   c) shipping and handling the record; and
   d) providing a copy of the record.

6.2 An Applicant making a Request for a record shall not be required to pay a fee for:
   a) their own personal information;
   b) the first 3 hours spent locating and retrieving a record; or
   c) the time spent severing information from a record.

6.3 If an Applicant is required to pay a fee for services under section 6.1 of this Bylaw, the District:
   a) must give the Applicant a written estimate of the total fee before providing the service; and
   b) may require the Applicant to pay a deposit in the amount set by the Head.

7.0 PROTECTION OF INFORMATION

The District must protect personal information in its custody or under its control by making reasonable security arrangements against such risks as unauthorized access, collection, use, disclosure or disposal.
8.0 REPEAL

The “District of Mission Freedom of Information Bylaw 2837-1994” and all amendments are repealed.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this 20th day of March, 2017
ADOPTED THIS ___ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
Minutes of the **SPECIAL MEETING of the DISTRICT OF MISSION COUNCIL (Administrative Hearing)** held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Monday, March 13, 2017 commencing at 1:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes  
Councillor Pam Alexis  
Councillor Carol Hamilton  
Councillor Jim Hinds  
Councillor Rhett Nicholson  

Council Members Absent: Councillor Danny Plecas  
Councillor Jenny Stevens  

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
Harminder Gill, Bylaw Enforcement Officer  
Jenny Hill, Administrative Assistant  
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer  
Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services  
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services  

Others Present: Ryan Bortolin, Stewart McDannold Stuart  
Dean Davison, Davison Law Group  
Nic DeBiasio, UFV Practicum Student  

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

   The meeting was called to order.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

   Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

   RESOLVED: That the March 13, 2017 Special Meeting of Council (Administrative Hearing) agenda be adopted.

   CARRIED  

3. **NEW BUSINESS**

   **Administrative Hearing Regarding the Denial of a Business Licence for Don Briere of Weeds Glass and Gifts Ltd.**

   In advance of the meeting, the March 13, 2017 Special Council Agenda was provided to Steve Simmonds, Don Briere’s legal counsel, and Council. The agenda included the following supporting documentation:

   - The ‘Hearing Process Procedures Staff Report to Council – 2017-03-13’  
     - Appendix A ‘Natural Justice and Procedural Fairness’
Mayor Hawes explained that the Special Meeting of Council (Administrative Hearing) was being held at the request of Mr. Briere and his legal counsel who had asked that Council reconsider the decision the District of Mission’s Development Services Department to deny his application for a business licence for Weeds Glass and Gifts Ltd. Mayor Hawes confirmed that both parties were advised of the date and time of the Administrative Hearing. Mayor Hawes also confirmed that a copy of the District’s disclosure package was provided to Mr. Briere’s legal counsel on February 21, 2017 and a copy of the Weeds Glass & Gifts’ disclosure package was provided to Mr. Simmonds on February 27, 2017.

Mr. Simmonds outlined the reasons for the denial of Mr. Briere’s business licence. Mr. Davison, Mr. Briere’s legal counsel, was given the opportunity to ask Mr. Simmonds questions in regards to his presentation. Mr. Davison advised he did not have any questions for Mr. Simmonds.

Mr. Davison presented arguments from his client’s disclosure package. After his presentation, Mr. Davison responded to several questions from Council. Mr. Simmonds then provided additional information in regards to Mr. Davison’s presentation.

After the presentations were concluded Council discussed recessing the Administrative Hearing to resolve into a closed session to obtain legal advice.

4. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC, RECESS THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING, AND IMMEDIATELY CONVENE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and
RESOLVED: That, pursuant to Sections 90 and 92 of the Community Charter, this Special Meeting of Council (Administrative Hearing) be closed to the public as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:

- Section 90(1)(i) of the Community Charter – the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that
purpose; and
CARRIED

The Special Meeting of Council (Administrative Hearing) was recessed at 1:53 p.m.

5. RECONVENE

Mayor Hawes reconvened the meeting at 2:38 p.m.

