Regular Meeting of Council
Agenda
February 5, 2018

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) Cedar Valley Local Area Plan Project Update
       This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff
       recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not
       required.
   (b) Rezoning Application from RU16 to RR7S to allow a secondary
       dwelling unit and Variances at the properties located at 34461 and
       34489 Ferndale Avenue
       This report details the rezoning and development variance permit
       applications to allow a three (3) lot subdivision on the properties located
       at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue and identifies the necessary
       amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

       Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have
       listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5699-2018-5050(276) under the
       “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also
       support the Development Variance Permit applications which will be
       listed for Council’s consideration under the “Development Variance
       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
       February 19, 2018.
(c) **Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 34884 Moffat Avenue**

This report details the development application to rezone 34884 Moffat Avenue to R930s to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such have listed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5705-2018-5050(278) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for February 19, 2018.

(d) **Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 416-1975 at a District-owned property located at an unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector**

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 416-1975 for the property located at an unaddressed property located on Cedar Valley Connector which will allow the underlying Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone to come into effect one year after final adoption of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for February 19, 2018.

(e) **Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 170-1972 and Rezoning of the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street to Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone**

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 170-1972, and to rezone the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street, as shown in Appendix 2, and identifies the necessary amendments to the Zoning Bylaw which will come into effect one year after final adoption of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw and Zoning Amending Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050 (279) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for February 19, 2018.
(f) **Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018**

This report proposes a new Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw for the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System. The adjudication model requires that the District adopt the supporting Bylaw and staff support implementation. The bylaw has been added to the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

5. **CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE**

(a) **2017 Investment Performance Report**

This report is to advise Council on the District’s investment holdings as at December 31, 2017, and the performance of the overall investment portfolio for the year. This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

(b) **Amendment to Financial Plan 2017 – 2021 Bylaw 5612-2016**

This report highlights the budget amendments that Council has approved since the 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw was adopted in December of 2016. These approved budget amendments can now be incorporated into a Financial Plan (2017 - 2021) amending bylaw. As such, 2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1) has been listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

(c) **2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the 2017 capital budget carry forwards attached as Appendix “A” to the report entitled “2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests” from the Manager of Accounting Services dated February 5, 2018, be approved;

2. That the 2017 operating budget carry forwards attached as Appendix “B” to the report entitled “2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests” from the Manager of Accounting Services dated February 5, 2018, be approved; and

3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly (final dollar amounts will depend on year-end balances).

(d) **Economic Development Select Committee – Terms of Reference**

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That the proposed changes to the Economic Development Select Committee Terms of Reference, as set out in the report from the Economic Development Officer dated February 5, 2018, be adopted.
(e) **Status of Community Emergency Preparedness Grant Funding for a Mobile Reception Centre**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That a budget be established for $24,312 to purchase supplies to stock the Emergency Support Services (ESS) mobile reception centre trailer and related training to be fully funded by the Community Emergency Preparedness Fund; and

2. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

(f) **Council Attendance at Conferences – Councillor Alexis’ Request**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That Councillor Alexis be authorized to attend the 2018 Business Improvement Areas of BC (BIABC) Annual Conference on behalf of Council; and

2. That expenses related to this conference be reimbursed as per District of Mission Policy ADM.06(PC)a and ADM.07(C).

6. **PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE**

(a) **Parks, Recreation and Culture Department 2017 Grant Update**

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

(b) **Tennis Court Development**

This report is provided for Council’s information only and there is no staff recommendation included.

(c) **South Arena Generator – Operating Budget**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Parks, Recreation and Culture operating budget be increased for 2018 to include an additional $14,700, with funding from General Fund Accumulated Surplus, to increase the maintenance levels of the #2 emergency generator at the Mission Leisure Centre that ensures cooling of the data room which supports Fire Hall #1/ EOC operations and ensures un-interrupted ventilation from the south arena refrigeration plant;

2. That the $14,700 increase be incorporated into the District’s annual budget for 2019 and beyond; and

3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.
(d) **January Ice Storm - Tree Clean-Up Efforts to Date**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Parks, Recreation & Culture operating budget be amended to include an additional $170,000 to offset the costs associated with tree trimming and removal costs associated with the recent ice storm, with funding from General Fund Accumulated Surplus;

2. That Parks, Recreation & Culture staff be asked to submit a detailed follow-up report once all street trees have been re-inspected; and

3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

7. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

(a) **Engineering & Public Works Capital Project Updates**

This report provides a year-end update on the status of the 2017 Engineering and Public Works capital projects. Most projects have reached substantial completion on or under budget. This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

(b) **Prentis Avenue Roadworks Funding Request and Contract Award**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That a contract for Prentis Avenue Road Improvements be directly awarded to Tiegen Excavating Ltd. in the amount of $237,149 including PST and 10% contingency, excluding GST;

2. That the works be funded from the approved 2018 Paving Program budget; and

3. That the Director of Engineering and Public Works be authorized to execute the contract.

(c) **Update on Free Residential Yard Waste Drop-off at Mission Landfill**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the free yard waste drop off program for residents be extended to March 3, 2018; and

2. That the weekly curbside compostable collection container and yard waste bundle limit of a combined total of 10, be extended to March 3, 2018.

(d) **7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That out of the proposed four options listed in the Engineering Technologist III’s report dated February 5, 2018, Option 1 be supported to implement separated bike lanes on both sides of 7th Avenue from Stave Lake Street to Grand Street, and shared bike lanes on both sides from Grand Street to Cedar Street;
2. That the implementation cost of Option 1 in the amount of $145,000 be funded from the existing Paving Program budget;

3. That the required five year maintenance cost of Option 1 in the amount of $66,000 be added to the District’s Operating budget beginning in 2023 and every five years thereafter; and

4. To support the District’s grant application to BikeBC for their cost sharing program for 7th Avenue Bike Lanes, and should that be approved it would partially offset the funding required from the Paving Program budget.

8. PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH

(a) Mission Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy, as attached to the report from the Fire Chief, be approved; and


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 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)(a) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;

   - Section 90(1)(g) of the Community Charter – litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality;
• Section 90(1)(j) of the *Community Charter* – information that is prohibited, or information that if it were presented in a document would be prohibited, from disclosure under section 21 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act;

• Section 90(1)(k) of the Community Charter – negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public;

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

(a) **Committee of the Whole report dated February 5, 2018**

   Report of recommendations to be circulated at the 7:00 p.m. reconvened public meeting

13. **DELEGATIONS**

(a) **Cassy Crawford and Donna Duvall, Mission Arts Council**

   Re: Request for funding assistance for the Fraser Valley Children’s Festival and the IGNITE Youth Mentorship Program

14. **PROCLAMATIONS**

(a) **Heritage Week**

   February 19\(^{th}\) – 25\(^{th}\), 2018

15. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

(a) **Public Hearing Notice for February 5, 2018**

   For reference

(b) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5691-2017-5050(270)**

   R17-029 (Wonnacott) – a bylaw to rezone property at 30883 Silverhill 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
(c) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5698-2017-5050(275)**

R17-034 (Clarkson) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32920 Boothby Avenue from Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone

Copy of *Notice to Owner/Occupant* and previous staff report included as background information

---

(d) **Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1)**

OCP17-005 (Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering) – a bylaw to redesignate portions of property at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street from *Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area* to *Urban Compact and Environmentally Sensitive Area*

Copy of *Notice to Owner/Occupant* and previous staff report included as background information for *Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1)* and *Zoning Amending Bylaw 5702-2018-5050(276)*

---

(e) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5702-2018-5050(276)**

R17-020 (Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering) – a bylaw to rezone properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Multiple Family 52 Rowhouse (MR52), Residential Compact 465 (RC465), Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) and Residential Compact 372 (RC372) zones

---

16. **COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES**

(a) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Meeting – November 14, 2017

(b) Economic Development Select Committee Meeting (draft) – January 10, 2018

---

17. **BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION**

(a) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5699-2018-5050(276)**

R17-025 (Minderhoud) – a bylaw to rezone property at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone

*See Development Services Section 4(b)*

(b) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5705-2018-5050(278)**

R17-036 (Proska) – a bylaw to rezone property at 34884 Moffat Avenue from Urban Residential 930 (R930) Zone to Urban Residential 930 Secondary Dwelling (R930s) Zone

*See Development Services Section 4(c)*
(c) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018**

A bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract for District-owned property located at an unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector

*See Development Services Section 4(d)*

(d) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018**

LUC 18-002 (DOM) - a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract for the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street

*See Development Services Section 4(e)*

(e) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050(279)**

A bylaw to rezone property at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone

*See Development Services Section 4(e)*

(f) **Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018**

A bylaw to support the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System

*See Development Services Section 4(f)*

(g) **2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1)**

A bylaw to amend “2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw 5709-2018”

*See Corporate Administration & Finance Section 5(b)*

(h) **Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1)**

(i) In accordance with Section 477 of the *Local Government Act*, Council has considered District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1) in conjunction with the District’s Financial Plan (including the Capital Expenditure Plan and Operating Expenditure Plan) and the Waste Management Plan

(ii) OCP17-005 (Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering) – a bylaw to redesignate portions of property at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street from *Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area* to *Urban Compact and Environmentally Sensitive Area*

*See “Public Hearings” Section 15(d)*
Zoning Amending Bylaw 5702-2018-5050(276)  Second and Third Readings
R17-020 (Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering) – a bylaw to rezone properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Multiple Family 52 Rowhouse (MR52), Residential Compact 465 (RC465), Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) and Residential Compact 372 (RC372) zones
See Public Hearing Section 15(e)

Street Naming (Machell and Carter Street Extensions, and Cunningham Avenue) Bylaw 5703-2018  Second and Third Readings
A bylaw to name two road extensions and one new road Page 341

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5691-2017-5050(270)  Third Reading
R17-029 (Wonnacott) – a bylaw to rezone property at 30883 Silverhill Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone
See Public Hearing Section 15(b)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5698-2017-5050(275)  Third Reading
R17-034 (Clarkson) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32920 Boothby Avenue from Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone
See Public Hearing Section 15(c)

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5697-2017-5050(274)  Adoption
R17-032 (Dhaliwal) – a bylaw to rezone property at 8597 Thorpe Street from Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL
RECOMMENDATION: That the following minutes be adopted:
(a) Regular Council Meeting – January 22, 2018 Page 347

RESOLUTIONS RELEASED FROM CLOSED
(a) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Appointments Page 361
This report is being provided for information purposes. Council action is not required.

NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

NOTICES OF MOTION

QUESTION PERIOD

ADJOURNMENT
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Dickinson, Planner
SUBJECT: Cedar Valley Local Area Plan Project Update

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

PURPOSE

This report provides Council a progress report regarding background research work currently underway for preparation of the Cedar Valley Local Area Plan (CVLAP). Staff will continue to provide Council with periodic updates regarding progress on preparing the CVLAP that will replace the 1996 Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan (CVCDP). This CVLAP will provide clear and proactive guidance for development and complete build-out of Cedar Valley.

WORK UPDATE

At this stage of the work program, staff are investigating the status of land uses, planning policies and engineering infrastructure that apply to Cedar Valley. The analysis includes a review of land development applications, infrastructure servicing, transportation network, demographic trends, natural area protection, and parks, trails and school development.

This review will inform the next stage of work to develop ‘block plans’ that will identify important road and infrastructure alignments in the remaining undeveloped areas of Cedar Valley. As this work proceeds, staff will also prepare updated policies to guide development in an informed, clear direction to ensure environmental protection while providing for economically viable development that supports OCP objectives including development densification and housing affordability. The updated policies and detailed block plans will form a key deliverable of the CVLAP.

Currently there are approximately 1,700 housing units in Cedar Valley, where approximately 1,300 units are located within the phase 1 servicing boundary (generally south of Tunbridge Avenue). According to the 1996 CVCDP, 3,723 residential units would accommodate a Cedar Valley population of approximately 10,671 at buildout.

On November 22, 2017, staff participated in a Parks, Natural Areas and Schools workshop. Parks planning consultants facilitated the workshop providing insights into identifying parks, school, natural area and trail locations. These land uses are strategic elements around which Cedar Valley will be planned, as they provide corridors for community connectivity, environmental protection, and neighbourhood identity as well as major destinations including park and school sites.
At the same time, engineering staff are reviewing the infrastructure needed to serve future residents. This investigation will focus on requirements for stormwater management, sanitary sewers and the road/cycling network. Given Cedar Valley’s unique high-water table, innovative stormwater management approaches may be required.

Not only are Cedar Valley’s environmentally sensitive areas habitat for riparian and terrestrial species, they can also perform a vital role as ‘natural infrastructure’ in stormwater management and climate moderation. A consultant study is proposed to provide updated insights for protecting and enhancing Cedar Valley’s natural areas, as well as provide recommendations on location and design criteria for trails and infrastructure services, such as stormwater detention ponds within or adjacent to sensitive ecosystem areas. The study will also help identify any additional development opportunities adjacent to these areas.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The budget for the Cedar Valley Local Area Plan is $75,000. Of this, $5,000 has been used for the parks planning consultant and approximately $30,000 will be utilized for engineering work and the remainder allocated for staff and consultant work.

The forthcoming work required for plan preparation will include an in-depth assessment of infrastructure servicing costs to determine future DCC rates and best approaches for DCC debt repayment. In this stage of the work program, an environmental consultant report is proposed for evaluating natural areas and ‘green infrastructure.’ A Provincial Planning Infrastructure Grant Program application has also been submitted for this study, that, if approved, would contribute up to $10,000 towards the work program.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

District of Mission staff are preparing the Cedar Valley Local Area Plan to provide updated guidance for development within Cedar Valley. The CVLAP will implement the District’s Strategic Plan, OCP and master plan policies to provide greater clarity for guiding Cedar Valley’s future development.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Mike Dickinson, Planner

Dan Sommer
Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed
DATE: February 5, 2018  
TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Mike Dickinson, Planner  
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application from RU16 to RR7S to allow a secondary dwelling unit and Variances at the properties located at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue  
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer  
Appendix 2 – Location Map  
Appendix 3 – Site Plan  
Appendix 4 – Variances Plan  
Appendix 5 – RAR Assessment Plan  
Appendix 6 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments  
Appendix 7 - Development Variance Permit DV18-001  
Appendix 8 - Development Variance Permit DV18-002  
CIVIC ADDRESS: 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue  
APPLICANT: Ed Minderhoud  
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Rural Residential OCP designation  
ZONE: Rural 16 (RU16) Zone  
LOCATION: Ferndale
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a three (3) lot subdivision on the properties located at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5699-2018-5050(276) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also support the Development Variance Permit applications which will be listed for Council’s consideration under the “Development Variance 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 February 19, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application and development variance permit applications have been received from the property owners for the properties located at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue. The application seeks to rezone the subject properties from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone to facilitate development of a single family dwelling with a secondary dwelling unit on each of the three proposed lots (Appendix 2 & 3).

An associated subdivision application (file S17-014) is proposed with the rezoning and development variance permit applications (Appendix 3). The proposed subdivision would create three parcels from the existing two properties. The proposed subdivision involves an adjustment of the common property line between 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue in order for the existing greenhouse and shop to be located on the newly configured north property at 33489 Ferndale Avenue (lot 3). The subdivision would adjust the common property line allowing for these structures to be located entirely on proposed lot 3 having an area of 2.19ha. The remaining, reconfigured 33461 Ferndale Avenue property would be subdivided into two smaller parcels (lots 1 and 2), where proposed lot areas are 0.866ha (Lot 1) and 0.734ha (Lot 2). Proposed Lot 1 would contain the existing single family dwelling, garage and barn (with possible secondary dwelling pending rezoning approval) at 33461 Ferndale Avenue, while proposed Lot 2 would be developed with a new home and secondary dwelling per RR7s zone regulations.

To facilitate the associated subdivision, the applicant is requesting three variances to the Zoning Bylaw as detailed in this report (Appendix 4). The first variance request is to permit a reduced interior setback for the existing barn on proposed Lot 1 from 15m to 6.42m. The second variance requested is for the greenhouse situated on proposed Lot 3 to reduce the front yard setback from 15m to 4.94m. The third variance requested is to reduce the front setback for the accessory building (a shop) from 7.5m to 6.43m. Variance details are explained in a following section of this report.

Approval of the subdivision is contingent upon approval of the corresponding rezoning and development variance permit applications. The permits would not be issued until the Zoning Amending Bylaw to rezone the subject properties from RU16 to RR7s is adopted.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS:
The subject properties have areas of 1.78ha (4.39 acres) for 34461 Ferndale Avenue and 2.03ha (5.01 acres) for 34489 Ferndale Avenue and are located on the north side of Ferndale Avenue. The properties slope gradually towards the north from Ferndale Avenue. The property at 34489 Ferndale Avenue has a panhandle that provides driveway access to Ferndale Avenue adjacent to the east side of 34461 Ferndale Avenue. 34489 Ferndale Avenue contains a conifer forest north of the existing single family dwelling. The forested portion of the property is traversed by LaCroix Creek and two tributaries. The property at 34461 Ferndale Avenue contains mature trees and is traversed east-west by a tributary of LaCroix Creek.

Environmental Protection
(a) Streamcourses
The applicant has had an assessment of the watercourses on the subject properties dated October 2017 prepared by a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP), who identified three areas on the properties which require protection (Appendix 5). A major tributary of LaCroix Creek extends in an east-west alignment across the north portion of 34461 Ferndale Avenue (shown as Watercourse 1 in the consultant’s report and map). LaCroix Creek and two tributaries are located on 34489 Ferndale Avenue.

The QEP recommended that LaCroix Creek, streamcourses 2 and 3 have a 10m SPEA. Streamcourse 4 is located mostly within the SPEA for LaCroix Creek, and Streamcourse 5 is at the immediate north-east corner of 34489 Ferndale Avenue, and will not be impacted by development. The protection areas for these watercourses in the consultant’s report are identified by a green line on Appendix 5. The BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development provided notice that the consultant’s report meets the assessment and reporting criteria for the Riparian Areas Regulation.

(b) Trees/Vegetation
Both subject properties contain mature trees. The forested area of 34489 Ferndale Avenue should remain in its natural state, given that a portion of this property is traversed by LaCroix Creek and its tributaries. Mature trees located on 34489 Ferndale Avenue should also be retained, particularly for areas adjacent to the existing barn in order to provide visual buffering for future dwellings on proposed lots 1 and 2. Protection of mature tree clusters on 34489 Ferndale Avenue shall be achieved by means of a tree protection covenant as a condition of this rezoning application.

Tree Retention
In accordance with Council Policy LAN.32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of two (2) trees for the new 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 tree (trees having a caliper of 0.2metres or greater) that will be removed except within the proposed municipal infrastructure necessary to complete the development.

Neighbourhood Character:
The subject property is located within the Ferndale neighbourhood that is designated Rural Residential within the OCP and is comprised of single family dwellings on large lots, some containing secondary dwellings. The proposed three-lot subdivision will yield one additional parcel and will fit within the context of the surrounding properties. This proposed development is believed to have little or no impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.
PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The proposed rezoning conforms to the OCP that describes Ferndale as a rural residential area north of the east side of central Mission, outside of the urban growth boundary. The OCP also states that “Mission recognizes that this may be a future growth area, but smaller lots in Ferndale are not considered appropriate at this time. This is because there is sufficient land already identified within the urban growth boundary to accommodate residential development for many years.” The OCP Rural Residential designation characteristics state: “Larger lot residential units on fringe of urban area not serviced by municipal water or sewer.” Land Uses include single detached residential and residential with accessory units with appropriate zoning. The minimum density permitted in the Rural Residential designation is 0.7 units per hectare (1.73 acre) lots or 1 – 2 units/ha.

This proposal also conforms to the OCP policies for Affordable and Inclusive Housing including:

- Policy 5.1.19: “Allow secondary suites in all single detached houses with lot sizes that are able to appropriately accommodate an additional on-site parking space.”
- Policy 5.1.20 “Allow detached suites such as garden cottages on all single detached lots with lot sizes that are able to appropriately accommodate an additional on-site parking space.”

Recognizing that the property owners propose to subdivide the two existing properties into three rural residential lots, each proposed lot would have sufficient space (all lot areas are > 0.7ha) to accommodate additional parking space for development of a secondary suite or secondary dwelling (coach house or garden cottage). The RR7s Zone Intent states: “The intent of these zones is to provide one Single Family Dwelling with a Secondary Dwelling Unit in the Rural Residential area, or where an RR zone is currently applied, and compatible accessory uses.” This proposal therefore conforms to the Zoning Bylaw regulations and the OCP policies.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCES (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

The applicant requests to vary the following sections of the Zoning Bylaw, Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone. Discussion and recommendations for the variances DV18-001 (Appendix 7) and DV18-002 (Appendix 8) are as follows:

I. Section 302.D.1 An interior side yard setback variance is requested to reduce the setback from 15m to 6.42m for the barn (classified in the Zoning Bylaw as a hobby agricultural building) on proposed Lot 1 (Appendix 7).

This existing building houses the applicant’s horses and is angled on the property whereby the east corner of the barn is located 6.42m from the east interior lot line of proposed lot 1. The barn is located on a bench at a lower elevation than the existing dwelling at 34461 Ferndale Avenue (on proposed lot 1) and the future dwellings on proposed lot 2 (Attachment 4). There is a mix of deciduous and conifer tress located between the barn and proposed common property line between lots 1 and 2. In view of the barn’s lower elevation on the property and screening by existing trees, it is not significantly visible from the existing dwelling at 34461 Ferndale Avenue or the proposed dwellings on lot 2. Protection of these trees is required by registration of a tree protection covenant against the property title of 34461 Ferndale Avenue as a condition of the associated rezoning application. Staff recommends support for this variance.

II. Section 302.D.1 A front yard variance is requested to reduce the setback from 15m to 4.94m for the greenhouse (classified in the Zoning Bylaw as a hobby agricultural building) on proposed Lot 3 (Appendix 8).
This existing greenhouse is located relatively close to the proposed lot 3 front lot line. It is located approximately 5m from the LaCroix Creek tributary SPEA boundary and 15m from the LaCroix Creek tributary top of bank (on proposed lot 1). It is located approximately 100m from the existing dwelling on proposed lot 1 and the potential building envelopes for a single family dwelling and secondary dwelling on proposed lot 2.

This variance is recommended with conditions that the applicant plant two conifer trees between the greenhouse and the proposed lot 1 property line in order to provide a measure of visual and nighttime lighting screening for the existing residence at 34461 Ferndale Avenue (lot 1) and proposed dwellings on lot 2. Financial security for the landscaping requirements is noted in the draft variance (Appendix 8). Staff recommends support for this variance with the above conditions.

III. Section 302.D.1 A front yard variance is requested to reduce the setback from 7.5m to 6.43m for the shop (classified in the Zoning Bylaw as an Accessory Building) on proposed Lot 3 (Appendix 8).

Recognizing that this structure is located a distance that is marginally less than the minimum required front yard setback, the variance requested is considered reasonable respecting that the proposed common lot line between proposed lots 1 and 2 with lot 3 is a straight alignment and provides for regularly configured parcels. This structure is accessed from the north, and mature trees are located on the south side of the building. Staff recommends support for this variance.

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

It is recognized that residential development imposes a unique financial burden on the community by creating or increasing demand for new/upgraded public facilities and amenities. To address this unique financial burden, applicants applying for a rezoning which has a residential component are requested to make a voluntary contribution to the District’s Community Amenity Reserve fund. Pursuant to Council Policy LAN.40, the Community Amenity Contribution requested for the one new residential lot proposed with this application is $2,815.00, payable prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

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).
SERVICING

The Engineering Department advises that municipal water is available to the property (Appendix 6). Municipal sanitary service is not available on Ferndale Avenue. Fraser Health has specific requirements related septic systems which would apply if more than one dwelling unit is serviced. Confirmation that the proposed septic system is approved for a secondary dwelling unit will be required prior to the adoption of the zoning bylaw amendment. The property owners are required to provide confirmation from a Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioner (ROWP) that an onsite sewage treatment system can be installed to accommodate the discharge from the proposed principal dwelling and secondary dwelling unit.