Council Members Present:  Mayor Randy Hawes
Councillor Pam Alexis
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Jim Hinds
Councillor Rhett Nicholson

Council Members Absent:  Councillor Danny Plecas
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present:  Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Harminder Gill, Bylaw Enforcement Officer
Jenny Hill, Administrative Assistant
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Others Present:  Ryan Bortolin, Stewart McDannold Stuart
Dean Davison, Davison Law Group
Nic DeBiasio, UFV Practicum Student

6. NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

Administrative Hearing Regarding the Denial of a Business Licence for Don Briere of Weeds Glass and Gifts Ltd.

Council reviewed the question as to whether to issue or deny a business licence for Don Briere for Weeds Glass and Gifts Ltd.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and
RESOLVED: That the decision of the Licence Inspector to refuse a business licence to Weeds Glass & Gifts Ltd. be upheld.
CARRIED
7. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That the Special Meeting of Council (Administrative Hearing) be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 2:39 p.m.

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on March 20, 2017 commenced at 1:00 p.m. for COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, and was immediately followed by a CLOSED MEETING of Council, and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. for REGULAR COUNCIL proceedings.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes  
Councillor Pam Alexis  
Councillor Carol Hamilton  
Councillor Jim Hinds  
Councillor Rhett Nicholson  
Councillor Jenny Stevens  

Council Members Absent: Councillor Danny Plecas

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
* Rogine Battel, Manager of RCMP Administration  
Kris Boland, Director of Finance  
* Marcy Bond, Senior Planner  
Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer  
* Mike Dickinson, Planner  
* Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Design and Planning  
Haylee Gould, Administrative Assistant  
Jay Jackman, Manager of Assets, Infrastructure and Projects  
* Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works  
Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects  
* Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector  
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning  
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer  
* Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture  
*Present for a portion of the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER  
Mayor Hawes called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA  
Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and  
RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of March 20, 2017 be adopted.  
CARRIED

3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and  
RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.  
CARRIED
4. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Councillor Nicholson assumed the Chair.

Official Community Plan and Zoning amendments to facilitate the development of properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street to create up to twenty-nine (29) compact residential lots

A report from the Senior Planner dated March 20, 2017 regarding the development applications for the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street to allow subdivision of the lands into approximately 29 compact single family lots, with some allowances for secondary dwellings, was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the applications moving forward and as such have listed the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amending Bylaws under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Discussion ensued, and the Committee expressed concern regarding:
- the number of proposed compact lots that would allow secondary suites;
- the potential for insufficient parking, both on individual lots and on the street; and
- whether the new streets would be wide enough to allow unimpeded fire truck and snow plow access, particularly with excessive street parking use.

Moved by Mayor Hawes, and

RECOMMENDED:
1. That, upon due consideration of Section 475 of the Local Government Act, consultations go forward in accordance with Policy LAN 47, and that persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultation referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of that section of the Act;

2. That the Mayor and the Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the Development Cost Charge Agreement as attached to the staff report from the Senior Planner dated March 20, 2017.

CARRIED

Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling use in the form of a secondary suite – 33936 McPhee Place

A report from the Planning Technician dated March 20, 2017 detailing the rezoning application to allow a secondary dwelling unit use at the property located at 33936 McPhee Place was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Councillors Alexis, Hamilton and Hinds expressed concern regarding the number of suites in this neighbourhood and the shortage of street parking on McPhee Place.
Discharge of Land Use Contract (LUC) 455-1975 and the Rezoning of the properties located at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone

A report from the Planner dated March 20, 2017 concerning the development application to discharge Land Use Contract 455-1975 and to rezone the property located at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw and the Land Use Contract Discharging Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda. It was noted that there is no development being contemplated at this time.

Rezoning and Development Variance Permit Application to facilitate a 3-lot subdivision – 7354 Wren Street

A report from the Planner dated March 20, 2017 detailing the rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a three (3) lot subdivision on the property located at 7354 Wren Street was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda. Staff also support the development variance permit application, which will be listed under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw.