REFERRALS

Engineering

The Engineering Department recommends: “From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to adoption to adoption” as outlined in Appendix 6.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING

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

1. An onsite sewage treatment system report, prepared by a Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioner (ROWP) with expertise in on-site sewage treatment systems subject to the system meeting the provisions of the Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw.

2. Registration of a tree protection covenant on the property title of 34461 Ferndale Avenue for retention and protection of mature trees located in proximity to the existing barn.

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

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Dickinson, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow
Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
**Appendix 1**

**Information for Corporate Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address</th>
<th>34461 Ferndale Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>018-137-938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Lot A Section 35 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP9028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address</th>
<th>34489 Ferndale Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>018-137-946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Lot B Section 35 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP9028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 34461 & 34489 Ferndale Avenue

Owner: Edward & Debora Minderhoud
(34461 Ferndale Avenue)
William Hill
(34489 Ferndale Avenue)

Applicant: Ed Minderhoud

Zoning: RU16

OCP Designation: Rural Residential
Appendix 3

Site Plan
Appendix 4

Variance Plan

Variance to reduce the front yard setback from 15m to 4.94m for a greenhouse (Hobby Agriculture Building)

Variance to reduce the front yard setback from 7.5m to 6.43m for a shop (Accessory Building)

Variance to reduce east interior side yard setback from 15m to 6.42m for a barn (Hobby Agriculture Building)
Appendix 5

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

November 27, 2017

CIVIC ADDRESS: 34461 & 34469 Ferndale Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: RU16  PROPOSED ZONE: RR7s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water service is available on Ferndale Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary service is not available on Ferndale Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm service is not available on Ferndale Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Ferndale Avenue provides paved access to the site. No upgrades are required.

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

Prepared by:
Jacek Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Brant Selviti, Director of Engineering & Public Works (Acting)

Reviewed by:
Jay Jockman, Manager of Development
Engineering & Projects

FILE 08-0310-17-J8
R17-025
Appendix 6

RAR Assessment Plan
Appendix 7

DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV18-001

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: Edward Theodore Minderhoud and Debora Kim Mindeehoud

as the registered owner (hereinafter referred to as the Permitee) 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:

LOT A SECTION 35 TOWNSHIP 17 NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN LMP9028

Parcel Identifier: 018-137-938

1. The said lands are zoned Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling 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) Section 302 Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone, Section D. 1. Setbacks by reducing the the Interior Side Setback for a Hobby Agriculture Building/Structure from fifteen (15) metres to six decimal four, two (9.42) metres.
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 _____ day of ______, 2018.

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 February, 2018.

Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

Michael Younie,
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV18-001

Document!
Appendix 8

DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV18-002

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: Edward Theodore Mindehoud and Deborra Kim Mindehoud

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:

LOT A SECTION 35 TOWNSHIP 17 NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN LMP9028

Parcel Identifier: 018-137-946

1. The said lands are zoned Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling 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) Section 302 Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone, Section D. 1. Setbacks by reducing the Front Setback for a Hobby Agriculture Building/Structure from fifteen (15) metres to four decimal nine, four (4.94) metres
   (b) Section 302 Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone, Section D. 1. Setbacks by reducing the Front Setback for an Accessory Building/Structure from seven decimal five (7.5) metres to six decimal four, three (6.43) metres

3. Submission of a landscaping security in the amount of $500.00 to account for planting of two conifer trees to the immediate south of the greenhouse (Hobby Agriculture Building) noted in 2 (a) above and on Schedule 1.

4. 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 ___ day of _______, 2018.

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 February, 2018.

__________________________
Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

__________________________
Michael Younie,
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV18-002
DATE: February 5, 2018  
TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner  
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 34884 Moffat Avenue  
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer  
Appendix 2 – Location Map  
Appendix 3 – Draft Site Plan  
Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments  
CIVIC ADDRESS: 34884 Moffat Avenue  
APPLICANT: Vern Proksa  
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Residential OCP designation  
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: November 22, 2017  
LOCATION: Hatzic
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to rezone 34884 Moffat Avenue to R930s to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff supports 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 February 19, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Vern Proksa, for the property located at 34884 Moffat Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Urban Residential 930 (R930) Zone to Urban Residential 930 Secondary Dwelling (R930s) Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite within a proposed addition to the existing house.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is 1,670 m² (17975 ft²) in size and is located in the Hatzic area. The subject property fronts Moffat Avenue between Lawrence Lane and Dewdney Trunk Road. The land moderately slopes from the north (front) to the south (rear) of the property. District mapping does not indicate the presence of a watercourse.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Urban Residential in the OCP and is zoned R930 zone. The proposal to rezone to the R930s Zone will allow a secondary dwelling unit.

The proposed rezoning conforms to OCP Policy 2.4.4 which encourages rezoning for secondary dwelling units as a form of infill housing. Secondary dwelling units may be considered on lots that are large enough to accommodate the following associated elements: on-site parking, private outside space, separate entrance that is clearly secondary to the primary dwelling and scale of the secondary dwelling must clearly be ancillary to the primary use.

The subject property is 1,670 m² (17,975 ft²) in size which exceeds the minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,010 ft²) in the proposed R930s Zone.

The proposed secondary suite is 70.2m² (756 ft²) which is less than 90.0m² (968.8 ft.) permitted under the Zoning Bylaw. The applicant has supplied a site plan (Appendix 3) that shows an unobstructed parking stall and a floor plan that shows a separate entrance for the suite, both of which are requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

The Inspection Services Division will ensure the proposed secondary suite meets the requirements of the BC Building Code, including fire separation, during the Building Permit review and plan check process.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within an urban residential neighbourhood comprised of single family dwellings on larger lots. The proposed secondary dwelling unit will fit within the context of the surrounding properties and is believed to have little or no impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.
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 rezoning application as outlined in Appendix 4.
REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:
The 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.

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: 34884 Moffat Avenue
PID: 008-629-943
Legal: Lot 71 District Lot 6 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan 39517
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 34884 Moffat Avenue
Owner: Diana Dutra & Vern Proksa
Applicant: Vern Proksa
Zoning: R930
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Appendix 3

Draft Site Plan

Parking Stall for Suite
CIVIC ADDRESS:  34884 Moffat Avenue

CURRENT ZONE:  R930   PROPOSED ZONE:  R930s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water service is available on Moffat Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is required.

According to the service record card, the property has an existing 19 mm (copper) service connection that was installed in August 1975.

The existing service connection shall be replaced with a new service that has been adequately sized for the future installation of a residential sprinkler system (not in conjunction with the current rezoning application). The new service shall be fitted with a meter box, meter setter, and meter with radio head at the property line. The meter shall be sized, supplied and installed by the District at the developer’s expense.

This requirement may be deferred to the building permit stage.

For further information, please contact Rod Hubler, Works Inspector, at 604-820-3743.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary service is available on Moffat Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is required.

This requirement may be deferred to the building permit stage.

For further information, please contact Mike Rohde, Senior Building Inspector, at 604-820-3728.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm service is available on Moffat Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is required.

This requirement may be deferred to the building permit stage.

For further information, please contact Mike Rohde, Senior Building Inspector, at 604-820-3728.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Moffat Avenue provides paved access to the site.
No upgrades are required.

FEES:  next page
FEES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC Area: C, Single Family (R930s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Subdivision Application: November 15, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewage Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,894.21</td>
<td>$4,894.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District No. 75 (Mission) Bylaw #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Site Acquisition &lt;21 units/ha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,894.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION:

From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to adoption once the fees have been paid.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

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

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 416-1975 at a District owned property located at an unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Bill 17, 2014
- Appendix 4 – Official Community Plan designation: Environmentally Sensitive Area
- Appendix 5 – Land Use Contract (LUC): 416-1975
- Appendix 6 – Underlying Zone: Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone
- Appendix 6 – Recommended Zone: Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone

CIVIC ADDRESS: Unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector
APPLICANT: District of Mission under the authority of Section 548 of the Local Government Act (LGA).
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 416-1975 for the property located at an unaddressed property located on Cedar Valley Connector which will allow the underlying Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic (IPRC) zone to come into effect one year after final adoption of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for February 19, 2018

BACKGROUND

The Land Use Contract (LUC) was a form of development approval permitted by the Province for a short period of time during the 1970’s. A LUC typically included information related to zoning, development control, engineering servicing requirements and development cost charges (DCCs) all contained within one document. As a result, the LUC became the governing document related to a property rather than the Zoning Bylaw. The legislation authorizing LUCs was repealed in 1978; however, LUCs approved prior to this date remain in force. Under the 1978 legislation, an amendment or termination of an LUC required the approval of both the property owner and District.

In May 2014, the Province passed Bill 17, 2014 (Appendix 3), an amendment to the Local Government Act that:

- terminates all LUCs in the province on June 30, 2024;
- directs municipalities to ensure zoning is in place on the subject properties prior to June 30, 2022;
- authorizes municipalities to terminate LUCs without property owner permission, should they choose to do so;
- requires local governments to give written notice of LUC termination, when LUCs are terminated early or in advance of the sunset date of June 30, 2024;
- extends non-conforming status to land, buildings and structures that are on land subject to a LUC after LUCs are terminated;
- provides the District’s Board of Variance (BoV) with new authority to extend the date set in early termination bylaws for reasons of hardship, up to the sunset date of June 30, 2024; and
- extends the no compensation payable provision to land use decisions related to properties subject to a LUC.

A LUC is a contract between a property owner and a municipality to address the use and development rights related to a property. The regulations in a LUC are similar to those found within a Zoning Bylaw, except that the LUC is registered to title and may contain other items typically not found within a zoning bylaw, such as engineering servicing standards and Development Cost Charges (DCCs).
Section 533 of the *Local Government Act* (LGA) provides legal non-conforming status to all properties subject to a LUC at time of expiry of the LUC (termination date set by the province or termination date set by District bylaw) provided the land, building or other structure has been lawfully used and constructed.

On November 20, 2017, Council directed staff to bring forward bylaws which would terminate all LUCs within the District prior to the June 30, 2022 deadline and, to review the suitability of the underlying zoning.

In this report, the direction to Staff states:

- where possible, recommend a zone that provides similar land use rights to those found in the LUC; and
- to recommend a zone in compliance with the Official Community Plan (OCP).

Staff has brought forward Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 in accordance with the approved process.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

Staff has reviewed current land uses, LUC 416-1975, the OCP and the Zoning Bylaw in relation to the subject property.

The review finds:

**Current Land Use:**

The subject property is undeveloped property that contains a ravine and a Class ‘A’ watercourse.

**Official Community Plan**

The subject property is designated Environmentally Sensitive Area (Appendix 4) in the OCP. This designation envisions: natural areas, including steep slopes, sensitive habitat, riparian corridors, low-impact recreation and research and education land uses.

**Land Use Contract**

LUC 416-1975 (Appendix 5) was approved on June 2, 1975 and permits a “60 unit condominium complex”.

**Underlying Zone**

The underlying Zoning of the subject property is Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone (Appendix 6).

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 because:

- the property is undeveloped and consists of Environmentally Sensitive Area, including a Class A watercourse. This type of development is generally in conformance with the OCP’s Environmentally Sensitive Area designation, an OCP Amendment is not required.
- the existing Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone is in compliance with the Environmentally Sensitive Area OCP designation. Staff believe the IPRC Zone is the most appropriate considering the current land use, OCP designation and current zone; as such, no change to the properties zone is proposed.
Staff are not aware of any known implications associated with the recommended Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw.

**Board of Variance (BoV)**

If the property owner feels that the termination of the LUC will cause undue financial hardship, the property owner has the right to appeal the in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw to the District's Board of Variance (BoV). The BoV may extend the in-effect date of the Bylaw up to June 30, 2024; however, the BoV does not have the authority to over-turn Council’s decision to terminate the LUC.

**COMMUNICATION**

**Public Information Meeting**

The Planning Department held a public information meeting on January 18, 2018 to gather feedback regarding LUCs. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to inform affected property owners of the end to LUCs and to consult with affected property owners and occupiers on zoning.

All property owners and occupiers directly affected by LUC 416-1975 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. At the public information meeting, staff did not receive any comments on this application.

**Website Communications**

Following Council’s direction of November 20, 2017, the District’s website was updated to provide general information on the LUC process. This included:

- Background information & frequently asked questions and answers.
- Copy of Bill 17, 2014;
- Copy of the November 20, 2017 Staff Report; and
- Copy of all LUCs.

**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*.

**INFORMATIONAL NOTES / REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING**

The Final Reading of the amending bylaw(s) will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. The subject property is within 800m of a controlled access highway. Final Reading of the bylaws will be held until approval from Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) is obtained.
2. The in-effect date of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 will be one year from the final adoption date of the Bylaw. An affected property owner may apply to the BoV to extend the in-effect date of the Bylaws up to June 30, 2024.
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: Unaddressed property on Cedar Valley Connector

PID: 011-325-321

Legal: Lot 10 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8517
Appendix 2

Location Map

Contract No.: 416-1975
Subject Property: No Address
See Map Below
OCP Designation: Parks Recreation and Natural Open Spaces
Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014 (Bill 17, 2014)

Amendments to Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter

Bill 17, 2014, the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014 includes a number of amendments intended to streamline local and provincial government land use planning and development approvals, modernize outdated legislative tools and provide greater certainty and transparency for residents and those who develop and build within communities. Specifically, Bill 17 introduces amendments to the Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter to remove unnecessary ministerial approvals for certain land use planning and development bylaws; allow modern land use policies and practices to replace land use contracts; and, protect developers from increases in development cost charges (DCC) (or development cost levies (DCL) in the City of Vancouver) for 12 months after DCC/DCL rate increases are made, where a rezoning or development permit application is in process.

Proposed Amendments:
Proposed amendments to the Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter:

Removing the requirement for Ministerial approval for Regional District (RD) land use bylaws
The following amendments remove the requirement for Ministerial approval of certain RD land use bylaws, streamlining the RD bylaw approval process. They also broaden the authority of the Minister to develop provincial policy guidelines in relation to RD land use bylaws, providing an opportunity to provide clarity regarding provincial interests and support the appropriate notification and referral of regional district bylaws to Provincial ministries and agencies.

- Removes requirement for Ministerial approval of RD OCP, zoning, subdivision servicing and temporary use bylaws (LGA s. 882, 913, 921, 930, 938).
- Provides discretionary authority for the Minister to require approval of RD bylaws (LGA s. 874.1).
- Broadens the existing authority of the Minister, to develop provincial policy guidelines in relation to RD zoning, subdivision servicing and temporary use bylaws (LGA s.873.2).
- Removes the requirement for the minister responsible for the Transportation Act to approve subdivision servicing bylaws, if a regional district provides the subdivision approving officer services, and provides discretionary regulatory authority for that minister to require approval of such bylaws (LGA s. 938(3.1)).

Removing Ministerial approval for soil removal and deposit bylaws that include fees
- Removes the requirement for the Minister to approve the application of fees within municipal soil removal and deposit bylaws (CC s. 195(3)), and for such regional district bylaws (LGA s. 723(7)).
- Note: The Ministry of Environment maintains its approval role for soil deposit bylaws, and the Ministry of Energy and Mines maintains its approval role for soil removal bylaws.
Terminating Land Use Contracts (LUC)

- Provides for the termination of all land use contracts in affected BC municipalities and regional districts on the “sunset” date of June 30, 2024 and requires all local governments to have zoning in place for lands covered by land use contracts by June 30, 2022 (LGA Part 26, Division 7.1, s. 914.1).
- Enables local governments to undertake early termination of land use contracts under certain conditions (LGA, Division 7.1, s. 914.2), namely:
  - Early termination bylaw is adopted on or before June 30, 2022;
  - Early termination bylaw comes into force at least one year after it is adopted;
  - A public hearing, which cannot be waived, is held (LGA s. 892, 893);
  - Zoning is in place where land use contracts are to be terminated; and
  - Proper land title office is notified of early termination bylaw within 30 days of its adoption.
- Requires local governments to give written notice of land use contract termination, when land use contracts are terminated early or in advance of the sunset date of June 30, 2024 (LGA s. 914.3).
- Provides Boards of Variance with new authority to extend the dates set in early termination bylaws for reasons of hardship, up to the sunset date of June 30, 2024 at the latest (LGA s.901.1).
- Provides non-conforming use status to land, buildings and structures that are on land subject to a land use contract after land use contracts are terminated (LGA s. 911).
- Provides that compensation is not payable with regard to land use decisions for the termination of land use contracts, which extends the current no-compensation provisions currently provided in relation to land use bylaws (LGA s. 914).
- Note: this amendment does not impact the City of Vancouver, as there are no lands affected by land use contracts in the City.

Providing in-stream protection from DCC/DCL rate changes

- Provides developers with 12 months protection from increases to development cost charges (DCCs) if a DCC bylaw is adopted after an application for a rezoning or a development permit has been submitted to a local government for approval (in a form acceptable to the local government and fees paid) (LGA s.937.001).
  - The same level of protection currently exists for subdivision (LGA s. 943) and building permit applications (LGA s. 937.001).
- Provides that the same 12-month protection applies to development cost levy (DCL) rate changes in the City of Vancouver for development permit and rezoning applications (in a form acceptable to the City and fees paid) (VC s.523D).
  - The City of Vancouver currently has the same level of protection for building permit applications (VC s. 523D (8.2)).

Practical Considerations:

- If the legislation is passed, the changes will come into force on the date that the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014 (Bill 17) receives Royal Assent.

Statutes amended:

- Local Government Act: sections 5, 723, 870, 873.2, 874.1, 876, 882, 890, 892, 893, 900, 901.1, 911, 913, 914, 914.1, 914.2, 914.3, 914.4, 921, 930, 937.001, 938
- Community Charter: section 195
- Vancouver Charter: sections 2.1, 523D

Link to Bill 17, 2014

http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCP Designation</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>• Institutional buildings and sites</td>
<td>• Civic, education, religious, health care, and assembly uses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One accessory dwelling unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>• Parks and open space supporting indoor and outdoor recreation amenities, trails and natural parkland</td>
<td>• Recreation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protected areas</td>
<td>• One accessory dwelling unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• see Section 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Forest</td>
<td>• Forested land managed for resource and recreation purposes</td>
<td>• Recreation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protected areas</td>
<td>• Forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>• Preserved natural areas including steep slopes, sensitive habitat, riparian corridors</td>
<td>• Low-impact recreation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Research and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Study Area</td>
<td>• Underutilized land in the ALR</td>
<td>• To be determined</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjacent lands not within the ALR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Site Comprehensive Development Area</td>
<td>• Sto:lo Heritage Trust Lands</td>
<td>• To be determined</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.1: Land Use Designations (continued)*
Appendix 5

DISTRICT OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 416 - 1975

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with the Comox Corporation of Canada Ltd.

WHEREAS under the provision 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. 155 - 1972", declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

The total RS-1 and RT-1 areas located in the NW of Section 17, NEQ Section 18, SEQ Section 19, NEQ Section 19, Section 20, Section 21, SEQ Section 28, SWQ Section 28, SEQ Section 29, SWQ Section 29, D.L.1, Group 3, D.L.4 Group 3, D.L.165, Group 1, in Township 17, N.W.D.

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 construct a 60 unit condominium complex within the said Development Area.

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 6th May, 1975, 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 "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 416 - 1975".

2. It shall be lawful for and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with the Comox Corporation of Canada Ltd., for the construction of a 60 unit Condominium Complex upon land known and described as:

Lot 10, Blocks 1-5 of the South East Quarter of Section 20, Township 17, Plan 8517, New Westminster District,

Located South of 6th Avenue and East of Briskham Road.

3. The Land Use Contract shall be in the form and manner set forth in Schedule "A" attached to this By-Law.

4. The Mayor and the Clerk of the District of Mission are hereby authorized to sign, seal and deliver a Land Use Contract in the form set out in the said Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this By-Law, on behalf of the District of Mission and to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission therefor.

READ A FIRST TIME this 20 day of May, 1975
READ A SECOND TIME this 20 day of May, 1975
READ A THIRD TIME this 20 day of May, 1975
RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 2nd day of June, 1975.

MAYOR

CLERK

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 416 - 1975".

CLERK
A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of this zone is to accommodate parks, open space and recreation facilities.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the IPRC zone:
   a. Institutional limited to:
      i. Cemetery, and
      ii. Prison and Detention Facility.
   b. Office limited to:
      i. Government Services.
   c. Recreation limited to:
      i. Park, and
      ii. Indoor Recreation Facility.
   d. Service limited to:
      i. Community Services.

2. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the IPRC zone:
   a. Food and Beverage limited to:
      i. Café, and
      ii. Coffee Shop, and
      iii. Restaurant.
   b. Institutional limited to:
      i. Child Care Centres,
      ii. Adult Education Institution, and
      iii. Trade School.
   c. Retail limited to:
      i. Retail Store - provided the products retailed are a direct correlation with the Principal Uses provided on the Lot.
d. Storage limited to:
   
i. *Enclosed Storage*, and
   
ii. *Outdoor Storage*.

C. Lot Area
   
1. N/A

D. Density
   
1. N/A

E. Setbacks
   
1. All *Buildings* and *Structures* shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum *Setbacks*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Interior Side</th>
<th>Exterior Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Building</strong></td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.7 ft)</td>
<td>(19.7 ft)</td>
<td>(19.7 ft)</td>
<td>(19.7 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory Building/Structure</strong></td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.6 ft)</td>
<td>(14.8 ft)</td>
<td>(4.9 ft)</td>
<td>(14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 1104 Part E.1, all *Buildings* shall be sited a minimum of 6.0 m (19.6 ft) from all *Undevelopable Areas* as defined in this Bylaw.

F. Lot Coverage
   
1. N/A

G. Floor Space
   
1. N/A

H. Height of Buildings
   
1. The *Height* of the *Principal Building* and *Accessory Buildings* shall not exceed the heights outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th><strong>Principal Building</strong></th>
<th><strong>Accessory Building/Structure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPRC</td>
<td>18.0 m (59.0 ft)</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.0 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Indoor Amenity Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Outdoor Amenity Space</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. Off Street Parking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Off Street Parking shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 109.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 170-1972 and Rezoning of the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street to Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Bill 17, 2014
Appendix 4 – Official Community Plan (OCP) designation: Commercial
Appendix 5 – Land Use Contract (LUC): 170-1972
Appendix 6 – Underlying Zone: Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone
Appendix 7 – Recommended Zone: Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street
APPLICANT: District of Mission under the authority of Section 548 of the Local Government Act (LGA).
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 170-1972, and to rezone the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street, as shown in Appendix 2 and identifies the necessary amendments to the Zoning Bylaw which will come into effect one year after final adoption of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw and Zoning Amending Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050 (279) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for February 19, 2018.

BACKGROUND

The Land Use Contract (LUC) was a form of development approval permitted by the Province for a short period of time during the 1970’s. A LUC typically included information related to zoning, development control and engineering servicing all contained within one document. As a result, the LUC became the governing regulations related to a property rather than the Zoning Bylaw. The legislation authorizing LUCs was repealed in 1978; however, LUCs approved prior to this date remain in force. Under the 1978 legislation, an amendment or termination of an LUC required the approval of both the property owner and District.

In May 2014, the Province passed Bill 17, 2014 (Appendix 3), an amendment to the Local Government Act that:

- terminates all Land Use Contracts (LUCs) in the province on June 30, 2024;
- directs municipalities to ensure zoning is in place on the subject properties prior to June 30, 2022;
- authorizes municipalities to terminate LUCs without property owner permission, should they choose to do so;
- requires local governments to give written notice of LUC termination, when LUCs are terminated early or in advance of the sunset date of June 30, 2024;
- extends non-conforming status to land, buildings and structures that are on land subject to a LUC after LUCs are terminated;
- provides the District’s Board of Variance (BoV) with new authority to extend the date set in early termination bylaws for reasons of hardship, up to the sunset date of June 30, 2024; and
- extends the no compensation payable provision to land use decisions related to properties subject to a LUC.