Rezoning Application and Street Naming to facilitate a 20 lot subdivision – 32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue

A report from the Planner dated March 20, 2017 regarding the street naming and development application to rezone 32554, 32596, and 32598 Cherry Avenue to facilitate a 20 lot subdivision was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw and Street Naming Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Councillor Hinds noted a correction to the history behind Breakey Street. Second Lieutenant Henry Leopold Breakey served with the 102\textsuperscript{nd} Regiment (Rocky Mountain Rangers) and was sent overseas with the 54\textsuperscript{th} Battalion. Breakey transferred to the Royal Flying Corp 102\textsuperscript{nd} Squadron as a machine gunner, and was mortally wounded on July 15, 1918 in defence of London during a bomber raid.

The Committee discussed the proposal and expressed concern about access to the properties on the laneway and the width of the lane.

Rezoning Application to allow a 2-lot subdivision at the property located at 7297 Wardrop Street

A report from the Planner dated March 20, 2017 detailing the development application to rezone the property located at 7297 Wardrop Street to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.
Rezoning Application R13-034 for the properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue to facilitate the creation of up to 36 single family lots under the Residential Compact RC372 zone

A report from the Senior Planner dated March 20, 2017 regarding the rezoning application for the properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue and identifying the necessary amendments to the Zoning Bylaw to allow for up to thirty-six (36) single family lots was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw and associated Street Naming Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

The Committee discussed traffic impacts for the intersection at Prentis Avenue and Stave Lake Street, parking for lots with secondary suites, and access for houses on Prentis Avenue.

Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house at the property located at 33759 Ferndale Avenue

A report from the Planning Technician dated March 20, 2017 detailing an application to rezone the property located 33759 Ferndale Avenue to allow for a secondary dwelling use in the form of a coach house was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Rezoning Application to formalize an existing secondary dwelling at 32973 10th Avenue

A report from the Planning Technician dated March 20, 2017 regarding the rezoning application to formalize a secondary dwelling unit use at the property located at 32973 10th Avenue was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 9953 Stave Lake Street

A report from the Planner dated March 20, 2017 detailing the development application to rezone the property located at 9953 Stave Lake Street facilitate a secondary dwelling unit was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit on each lot resulting from a proposed 4 lot subdivision of the property located at 9319 Stave Lake Street

A report from the Manager of Planning dated March 20, 2017 regarding the development application to rezone 9319 Stave Lake Street to permit a secondary dwelling unit on each lot resulting from a proposed 4 lot subdivision was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.
Development Variance Permit, 5% Cash in Lieu of Parkland for Subdivision Application, and adoption of Street Naming Bylaw for the property at 8394 McTaggart Street

A report from the Senior Planner dated March 20, 2017 detailing the Development Variance Permit, Street Naming Bylaw and the 5% Cash in Lieu of Parkland requirements to facilitate the subdivision of 8394 McTaggart Street to allow for a maximum of 20 single family lots was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the associated Street Naming Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda. Staff also support the accompanying Development Variance Permit which will be listed for Council consideration under “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the associated Zoning Amending Bylaw.

Moved by Mayor Hawes, and

RECOMMENDED: That pursuant to Section 510 of the Local Government Act, 5% Cash in Lieu of parkland for subdivision of the property at 8394 McTaggart Street be applied to subdivision file S16-001.

CARRIED

Official Community Plan Review – Update and Change to project scope by adding a Council workshop

A report from the Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated March 20, 2017 which provided an update on the Official Community Plan review process and identified an amendment to the project scope and timeline from the addition of a Council workshop was provided for the Committee’s information.

5. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

Budget Carry Forward Request for Tech Sector Development Projects

A report from the Economic Development Officer dated March 20, 2017 to request that two tech-related projects have their remaining budgets carried forward to 2017 was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the 2016 unspent budgeted amounts for the following projects be carried forward to 2017:
   a. Fraser Valley Tech Jobs Portal, $7,000 funded from General Fund Accumulated Surplus;
   b. Tech Sector Implementation Strategy, $30,000 funded from General Fund Accumulated Surplus; and

2. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED
New Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Bylaw

A report from the Administrative Assistant dated March 20, 2017 proposing to repeal and replace the existing Freedom of Information Bylaw was provided for the Committee’s information.

The new Freedom of Information Bylaw 5560-2016 is listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Mission International Cultural Association Request for Funding

A report from the Deputy Corporate Officer dated March 20, 2017 regarding a request for funding from the Mission International Cultural Association to assist with the cost of hosting an official delegation from Mission’s Sister City of Oyama, Japan was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the Mission International Cultural Association receive a grant of $8,000 from the Contingency budget to assist with the cost of hosting an official delegation from Mission’s Sister City of Oyama, Japan in the summer of 2017; and
2. That the Mission International Cultural Association provide the District with a detailed report of how the grant funds were spent by December 31, 2017.

CARRIED

6. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

Councillor Hamilton assumed the Chair.

2017 National Volunteer Week

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated March 20, 2017 to request that the week of April 23 to 29, 2017 be declared as Volunteer Recognition Week, and to extend thanks to the District’s volunteers, was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the week of April 23 to 29, 2017 be declared “Volunteer Recognition Week” in the District of Mission; and
2. That Council extends its thanks to all volunteers who contribute to the quality of life in the District.

CARRIED

Mission PLAY Pass Program

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated March 20, 2017 seeking support to eliminate the cap on the number of eligible visits to the Mission Leisure Centre under PLAY Pass Program Policy C-FIN.03 was provided for the Committee’s consideration.
Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED: That the PLAY Pass Policy C-FIN.03 be revised to eliminate the maximum number of visits and that the policy allow for an unlimited number of visits for those holding a valid PLAY Pass.

CARRIED

Staff were directed to report back to Council in a year to review the impact of the policy change.

7. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Councillor Hinds assumed the Chair.

**Updating GIS Orthographic Photos**

The Committee reviewed a report from the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design dated March 20, 2017 requesting approval to initiate a joint project with the Forestry Department to update the District’s orthographic photo layer to be used in the Geographic Information System (GIS) and Webmap.

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That staff initiate a joint project with the Forestry Department to retain a contractor to update District’s orthographic photos at the preliminary cost estimate of $18,400 (GST excluded), as outlined in the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design report dated March 20, 2017;

2. That the requested budget of $18,400 plus GST for updating the District’s Orthographic photo be approved, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund; and

3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

**2017 Paving, Watermain, Sewer, Drainage, and Sidewalk Project Locations**

A report from the Manager of Development Engineering and Projects dated March 20, 2017 to provide an update on the planned Engineering and Public Works paving, watermain, sewer, drainage and sidewalk capital projects for 2017 was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff were directed to reassess pedestrian traffic issues near Hatzic Elementary and Middle Schools, and to report back to Council on proposed sidewalk locations in that area.

**Local Area Service Program**

A report from the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design dated March 20, 2017 to introduce a new Local Area Service policy was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, and

RECOMMENDED: That the Local Area Service Policy, as attached to the report from the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design dated March 20, 2017, be approved.

CARRIED
Stave Lake Street Improvements Conceptual Design

A report from the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design dated March 20, 2017 seeking approval to engage engineering consulting services to explore viable options to upgrade Stave Lake Street was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That staff acquire engineering consulting services at the estimated cost of $36,000 (including 20% contingency) plus GST to explore available options to upgrade the Stave Lake Street corridor from 11th Avenue to Dewdney Trunk Road, and provide conceptual designs for each option with their corresponding Class D cost estimates;

2. That $36,000 of the existing 2018 budget to upgrade Stave Lake Street from 11th Avenue to Best Avenue be advanced to 2017, to allow the conceptual design to begin immediately, to better coordinate with the ongoing development applications at Parr and Prentis Avenues;

3. That staff report back to the Council with the preferred option(s) to upgrade Stave Lake Street; and

4. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

Fraser River Forcemain Sanitary Crossing Design-Build Project Award

A report from the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design dated March 20, 2017 to recommend that the Fraser River Forcemain Sanitary Crossing Upgrade Project be awarded to Onsite Engineering Ltd., was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Discussion ensued regarding the final alignment of the forcemain and the potential impacts on private property owners, and how the District could best capitalize on the sand that may be dredged up from the river during construction.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the Fraser River Forcemain Sanitary Crossing Upgrade Design-Build Project, RFP 2016-031, be awarded to Onsite Engineering Ltd., in the amount of $446,000 (including 15% contingency and excluding GST);