A Land Use Contract (LUC) is a contract between a property owner and a municipality to address the use and development rights related to a property. The regulations in a LUC are similar to those found within a Zoning Bylaw, except that the LUC is registered to title and may contain other items typically not found within a zoning bylaw, such as engineering servicing standards and Development Cost Charges (DCCs).
Section 533 of the *Local Government Act* (LGA) provides legal non-conforming status to all properties subject to a Land Use Contract at time of expiry of the land use contract (termination date set by the province or termination date set by a District bylaw) provided the land, building or other structure has been lawfully used and constructed.

On November 20, 2017, Council directed staff to bring forward bylaws which would terminate Land Use Contracts within the District prior to the June 30, 2022 deadline. As a result, Staff has brought forward a termination Bylaw and associated Zoning Amending Bylaw in accordance with the approved process.

In this report, the direction to Staff states:

- where possible, recommend a zone that provides similar land use rights to those found in the LUC; and
- to recommend a zone in compliance with the Official Community Plan (OCP).

Staff has brought forward Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050(279) in accordance with the approved process.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

Staff has reviewed current land uses, Land Use Contract (LUC) 170-1972, the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Zoning Bylaw in relation to the subject properties.

The review finds:

**Current Land Use**

The subject properties are currently occupied by a one storey commercial building containing a restaurant and an accessory parking lot.

**Official Community Plan**

The subject properties are designated Commercial (*Appendix 4*) in the Official Community Plan. This designation small to large format retail centres, with up to 4 storey buildings that include a variety of uses, including: retail, tourist accommodation, automotive, entertainment, light industrial office, service, indoor recreations use with upper level residential uses.

**Land Use Contract**

LUC 170-1972 (*Appendix 5*) was approved on August 7, 1972 and permits “[the] erection of a commercial building 1600 square feet for take-out fried chicken and 2220 square feet for a commercial rental enterprise”.

**Underlying Zoning**

The underlying zoning on the subject properties is Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone (*Appendix 6*).

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050(279) because:

- existing development on the property consists of a commercial building and accessory parking lot. This development type is generally in conformance with the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Commercial. An OCP Amendment is not required.
the recommended Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone provides similar permitted uses and regulations to those found in LUC 170-1972 and would be consistent with the OCP.

Staff are not aware of any known implications associated with the recommended Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw and associated rezoning of the subject properties to Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone (Appendix 7).

BOARD OF VARIANCE (BoV)

If the property owner feels that the termination of the LUC will cause undue financial hardship, the property owner has the right to appeal the in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw to the District’s Board of Variance (BoV). The BoV may extend the in-effect date of the Bylaw up to June 30, 2024; however, the BoV does not have the authority to over-turn Council’s decision to terminate the LUC or rezone the property.

COMMUNICATION

Public Information Meeting

The Planning Department held a public information meeting on {insert date} to gather feedback regarding Land Use Contracts. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to inform affected property owners of the end to Land Use Contracts and to consult with affected property owners on the underlying zoning.

All property owners and occupiers directly affected by LUC 170-1972 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. At the public information meeting, staff did not receive any comments on this application.

Website Communications

The District’s website provides general information on the Land Use Contract process. This includes:

- Background & Frequently asked questions (FAQs).
- Bill 17, 2014;
- Copy of the November 20, 2017 Staff Report; and
- Copy of all Land Use Contracts.

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 and 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.
INFORMATIONAL NOTES / REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING

1. The subject properties are within 800m of a controlled access highway. Final Reading of the bylaws will be held until approval from Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) is obtained.

2. The in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050(279) will be one year from the final adoption date of the Bylaws. After application by an affected property owner, the BoV may extend the in-effect date of the Bylaw up to June 30, 2024.

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: 32793 Lougheed Highway
PID: 011-941-669
Legal: Lot 24 Except Firstly: Part Statutory Right of Way Plan 4862; Secondly: Part Dedicated Road Plan NWP87967; Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951

Civic Address: Unaddressed property on Wardrop Street
PID: 011-941-626
Legal: Lot 23 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951
Appendix 2

Location Map

Land Use Contract: 170-1972
Subject Property: 32793 Lougheed Highway
Owner: Su Chen Investments Ltd.
Applicant: District of Mission under the authority of Section 548 of the Local Government Act (LGA)
Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014 (Bill 17, 2014)

Amendments to Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter

Bill 17, 2014, the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014 includes a number of amendments intended to streamline local and provincial government land use planning and development approvals, modernize outdated legislative tools and provide greater certainty and transparency for residents and those who develop and build within communities. Specifically, Bill 17 introduces amendments to the Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter to remove unnecessary ministerial approvals for certain land use planning and development bylaws; allow modern land use policies and practices to replace land use contracts; and, protect developers from increases in development cost charges (DCC) (or development cost levies (DCL) in the City of Vancouver) for 12 months after DCC/DCL rate increases are made, where a rezoning or development permit application is in process.

Proposed Amendments:
Proposed amendments to the Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter:

Removing the requirement for Ministerial approval for Regional District (RD) land use bylaws
The following amendments remove the requirement for Ministerial approval of certain RD land use bylaws, streamlining the RD bylaw approval process. They also broaden the authority of the Minister to develop provincial policy guidelines in relation to RD land use bylaws, providing an opportunity to provide clarity regarding provincial interests and support the appropriate notification and referral of regional district bylaws to Provincial ministries and agencies.

- Removes requirement for Ministerial approval of RD OCP, zoning, subdivision servicing and temporary use bylaws (LGA s. 882, 913, 921, 930, 938).
- Provides discretionary authority for the Minister to require approval of RD bylaws (LGA s. 874.1).
- Broadens the existing authority of the Minister, to develop provincial policy guidelines in relation to RD zoning, subdivision servicing and temporary use bylaws (LGA s. 873.2).
- Removes the requirement for the minister responsible for the Transportation Act to approve subdivision servicing bylaws, if a regional district provides the subdivision approving officer services, and provides discretionary regulatory authority for that minister to require approval of such bylaws (LGA s. 938(3.1)).

Removing Ministerial approval for soil removal and deposit bylaws that include fees
- Removes the requirement for the Minister to approve the application of fees within municipal soil removal and deposit bylaws (CC s. 195(3)), and for such regional district bylaws (LGA s. 723(7)).
- Note: The Ministry of Environment maintains its approval role for soil deposit bylaws, and the Ministry of Energy and Mines maintains its approval role for soil removal bylaws.
**Terminating Land Use Contracts (LUC)**

- Provides for the termination of all land use contracts in affected BC municipalities and regional districts on the “sunset” date of June 30, 2024 and requires all local governments to have zoning in place for lands covered by land use contracts by June 30, 2022 ([LGA Part 26, Division 7.1, s. 914.1](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
- Enables local governments to undertake early termination of land use contracts under certain conditions ([LGA, Division 7.1, s. 914.2](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)), namely:
  - Early termination bylaw is adopted on or before June 30, 2022;
  - Early termination bylaw comes into force at least one year after it is adopted;
  - A public hearing, which cannot be waived, is held ([LGA s. 892, 893](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm));
  - Zoning is in place where land use contracts are to be terminated; and
  - Proper land title office is notified of early termination bylaw within 30 days of its adoption.
- Requires local governments to give written notice of land use contract termination, when land use contracts are terminated early or in advance of the sunset date of June 30, 2024 ([LGA s. 914.3](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
- Provides Boards of Variance with new authority to extend the dates set in early termination bylaws for reasons of hardship, up to the sunset date of June 30, 2024 at the latest ([LGA s.901.1](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
- Provides non-conforming use status to land, buildings and structures that are on land subject to a land use contract after land use contracts are terminated ([LGA s. 911](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
- Provides that compensation is not payable with regard to land use decisions for the termination of land use contracts, which extends the current no-compensation provisions currently provided in relation to land use bylaws ([LGA 914](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
- **Note:** this amendment does not impact the City of Vancouver, as there are no lands affected by land use contracts in the City.

**Providing in-stream protection from DCC/DCL rate changes**

- Provides developers with 12 months protection from increases to development cost charges (DCCs) if a DCC bylaw is adopted after an application for a rezoning or a development permit has been submitted to a local government for approval (in a form acceptable to the local government and fees paid) ([LGA s.937.001](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
  - The same level of protection currently exists for subdivision ([LGA s. 943](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)) and building permit applications ([LGA s. 937.001](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
- Provides that the same 12-month protection applies to development cost levy (DCL) rate changes in the City of Vancouver for development permit and rezoning applications (in a form acceptable to the City and fees paid) ([VC s.523D](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).
  - The City of Vancouver currently has the same level of protection for building permit applications ([VC s. 523D (8.2)](http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm)).

**Practical Considerations:**

- If the legislation is passed, the changes will come into force on the date that the *Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014* (Bill 17) receives Royal Assent.

**Statutes amended:**

Local Government Act: sections 5, 723, 870, 873.2, 874.1, 876, 882, 890, 892, 893, 900, 901.1, 911, 913, 914, 914.1, 914.2, 914.3, 914.4, 921, 930, 937.001, 938

Community Charter: section 195

Vancouver Charter: sections 2.1, 523D

**Link to Bill 17, 2014**

http://www.leg.bc.ca/40th2nd/1st_read/gov17-1.htm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCP Designation</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Employment Lands</td>
<td>• Future employment opportunities</td>
<td>• To be determined through plan</td>
<td>• Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>• Small to large format retail centres, with up to 4 storey buildings</td>
<td>• Commercial</td>
<td>• Up to 2.0 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Retail, tourist accommodation, automotive, entertainment, light industrial, office, service, indoor recreation and upper level residential uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>• Industrial buildings and structures, with large lots to accommodate circulation, parking and storage</td>
<td>• Industrial</td>
<td>• Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Sales/showroom space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessory dwelling unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Industrial</td>
<td>• Gravel pits</td>
<td>• Heavy industry</td>
<td>• n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>• Farming with rural residential</td>
<td>• Agriculture</td>
<td>• Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential with accessory units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.1: Land Use Designations (continued)*
APPENDIX 5

DISTRICT OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 170 - 1972

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with B. W. I. Properties Ltd.

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 By-Law No. 155 - 1972", declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

Blocks 23 and 24 of the South East Quarter of Section 20, Township 17, Plan 951, EXCEPT part 2303 square feet more or less, of said Block 24 as shown on Plan 4862, New Westminster District

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 take-out chicken and commercial enterprise within the said Development Area:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 24th day of April, 1972 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 "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 170 - 1972".

2. It shall be lawful for and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with B. W. I. Properties Ltd. for the construction of a take-out chicken and commercial enterprise upon land described as:

Blocks 23 and 24 of the South East Quarter of Section 20, Township 17, Plan 951, EXCEPT part 2303 square feet more or less, of said Block 24 as shown on Plan 4862, 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 1st day of May, 1972.

READ A SECOND TIME this 1st day of May, 1972.

READ A THIRD TIME this 1st day of May, 1972.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 7th day of August, 1972.

MAYOR

CLERK

I HEREBY CERTIFY the above to be a true and correct copy of "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 170 - 1972".

CLERK
SUBSTITUTE FORM

DATE: 20/June/73
NATURE OF CHARGE: Land Use Contract
Restrictive covenants
DECLARED VALUE - $5,000

Darlene Staats,
c/o VERNON & THOMPSON,
Barristers & Solicitors,
22195A Dewdney Trunk Rd., Maple Ridge, B.C.
Phone - 463-6281

LAND USE CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 20th day of June, 1972.

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation, duly incorporated
under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, of 33157
First Avenue, Mission City, British Columbia.

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

OF THE FIRST PART

AND:

B. W. I. PROPERTIES LTD., a company duly incorporated
under the laws of the Province of British Columbia on
November 6th, 1968 under No. 82748, of 45835 Yale Road
West, Chilliwack, British Columbia

(hereinafter called "THE DEVELOPER")

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 702(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 held 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:

OWNER

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:

Blocks 23 and 24 of the South East Quarter of Section 20, Township 17, Plan 951 EXCEPT part 2303 square feet more or less, of said Block 24 as shown on Plan 4862, New Westminster District

(LAND

(herinafter called "THE LAND")

CONSENTS

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, thereover 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 "B" hereto.

9. All utilities, including water, sewer, gas, telephone 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 parks, 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 "F" hereto.

12. No land shall be subdivided except in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "G" 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.

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 "L" 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 to 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.

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". 
INTRODUCTION 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.

BINDING 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
24th day of APRIL, A.D. 1972.

This agreement was approved on the 7th day of
August, A.D. 1972 by by-law No. 170.

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 THE
DISTRICT OF MISSION
was affixed in the presence of:

[Signatures]

CLERK

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
by the Developer in the
presence of:

Name: John Carter
Address: R.R.I., P.O. Box
Occupation: Development Officer

[Signature]

B.W.I. PROPERTIES LTD.,
President
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 5th day of May, 1973, at Chilliwack, in the Province of British Columbia, (whose identity has been proved by the evidence on oath of

ELDON UNGER (who is) personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the President of B.W.I. Properties Ltd., and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as

President of the said B. W. I. Properties Ltd.

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 Chilliwack, in the Province of British Columbia, this 5th day of May, 1973.

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:

I, , 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 , for the purposes named thereon.

2. The said instrument was executed at the part thereof, for the purposes named therein.

3. I know the said person, and that he is of the full age of nineteen years.

4. I am the subscribing witness to the said instrument and of the full age of sixteen years.

Sworn before me at Chilliwack, in the Province of British Columbia, this 5th day of May, 1973.

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 5th day of MAY, 1973, at Mission City, in the Province of British Columbia, Harold Barnet (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 Clerk of the District of Mission, and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Clerk of the said District of Mission and affixed the seal of the District of Mission 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 5th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three.

[Signature]

A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia.

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits within British Columbia.

LAURENCE A. H. WAINWRIGHT
A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia.

AFFIDAVIT OF WITNESS

Province of British Columbia

To Wit:

I, , of the , in 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

A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia.

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits within British Columbia.
# LAND USE CONTRACT

**SCHEDULE OF PERSONS HAVING A REGISTERED INTEREST IN THE LAND WHOSE CONSENTS ARE REQUIRED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NATURE OF CHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Development Bank</td>
<td>900 West Hastings St., Vancouver 1, B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT

The Industrial Development Bank hereby consents to the registration in the Land Registry Office in New Westminster, British Columbia of the Land Use Contract attached herewith.

The Corporate Seal of the INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK was affixed in the presence of:

[Signatures]

DEPUTY SECRETARY

[Signatures]

LEGAL DEPT.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 3rd day of
July 1973, at the City of Montreal in the
Province of Quebec, Gyles Rene d'Artois
who is personally known to me, appeared before me and
acknowledged to me that he is the Deputy Secretary
of INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK, and that he is the person
who subscribed his name to the annexed Instrument as
Deputy Secretary of the said INDUSTRIAL
DEVELOPMENT BANK, and together with its Administrative Assistant
affixed the Seal of the said INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK
to the said Instrument, and that they were first duly
authorized to subscribe their names 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 at the
City of Montreal in the
Province of Quebec this 3rd
day of July 1973.

[Signature]
A Notary Practicing in and
for the Province of Quebec.
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Dated

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

EMI PROPERTIES LTD.

CONSULTANT OF LAND USE CONTRACT
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "A"

Schedule of permitted land use.

Erection of a commercial building 1600 square feet for take-out fried chicken and 2220 square feet for a commercial rental enterprise.
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "B"

Plot Plan and Specifications:

Site Area - 13,325 square feet 41'x325'

Yards front - 1,025 square feet 25'x41'

rear -  8,364 square feet 41'x204'

side - Nil

Site Coverage -  3,820 square feet

Height of Building and Structures

maximum - 14 feet

minimum

Floor space ratio - Not applicable

Minimum floor area - 3,820 square feet

Number of units - 2
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "C"

Off Street Parking:
Total area - 41' x 199' = 8,159 square feet
Number of Spaces - Twenty Six (26)
Size of Spaces - 9' x 20'
Surfacing - Asphalt
Lighting - Floodlighting from poles
Signs - Nil
Access - From Cedar Street

Plan - Below

Off Street Loading:
Total area - 18' x 20'
Size of Area - 360 square feet
Location - at rear of building
Surfacing - Asphalt
Lighting - Pole lighting
Signs - Nil
Access - Cedar Street

Plan
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "D"

Signs: NOT APPLICABLE
Number
Types
Location
Design
Size

Plan

Buildings & Structures: NOT APPLICABLE
Plans

Specifications

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:
Plans

Specifications -

Area surrounding building at southern and northern end to be landscaped and maintained in a neat and tidy manner with grass, trees and flowering plants.

North end of property to be screened off from residential properties by a landscaped screen.

Adequate storm drainage to be provided, in all areas relating to drainage from this parcel.
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "E"

Utilities: NOT APPLICABLE

Water
Sewer
Gas
Telephone
Electricity
Plans
Specifications
Locations
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "P"

Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways: NOT APPLICABLE

Plans
Specifications

Street Lighting:

Plans
Specifications

Boulevards:

Plans
Specifications

Signs:

Plans
Specifications
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "G"

Subdivision Plans: NOT APPLICABLE

Parcel(s):

Area

Shape

Dimensions

Highways:

Dimensions

Location

Alignment

Gradient
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "H"

Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities: NOT APPLICABLE

Construction

Location

Size

Development

Furnishing

Plans
**LAND USE CONTRACT**

**SCHEDULE "I"**

Development and Service to be provided or paid for by the

Municipality  NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "J"

Works and Services to be Maintained and Operated by the Developer

NONE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "K"

Performance Security:  
Amount:  

Performance Bond:

Mortgage:

Certified Cheque:  $350.00 Development Charge

Other:  $1,000.00 letter of credit as security for completion by the Developer of all the requirements of this contract
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE 'L:'

Item to be provided constructed
Located, Developed

3,820 square feet commercial
building and other items as in
this Contract stipulated

Date of Completion:

DECEMBER 31st, 1972.
A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of these zones is to provide one Single Family Dwelling, one Single Family Dwelling with an associated Secondary Dwelling, one Duplex, or one Boarding House (RB558 only) in the Urban Compact and Urban Residential areas and compatible accessory uses.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the RT465 Zone:
   a. Residential limited to:
      i. One Duplex provided the minimum Lot Area is 558 sq m (6,006 sq ft), or
      ii. One Single Family Dwelling.

2. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the RB558 Zone:
   a. Accommodation limited to:
      i. One Boarding House.
   b. Residential limited to:
      i. One Single Family Dwelling.

3. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the RT465 and RB558 Zones:
   a. Agriculture limited to:
      i. Hobby Greenhouse.
   b. Residential limited to:
      One of:
      i. Secondary Dwelling Unit (Section106 Part F.) limited to:
         • Secondary Suite, or
         • Coach House, or
         • Garden Cottage
      And
      ii. Detached Garage,
      iii. Home Occupation.
c. Storage limited to:
   i. Enclosed Storage.

4. Conditions of Use:
   a. Where a Duplex or a Boarding House is sited on a lot, a Secondary Dwelling is not permitted.

C. Lot Area

1. Except where such a Lot existed at the date of adoption of this Bylaw or Lots created under Section 104, Part D, each Lot shall have a minimum area, width, and depth as shown on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT465</td>
<td>465 sq m</td>
<td>16.0 m</td>
<td>30.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5,005 sq ft)</td>
<td>(52.5 ft)</td>
<td>(98.4 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB558</td>
<td>558 sq m</td>
<td>18.0 m</td>
<td>30.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6,006 sq ft)</td>
<td>(59.1 ft)</td>
<td>(98.4 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 603, Part C.1, where a Lot contains an Undevelopable Area, that area shall not be included in the calculation of minimum Lot Area.

3. Notwithstanding Section 603, Part C.1 and C.2, where a Lot contains natural slopes greater than or equal to 33%, that sloped area shall not be included in the calculation of minimum Lot Area, or used as part of the measurement for minimum Lot Depth or Lot Width.

D. Setbacks

1. All Buildings and Structures shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Interior Side</th>
<th>Exterior Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Building</td>
<td>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>1.5 m (4.9 ft) minimum</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building/Structure</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>1.3 m (4.3 ft)</td>
<td>1.5 m (4.9 ft)</td>
<td>3.0 m (9.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 603, Part D.1, where the lot is a cul-de-sac, all Interior Side Yard Setbacks may be reduced to 1.5 m (4.9 ft).

3. The Front Yard Setback of the Principal Building may be reduced to a minimum of 4.0 m (13.1 ft) provided the Front Yard Setback of a garage is a minimum of 6.0 m (19.7 ft).

4. Notwithstanding Section 603 Part D.1, all Buildings shall be sited a minimum of 6.0 m (19.7 ft) from all Undevelopable Areas as defined in this Bylaw.

5. Notwithstanding Section 603 Part D.1, the Buildable Area of any Lot shall be a minimum 150 sq m (1,614.6 sq ft).
E. Lot Coverage

1. Buildings shall together cover not more than the Lot Area as noted in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT465</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB558</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Floor Space

1. The floor space should not exceed the following ratios or the maximum floor area, whichever is less, as listed in the following table (A Coach House, Garden Cottage, and Garage space, detached or attached, is not used in calculating total floor space):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Floor Space Ratio</th>
<th>Maximum Floor Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT465</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>353 sq m (3,800 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB558</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>353 sq m (3,800 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The maximum Floor Space of the upper most Storey of the Principal Building shall not exceed 80% of the Floor Space of the Storey below it. The reduced Floor Space of the upper most Storey shall be accomplished by an offset from either the front exterior walls, side exterior walls or a combination thereof, of the Storey below.

For the purposes of calculating the 80%, the following criteria apply:

a. Notwithstanding the definition of Floor Space, the 80% shall be calculated by comparing the sum of the area enclosed by the exterior walls of the upper most Storey with that of the Storey below it.

b. Garages, and covered, unenclosed, uninhabitable front porches & front verandas are included if they form part of the Storey below the upper most Storey.

G. Impervious Surfaces

1. Impervious Surfaces shall together cover not more than the Lot Area as noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT465</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB558</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Number of Residential Buildings

1. Buildings for a Residential Use shall be limited to one per Lot except where a Secondary Dwelling is located within a Coach House or Garden Cottage.
I. Height of Buildings

1. The intent of the Height of the Principal Building shall permit a two storey Building with a Basement not exceeding 9.5 m (31.1 ft).

2. The Height of an Accessory Building shall not exceed one storey to a maximum of 6.0 m (19.7 ft).

3. The Height of an Accessory Building for a Coach House shall not exceed the Height of the Principal Building or 7.0 m (23.0 ft), whichever is less.

J. Off Street Parking

1. Off Street Parking shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 108.

2. Off Street Parking shall not occupy more than 30% of the Front Yard.

2. Access to the lot for Off Street Parking from the Front Lot Line shall be limited to a maximum of 5.0 m (16.4 ft).

K. Hobby Greenhouse Use

1. Shall be limited to a maximum of one Building not exceeding a total area of 20 sq m (215.3 sq ft).

L. Supportive Recovery

1. A Supportive Recovery Use may be permitted as a Residential Use on a lot in the RT465 zone only subject to the following conditions. A Supportive Recovery Use shall:

   a. be subject to a Housing Agreement;

   b. have sleeping accommodation for not more than 10 persons (including site staffing);

   c. not be permitted where there is a Duplex, Secondary Dwelling Unit, Boarding Use, or a Home Occupation Use on the lot;

   d. not permitted within 250 m of an existing Supportive Recovery Use, or a primary or secondary school; excluding buildings for which a business license has been issued prior to Jan 31, 2009;

   e. be located within 250 m of a public transit stop;

   f. have no indication that the building is used for a purpose other than a Residential Use.
A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of the Commercial Highway One (CH1) zone is to provide for a broad range of businesses to serve the general retail, office, service and shopping needs of the community located along the Lougheed Highway corridor in the Commercial area.