2. That $146,000 of the 2019 budget for this project be advanced to 2017, to allow the detailed design to begin immediately, to better coordinate with timing requirements of the District’s ongoing “Clean Water and Wastewater Fund” grant application;

3. That an internal loan of up to $146,000 from the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund to the Regional Sewage Treatment DCC Reserve Fund be approved, in the event that there is a shortfall in the Regional Sewage Treatment DCC Reserve Fund during the year; and

4. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED
8. **RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Mayor Hawes resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That Council rise from Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

9. **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC, RECESS THE PUBLIC MEETING UNTIL 7:00 P.M. AND IMMEDIATELY CONVENE INTO CLOSED SESSION**

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED:

1. That pursuant to Section 90 of the *Community Charter*, the public be excluded from this portion of the meeting as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:
   - Section 90(1)(e) of the *Community Charter* – the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;
   - Section 90(1)(g) of the *Community Charter* – litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality; and
   - Section 90(2)(b) of the *Community Charter* – the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party.

2. That the public portion of the meeting be recessed until 7:00 p.m.; and

3. That Council immediately resolve into the closed portion of their meeting.

CARRIED

The meeting recessed at 2:47 p.m.

10. **RECONVENE**

Mayor Hawes reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes  
Councillor Pam Alexis  
Councillor Carol Hamilton  
Councillor Jim Hinds  
Councillor Rhett Nicholson  
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Council Members Absent: Councillor Danny Plecas

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
Rogine Battel, Manager of RCMP Administration  
Ted De Jager, Officer in Charge, Mission RCMP Detachment  
Mike Dickinson, Planner  
Haylee Gould, Administrative Assistant  
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
11. MISSION MOMENTS: MUNICIPAL FOREST

As part of Mission’s 125th Anniversary celebrations, Bob O’Neal, Director of Forestry, presented Mission Moments: Municipal Forest.

In 1955, Mission’s Council submitted an application for a forest management licence, the first of its kind in BC. In 1958, Tree Forest Licence 26 (TFL26) was granted and forestry operations began for the Mission Municipal Forest.

The millionth tree was planted in 1971, after 23 years of operations. The two-millionth tree was planted just eight years later. Today, Mission’s forest is approaching the four-millionth tree planting. The Mission Municipal Forest is world-renowned for its exceptional yellow cedar.

The Mission Municipal Forest has grown to include diverse recreation resources, including the Stave Dam Interpretive Trail, Sayres Lake Campground, and Zajac Ranch for Children. The Stave West Master Plan will see increased tourism and enhanced recreation and educational opportunities, beginning with three new campgrounds to be constructed this year.

12. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the March 20, 2017 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC17/107 to RC17/129 be adopted.

CARRIED

13. PRESENTATIONS

RCMP Corporate Management Finance Presentation

Autumn Longley, Senior Financial Manager and Syvia Poon, Senior Finance Analyst for the RCMP’s E-Division, appeared before Council to present an overview of the RCMP contract for Mission.

Under the current RCMP contract, the District is responsible for 90% of the costs of policing, with the Federal Government providing the other 10%. Some costs outside of this formula (and therefore covered by the District) are accommodations, support staff, and prisoner facilities. The Federal Government provides full coverage of legal fees, compensation claims, and relocation costs.

The largest cost driver for Mission is pay – totalling approximately 5.2 million out of the 9 million budget for 50 members. Collective bargaining is underway, with a new agreement expected to result in retroactive payments. These payments have been budgeted for and are held in reserve, as well as some funding for the Green Timbers facility.
14. DELEGATIONS

Clinton and Veronica Tod  
Re: Herar Lane

Clinton and Veronica Tod appeared before Council to express concern regarding a notice they received from the District indicating that parking in front of their house on Herar Lane is prohibited. They submitted a petition with 15 signatures requesting the District to allow for parking of up to two vehicles per house along Herar Lane. Staff noted that the Fire Chief had concerns about access for emergency purposes, and that parking in laneways is prohibited District-wide.