2. The intent of the Commercial Highway Two (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 area only. The Commercial Highway Two (CH2) zone allows Drive-through Restaurants as a permitted use.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses subject to the limitations noted within, and no other shall be permitted in the CH1 and CH2 zones:

   a. Accommodation limited to:
      i. Hotel, and
      ii. Motel.

   b. Automotive limited to:
      i. Car Wash,
      ii. Parking Lot,
      iii. Vehicle Rental, and
      iv. Vehicle Service.

   c. Cultural limited to:
      i. Cultural Assembly.

   d. Entertainment limited to:
      i. Adult Entertainment Parlour,
      ii. Arcade,
      iii. Banquet Hall,
      iv. Cinema,
      v. Night Club, and
      vi. Pool and Billiard Hall.
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e. Food and Beverage limited to:
   i. Café,
   ii. Coffee Shop,
   iii. Drive-through Restaurant (CH2 zone only), and
   iv. Restaurant.

f. Industrial limited to:
   i. Light Manufacturing.

g. Institutional limited to:
   i. Adult Educational Institution,
   ii. Child Care Centre,
   iii. Civic Assembly,
   iv. College,
   v. Educational Facility,
   vi. Trade School, and
   vii. University.

h. Office limited to:
   i. Escort Service,
   ii. Government Service,
   iii. General office Use, and
   iv. Administrative Office Use.

i. Personal Service limited to
   i. Barber Shop,
   ii. Body Art and Tattoo Parlour,
   iii. Body Rub Parlour,
   iv. Cleaning and Repair of Clothing,
   v. Hair and Body Salon,
   vi. Medical Clinic, and
   vii. Spa.

j. Recreation limited to:
   i. Bowling Alley, and
   ii. Indoor Recreation Facility.

k. Residential limited to:
   i. Apartments provided they:
1. Form an integral part of a commercial Building on the lot,
2. Are not be located on the 1st storey, and
3. Are the only Use in a storey and in all other storeys above the Residential Use.

I. Retail limited to:

i. Adult Entertainment Store,
ii. Adult Video Store,
iii. Auction-Retail,
iv. Bakery,
v. Building Supply Store,
vi. Butcher,
vii. Convenience Store,
viii. Flea Market,
ix. Furniture Store,
x. Garden Supply Store,
xi. Household Equipment Rental,
xii. Liquor Store,
xiii. Pawnshop,
xiv. Pharmacy,
xv. Produce Sales,
xvi. Retail Store,
xvii. Retail Warehouse,
xviii. Rural Agency Store,
xix. Second Hand Store,
xx. Shopping Centre,
xxi. Specialty Food,
xxii. Supermarket, and
xxiii. Video Rental.

m. Service limited to:

i. Appliance Repair,
ii. Beverage Container Return Centre,
iii. Community Service,
iv. Dog and Cat Daycare Kennel,
v. Drive-through Service,
vi. Financial, Insurance and Real Estate,
vii. Funeral Parlour and/or Memorial Service Facility,
viii. General Service Use,
ix. Photocopying, and
x. Veterinary Clinic.

2. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the CH1 and CH2 zones:

a. Storage limited to the following:

i. Enclosed Storage.
C. Lot Area

1. The minimum Lot Area must not be less than 0.2 ha (0.5 ac).

2. Notwithstanding Section 804, Part C.1, where a Lot contains an Undevelopable Area, that area shall not be included in the calculation of minimum Lot Area.

3. Notwithstanding Section 804, Part C.1 and C.2, where a Lot contains natural slopes greater than or equal to 33%, that sloped area shall not be included in the calculation of minimum Lot Area.

D. Density

1. The maximum density for the residential portion of the development shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Maximum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH1</td>
<td>80 upha (32 upa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2</td>
<td>80 upha (32 upa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Setbacks

1. All Buildings and Structures shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Interior Side</th>
<th>Exterior Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Building</strong></td>
<td>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
<td>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
<td>3.0 m (9.8 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.7 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory Building/Structure</strong></td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 804 Part E.1, all Buildings shall be sited a minimum of 6.0 m (19.6 ft) from all Undevelopable Areas as defined in this Bylaw.

F. Lot Coverage

1. Buildings shall together cover not more than the Lot Area as noted in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Floor Space

1. The floor space should not exceed the following ratio as listed in the following table (Neither indoor amenity space, garage space, detached or attached, or parking within the building envelope, including underground, are used in calculating total floor area).
H. Height of Buildings

1. The Height of the Principal Building and Accessory Buildings shall not exceed the heights outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Principal Building</th>
<th>Accessory Building/Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH1</td>
<td>14.0 m (45.9 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2</td>
<td>14.0 m (45.9 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Indoor Amenity Space

1. Developments that contain 15 units or more shall provide in Indoor Amenity Space at a rate of at least 2.8 sq m (30.0 sq ft) per unit.

2. The Indoor Amenity Space Can house a Child Care Centre provided they comply with the following requirements:
   a. Have direct access from a highway, independent from the access to the residential uses; and
   b. Have direct access to an open space and play area within the lot.

J. Outdoor Amenity Space

1. Outdoor Amenity Space shall be a minimum of 2.8 sq m (30.0 sq ft) per unit.

2. Shall have a slope of 5% or less.

5. For developments that contain 10 or more units, a level children’s play area with play equipment shall be provided.

K. Off Street Parking

1. Off Street Parking shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 109.

2. Parking within the required setbacks is not permitted.

3. All residential parking shall be provided within the Building envelope, including underground parking.
This report proposes a new Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw for the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System. The adjudication model requires that the District adopt the supporting Bylaw and staff support implementation. The bylaw has been added to the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

PURPOSE:

This report provides information on the preparation for the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System. The adjudication model requires that the District adopt the supporting Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw (Attached).

BACKGROUND:

In October 2003, the Province enacted the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act (BNEA) to provide an alternative approach for processing and resolving minor bylaw infractions, ranging from parking tickets to dog licensing to minor zoning infractions. Under the Act, local governments may establish a local government bylaw dispute adjudication system to replace the provincial court as the venue for resolving disputes of minor municipal breaches. The key objective for the change to the adjudication system is to alleviate the administrative and cost burden to the municipality to enforce these types of bylaw infractions, and to provide the public with a more expedient dispute resolution process.

The Act, and the authority it provides to an adjudication system, applies to both municipalities and regional districts. In order to proceed under the legislation, a local government must make a request to the Attorney General to have a regulation enacted applying to the local government. In early December 2017, the Attorney General’s Office formerly approved the District of Mission’s application. The final step of the approval process is for Council to adopt the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw.

The Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication Registry serves as the case registry for the Adjudication System. It is a partnership between six local governments: City of Chilliwack, District of Kent, District of Hope, Village of Harrison Hot Springs, Fraser Valley Regional District, and the District of Mission.

The system in the Upper Fraser Valley is authorized by the Province of British Columbia to operate as a municipal bylaw court for resolving disputes in bylaw enforcement matters for these six local governments. While there is one combined system for all six of the participating local governments, each member municipality must maintain their own bylaws, penalties and policies with respect to compliance with the bylaws. The objective of the bylaw adjudication process is to obtain compliance with the bylaw; punishment is not the primary objective. Compliance with local government bylaws
continues to be the primary objective of the Bylaw Adjudication System, and staff work with individuals who have been issued tickets to achieve this goal. There is a direct correlation to the success of a bylaw in terms of compliance to its consistent and fair enforcement.

The Bylaw Adjudication System uses Screening Officers that work with persons who have disputed their tickets to negotiate compliance agreements, make payment arrangements, and refer matters to adjudication. The Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw also identifies those offences for which a compliance agreement would be available. This provision authorizes the Screening Officer to conduct negotiations with respondents and establish agreements for compliance with the bylaws that would permit combining multiple offences and the reduction of penalty amounts where the respondent has indicated a willingness to sign an agreement promising to be compliant with the bylaw in future.

Offence notices are “tickets” presented to a person who is alleged to have committed an offence against a local government bylaw. The form of these notices is prescribed by the provincial legislation. Offence descriptions and fine amounts are stipulated in bylaws of the participating local government. A respondent receiving a bylaw offence notice that believes they should not have received the notice may dispute the matter by filing a dispute with the Registry.

In this regard, the Bylaw Adjudication process provides a two-step system for resolving these disputes. The first step is a mandatory meeting with the Screening Officer. The second step is the actual bylaw adjudication. The purpose in requiring the respondent to meet with the Screening Officer is to pre-screen the disputes prior to adjudication. In many cases, the respondent is prepared to pay the ticket, but prior to doing so wants to have an opportunity to make a statement on the fairness of the bylaw or the enforcement process. In other cases, the notice may have been issued in error or there were extenuating circumstances that should be considered. In these cases, the Screening Officer will follow established policy guidelines that will authorize amending or forgiving the offence. Even in situations where the offence notice was correctly issued, the Screening Officer can serve an important role in the process by explaining the intent and purpose of the bylaw and negotiating with the respondent in order to obtain a commitment for future compliance with the bylaw.

In situations where the Screening Officer is unsuccessful in resolving the dispute, the respondent will have the option of requesting that the dispute be referred to adjudication. The Adjudicator is provided to the system by the Attorney General’s Office of the Province of British Columbia. Adjudicators will hold hearings once each month to consider all the cases referred to that level of the system. Adjudicators only have the authority to consider the offence on the basis of evidence presented. Evidence may be presented to the Adjudicator by the local government and the respondent by giving evidence in person, by telephone or in writing. Regardless of the method chosen by the local government, the respondent is free to provide evidence in any of the three methods described. The burden of proof is the “balance of probabilities”, which is consistent with civil court in the Province of British Columbia. The formal rules of court evidence are not used in the Adjudication System. Upon hearing the evidence, the Adjudicator will render a decision. The Adjudicator may only render a decision of guilty or not guilty. The Adjudicator is not at liberty to modify the offence or penalty. If the Adjudicator finds the respondent guilty, the applicable fines become payable immediately and a $25 adjudication fee is levied. If the Adjudicator finds the respondent not guilty, the bylaw fine is cancelled and no other penalties are applied.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The District of Mission currently utilizes the Municipal Ticket Information (MTI) Bylaw, which requires registering offences with the Provincial Court. The MTI Bylaw will be maintained and updated as needed. This report recommends that a new bylaw enforcement tool, referred to as the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw, supplement and streamline existing enforcement. The two systems (MTI and Bylaw Notice Enforcement) are completely separate enforcement options and it is intended that the
enforcement officer choose the appropriate system at the time of writing a ticket.

While the Bylaw Adjudication System offers a more expedient and less expensive trial process, the maximum penalty amount under this system is limited to $500. The Bylaw Adjudication model has a charge standard that relies on the “balance or probability” which is far easier to attain. On the other hand, while enforcement through the MTI Bylaw offers a higher maximum penalty ($1000) but the MTI system is not as efficient, carries far more costs associated with staff time and court, and takes much longer to seek remedy. In addition, the MTI system requires a charge standard of “beyond a reasonable doubt” which can be a barrier for addressing minor offences. Staff propose using the systems in such a way that vehicular offences and most minor offences would be enforced using the Bylaw Adjudication System. The smaller penalty limit in this system should not present a challenge for most enforcement activity. The MTI would be used for more egregious offences wherein a more substantial penalty is warranted in order to encourage the respondent to comply with the MTI Bylaw.

In preparation for the Adjudication System, staff have also prepared amendments to the offence and penalty section of the MTI Bylaw. Council adopted these changes in late December 2017 in order to increase fine amounts for most offences and allow for better cost recovery. The proposed Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw contains its own schedule of fines. These changes will provide consistency in enforcement, allow for cost recovery, and align with the strategy of using MTI’s primarily for more serious offences or for coping with respondents who have demonstrated willful defiance of the District’s bylaws. The Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw broadens the number of bylaws that can be enforced through the Bylaw Adjudication System and establishes penalties that are more consistent with offences for which the MTI Bylaw has been formerly used. The bylaw amendment also establishes a discount for early payment of the penalty and an increased penalty for late payment, both of which are a requirement of the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act.

Bylaw Adjudication System Overview:

- Eliminates the requirement to personally service fines;
- Establishes a dedicated forum for resolving local bylaw enforcement disputes (bylaw court);
- Avoids the unnecessary attendance of witnesses;
- Uses a dispute resolution-based approach to obtaining independently adjudicated decision;
- Avoids the need to hire legal counsel; and
- Promotes the timely resolution of bylaw enforcement disputes – hearings may be held in person, by phone, or in writing.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This report most closely aligns with Council’s Strategic Plan 2016-2018, Objective Number 2 – Improved Public Safety. The strategy outlined in this report promotes public safety and accountability and provides staff with increased tools for identifying and addressing the concerns of our community.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

While there are no financial implications associated with this report, staff believe that improved cost recovery will result in better faster dispute resolution and fine payment.

COMMUNICATION:

No communication action is required.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
It is believed that the proposed Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw will result in a more effective and efficient bylaw enforcement process that will allow enforcement personnel to assess the enforcement problem and use the ticket system that will achieve the most positive result in terms of bylaw compliance.

SIGN-OFFS:

Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services

Reviewed by:
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5700-2018

A Bylaw respecting the enforcement of Bylaw Notices in conjunction with the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication Registry.

WHEREAS, the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act grants the District the authority to create this bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. **TITLE**

   This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018".

2. **INTERPRETATION**

   In this bylaw,
   
   “Act” means the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act;
   
   “District” means the District of Mission;
   
   “Registry” means the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry established pursuant to this Bylaw.

3. **TERMS**

   The terms in this Bylaw have the same meaning as the terms defined in the Act.

4. **BYLAW CONTRAVENTIONS**

   The bylaw contraventions designated in the Schedules attached to and forming part of this Bylaw may be dealt with by bylaw notice.

5. **OFFENCE AND PENALTY**

   The penalty for a contravention referred to in Section 4 of this Bylaw is:

   5.1 the penalty amount is set out in columns A1 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw, subject to subsection 5.2 and 5.3.

   5.2 the early payment penalty set out in columns A2 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw, if received by the Registry within 14 days of a person receiving or being presumed to have received the bylaw notice.

   5.3 subject to a late payment surcharge, in addition to the penalty under subsection 5.1, and is the late payment penalty set out in columns A3 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw, if payment is received more than 28 days after a person received or is presumed to have received the bylaw notice.
6. **PERIOD FOR PAYING A DISPUTED NOTICE**

6.1 Within 14 days of the date on which a person received or is presumed to have received the bylaw notice, a person who receives a bylaw notice, must:
   
   a) pay the penalty in any manner prescribed on the reverse side of the bylaw notice; or
   
   b) request dispute adjudication by completing the form on the reverse side of the bylaw offence notice and delivering it to the Registry Office at 8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A4.

6.2 A person may pay the indicated penalty after 14 days of receiving the bylaw notice, subject to the applicable surcharge for late payment in accordance with subsection 5.3, but no person may dispute the bylaw offence after 14 days of receiving the bylaw notice.

6.3 Where a person was not served personally with a bylaw notice and advises the District, in accordance with the requirements of section 25 of the Act, that a copy of the original bylaw notice was not received, the time limits for responding to a bylaw notice under Part 5 and section 6.1 of this bylaw do not begin to run until a copy of the bylaw notice is re-delivered in accordance with the Act.

7. **BYLAW NOTICE DISPUTE ADJUDICATION REGISTRY**

7.1 The Registry is established as a bylaw notice dispute adjudication system in accordance with the Act to resolve disputes in relation to bylaw notices.

7.2 The civic address of the Registry is: 8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, British Columbia, V2P 8A4.

7.3 The District is authorized to enter into, and the Mayor and Corporate Officer are authorized to execute, the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry Agreement attached to and forming a part of this Bylaw as Schedule B.

7.4 Every person who is unsuccessful in a dispute adjudication in relation to a bylaw offence notice or a compliance agreement under the dispute adjudication system established under this section, must pay to the District an additional administration fee of $25 for the purpose of the District recovering the costs of the adjudication system.

8. **SCREENING OFFICERS**

8.1 The position of Screening Officer is established.

8.2 The following are designated classes of persons that are appointed as Screening Officers:

   a) Manager of Inspection Services or designate;
b) Any person appointed to the position of Screening Officer by the Administrative Committee established under the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry Agreement attached to and forming a part of this Bylaw as Schedule B.

9. **POWERS, DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF SCREENING OFFICERS**

9.1 The powers, duties and functions of Screening Officers are as set out in the Act, and include the following powers:

a) To communicate information respecting the nature of the contravention, the provision of the bylaw contravened, the facts on which the contravention allegation is based, the penalty for a contravention, the opportunity to enter into a compliance agreement, the opportunity to proceed to the bylaw notice dispute adjudication system and the fee or fees payable in relation to the bylaw notice enforcement process, where requested by a person against whom a contravention is alleged;

b) To communicate with any or all of the following for the purposes of performing their functions under this bylaw or the Act:

i. the person against whom a contravention is alleged or their representative;

ii. the officer issuing the notice;

iii. the complainant or their representative;

iv. District staff and records regarding the disputant’s history of bylaw compliance.

c) To prepare and enter into compliance agreements under the Act with persons who dispute bylaw notices, including to establish terms and conditions for compliance that the Screening Officer considers necessary or advisable, including time periods for payment of penalties and compliance with the bylaw.

d) To provide for payment of a reduced penalty if a compliance agreement is entered into, as provided in column A4 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw; and

e) To cancel bylaw offence notices in accordance with the Act or District policies and guidelines.

9.2 The bylaw contraventions in relation to which a Screening Officer may enter into a compliance agreement are indicated in column A4 of the Schedules to this Bylaw.

9.3 The maximum duration of a compliance agreement is one year.

9.4 Where a compliance agreement is entered into, the penalty payable for the offence shall be reduced to one half of the penalty for the offence as listed in Column A1 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw.
10. **BYLAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS**

Persons acting as any of the following are hereby designated as Bylaw Enforcement Officers for the purposes of this Bylaw and the Act:

a) Special constables, officers, members or constables of:
   i. The provincial police force as defined in section 1 of the *Police Act*, or
   ii. A municipal police force;

a) Members of the Royal Canadian Mountain Police;

b) Bylaw Enforcement Officers, Building Inspectors, Animal Control Officers or other persons acting in another capacity on behalf of the District for the purpose of enforcement of one or more of its bylaws.

11. **FORMS OF BYLAW NOTICE**

The District may, from time to time, provide for the form or forms of the bylaw notice, provided the bylaw notice complies with the Act.

12. **SCHEDULES**

The following Schedules attached hereto form an integral part of this Bylaw:

- Schedule 1 – Commercial Vehicle Licensing Bylaw 1381-1984
- Schedule 2 – Traffic Regulation Bylaw 1698-1987
- Schedule 3 – Business Licence Bylaw 3694-2007
- Schedule 4 – Building Bylaw 3590-2003
- Schedule 5 – Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009
- Schedule 6 – Sign Bylaw 1662-1987
- Schedule 7 – Water Bylaw 2196-1990
- Schedule 8 – Burning Bylaw 2975-1996
- Schedule 9 – Truck Route Bylaw 1811-1988
- Schedule 10 – Fire Prevention Bylaw 3281-1999
- Schedule 11 – Soil Deposit Bylaw 3550-2003
- Schedule 12 – Soil Removal Bylaw 3088-1997
- Schedule 13 – Sewer Bylaw 5033-2009
- Schedule 14 – Solid Waste Management Bylaw 5526-2015
- Schedule 15 – Good Neighbour Bylaw 5524-2015
- Schedule 16 - Public Use of Parks Bylaw 5001-2008
13. **SEVERABILITY**

If a portion of this Bylaw is found invalid by a court, it will be severed and the remainder of the Bylaw will remain in effect.

READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018

READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018

ADOPTED THIS ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
### SCHEDULE 1

**Commercial Vehicle Licensing Bylaw 1381-1984**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating without a licence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to display licence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 2

**Traffic Regulation Bylaw 1698-1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place container within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place debris within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place landscaping within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place object within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct traffic</td>
<td>3.02(h)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit material on highway</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post bill or placard</td>
<td>3.09(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of snow/ice on sidewalk</td>
<td>3.10(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of rubbish on sidewalk</td>
<td>3.10(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag object on highway</td>
<td>4.01(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiked tires</td>
<td>4.01(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhanging load</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate noise making device without permit</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed 50 km per hour</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed posted speed</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed in lane</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct traffic</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobey instruction to weigh vehicle</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding on sidewalk</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate control of cycle</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless cycling</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to keep right</td>
<td>7.05(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing headphones</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park vehicle contrary to traffic control device</td>
<td>8.01(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on sidewalk</td>
<td>8.02(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on boulevard</td>
<td>8.02(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 1.5m of driveway</td>
<td>8.02(b)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in intersection</td>
<td>8.02(c)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 5m of hydrant</td>
<td>8.02(d)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on crosswalk</td>
<td>8.02(e)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of crosswalk</td>
<td>8.02(f)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of stop sign</td>
<td>8.02(g)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE 2 (cont’d)

**Traffic Regulation Bylaw 1698-1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th><strong>Fine Effective 2018</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of traffic control signal</td>
<td>8.02(g)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 15m of rail crossing</td>
<td>8.02(h)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park to display vehicle for sale/repair vehicle</td>
<td>8.02(i)(i)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park to advertise, grease, paint, wreck, store or repair, except where repairs are necessitated by an emergency</td>
<td>8.02(i)(ii)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park to display signs</td>
<td>8.02(i)(iii)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on highway to sell commodities</td>
<td>8.02(j)(iv)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on a bridge</td>
<td>8.02(k)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in tunnel</td>
<td>8.02(k)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 1.5m of intersecting lane</td>
<td>8.02(n)(i)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of intersection</td>
<td>8.02(n)(ii)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on a lane within 1.5m of intersection</td>
<td>8.02(o)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on yellow line</td>
<td>8.02(q)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct visibility of traffic control device</td>
<td>8.02(r)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No valid license plate</td>
<td>8.02(s)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime parking</td>
<td>8.02(t)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled parking zone</td>
<td>8.02(u)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to avoid time limit</td>
<td>8.02(v)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed 48 hours</td>
<td>8.02(w)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in any electric vehicle charging station stall at a public parking facility</td>
<td>8.02(x)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on any portion of a boat launch</td>
<td>8.02(y)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in such a manner as to obstruct the free passage of traffic</td>
<td>8.02(z)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No valid insurance</td>
<td>8.02(aa)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 5 meters of a community mailbox</td>
<td>8.02(bb)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within a loading zone</td>
<td>8.02(cc)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park unattached trailer</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed time limit</td>
<td>8.04(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park between 3:00 am to 7:00 am in CC-D1 zones</td>
<td>8.04(b)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in loading zone</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper diagonal parking</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park large vehicle in residential area</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park during snow removal</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park more than 30 cm from curb</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facing wrong direction</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobey Flag Person/School Patrol</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE 3

**Business Licence Bylaw 3964-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No business licence</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession, trade, sale or distribution of shark fins or derivative products</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to post licence</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 4

**Building Bylaw 3590-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction without permit</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupy building without approval</td>
<td>5.2(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupy building contrary to permit</td>
<td>5.2(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamper with notice</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contrary to permit</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to fence pool</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 5

**Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Use</td>
<td>103(A)(1)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 6

**Sign Bylaw 1662-1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign without permit</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited sign</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule 7

**Water Bylaw 2196-1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 1</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 2</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 3</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $500</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $350</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $650</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 4</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $500</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $350</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $650</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule 8

**Burning Bylaw 2975-1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited burn</td>
<td>5(