Mr. and Mrs. Tod brought forward another concern regarding the property located at 8282 Melburn Drive. The house backs onto Herar Lane, and the residents use the back of their property as a driveway. They submitted a petition with 14 signatures requesting that the District require the homeowner of 8282 Melburn Drive to erect a gate on the back of their property to reduce the chance of a collision.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That staff investigate the concerns of the residents of Herar Lane with respect to:

a) parking in the lane, and
b) the rear access driveway at 8282 Melburn Drive

and report back to Council.

CARRIED

Bob Scagg  
Re: Development in West Mission

Bob Scagg, on behalf of Pacific Gateway Properties, appeared before Council to request that the lands in west Mission remain designated Urban in the new Official Community Plan, which is currently under review. Mr. Scagg noted that the Urban designation is necessary to encourage the development of the area and subsequent delivery of water and sewer services to residents in west Mission. Mr. Scagg also commented that a review of the “Area Wide Transportation Concept” is required, as the original concept was completed before the opening of the Golden Ears Bridge, the Pitt River Bridge and the Mary Hill Bypass, all of which impact traffic in west Mission.

Mayor Hawes thanked Mr. Scagg on behalf of Council for his presentation.

15. PROCLAMATIONS

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That May 6, 2017 be proclaimed “Ukrainian Cultural Festival Day” within the District of Mission.

CARRIED
16. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5627-2017-5050(234)

R16-037 (Dhaliwal) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32857 Best Avenue from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into two (2) lots of a minimum 558 square metres (6,006 square feet) lot size and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each property. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 012-422-894
Lot 2 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 79781

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Rob Publow, Manager of Planning, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Proposed subdivision plan.
3. Subject property map.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

1. An emailed from Natalia Nikolaeva dated March 15, 2017 in opposition to the application.
2. An emailed from Vladimir Nikolaeva dated March 17, 2017 in opposition to the application.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Kathrine Campbell, lives next door and to the west of the subject property. She advised that she is not opposed to the application but expressed concerns regarding the height of the proposed dwelling and is concerned that a high-pitched roof would block visibility from her window. The Manager of Planning clarified that the height restriction for the dwelling is 11 meters and is measured at surrounding grade. He noted that this number could change based on roof pitch. Mayor Hawes noted that a secondary suite can take the form of either a basement suite or a coach-house.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5627-2017-5050(234) R16-037 (Dhaliwal) closed.

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5628-2017-5050(235)

R16-052 (Willson) – a bylaw to rezone property at 9981 Willingdon Street and 33249 Richards Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone and Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject properties into 3 lots of a minimum 0.7 hectares (1.73 acres) lot size and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each property. The subject property is legally described as:
The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Rob Publow, Manager of Planning, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Proposed subdivision plan.
3. Subject property map.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5629-2017-5050(235) R16-052 (Willson) closed.

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5629-2017-5050(236)

R16-046 (Gill) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32163 Bueckert Avenue from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into two (2) lots of a minimum 465 square metres (5,005 square feet) lot size. The subject property is legally described as:

- Parcel Identifier: 024-655-635
- Lot 1 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP44349

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Rob Publow, Manager of Planning, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Subject property map.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5629-2017-5050(236) R16-046 (Gill) closed.

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5630-2017-5050(237)

R16-051 (OTG Developments) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32811 4th Avenue from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each new lot. The subject property is legally described as:
The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Rob Publow, Manager of Planning, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Subject property map.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Lee Harrison lives to the north of the subject property. In response to his query, the Manager of Planning advised that the setback from the side lot on Cedar Street to the west of the two lots is set at 4.5 metres from the lot line. Mr. Harrison expressed concerns in regards to potential parking issues. Staff advised that each dwelling would require two stalls for the principle residence and one stall for any secondary dwelling. In response to Mr. Harrison’s question, the Manager of Planning advised the height allowance is 11 meters, which is considered standard for residential construction, but could be higher with a peaked roof. Mayor Hawes noted that there have been changes made to the OCP with the goal of creating more density in the downtown core and surrounding area, and that this application is an example of a redevelopment which could hopefully achieve this goal and provide better access to the downtown core area.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5630-2017-5050(237) R16-051 (OTG Developments) closed.

17. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be received as information:

(a) Economic Development Select Committee meeting – January 11, 2017
(b) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting – February 15, 2017

CARRIED

18. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED:

1. That, in accordance with Section 477 of the Local Government Act, Council has considered District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5622-2017-4052(47) in conjunction with the District's Financial Plan (including the Capital Expenditure Plan and Operating Expenditure Plan) and the Waste Management Plan.

2. That Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5622-2017-4052(47) (OCP16-001 Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to redesignate the properties located at 8540, 8554, and 8590 Nottman Street from Urban Residential Compact Cluster to Urban Residential Compact, be read a first time.

4. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5625-2017-5050(233) (R16-030 McIntyre) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 32290 and 32336 Lougheed Highway from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone, be read a first and second time.


6. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5632-2017-5050(238) (R16-048 Redekop) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 7354 Wren Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone, be read a first and second time.

7. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5633-2017-5050(239) (R16-050 Civic Consultants) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 32554, 32596 and 32598 Cherry Avenue from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone, be read a first and second time.

8. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5635-2017-5050(240) (R16-043 Mani) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 7297 Wardrop Street from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone, be read a first and second time.

9. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5636-2017-5050(241) (R16-034 Tiegen & Toor) – a bylaw to rezone properties located at 33880, 33904 and 33930 Prentis Avenue from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone, be read a first and second time.

10. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5638-2017-5050(243) (R16-047 Pankratz) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33759 Ferndale Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be read a first and second time.

11. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5639-2017-5050(244) (R16-053 Docksteader) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 32973 10th Avenue from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone, be read a first and second time.

12. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5640-2017-5050(245) (R17-001 Clark) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 9953 Stave Lake Street from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be read a first and second time.

13. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5641-2017-5050(246) (R16-032 Rempel) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 9319 Stave Lake Street from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be read a first and second time.


15. That Street Naming (McTaggart Street Extension and Ewert Avenue Extension) Bylaw 5631-2017 – a bylaw to name two extensions of road in a subdivision, be read a first, second and third time.
16. That Street Naming (Breakey Street, McQuarrie Lane Extension, Lissimore Avenue Extension) Bylaw 5634-2017 – a bylaw to name a new road and two extension of road in a new subdivision, be **read a first, second and third time**.

17. That Street Naming (Prentis Avenue Extension and Tooley Place) Bylaw 5642-2017 – a bylaw to name an extension of a street and a new street within a new subdivision, be **read a first, second and third time**.

18. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5627-2017-5050(234) (R16-037 Dhalwal) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32857 Best Avenue from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone, be **read a third time**.

19. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5628-2017-5050(235) (R16-052 Willson) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 9981 Willingdon Street and 33249 Richards Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone and Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be **read a third time**.

20. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5629-2017-5050(236) (R16-046 Gill) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32163 Bueckert Avenue from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone, be **read a third time**.

21. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5630-2017-5050(237) (R16-051 OTG Development Concepts) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32811 4th Avenue from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone, be **read a third time**.

22. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5480-2015-5050(165) (R13-031 D & D Design Ltd.) – a bylaw to rezone property at 7883 Cedar Street from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC372s), be **adopted**.

**CARRIED**

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed rezoning of 33936 McPhee Place. The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer advised Council that the dwelling’s final building inspection was approved in October, 2016 and, although staff are not aware of a covenant being put in place to prohibit secondary suites, they do not believe a secondary suite has been installed.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5613-2016-5050(226) (R16-040 Dhalwal) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33936 McPhee Place from Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone, be **read a first and second time**.

**OPPOSED:** Councillor Alexis
Councillor Hamilton
Councillor Stevens

**DEFEATED**

19. **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Regular Council Meeting – March 6, 2017

**CARRIED**
20. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS
There was no new/other business.

21. NOTICES OF MOTION
There were no notices of motion.

22. QUESTION PERIOD
Tony Miniacci of Analytical Consulting and proponent for the Nottman Street development application asked how he could properly prepare for the public hearing without knowing how Council would like to proceed.
The Mayor responded that Council would not be making any decision on the proposal until after the public hearing.

23. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and
RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR               MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER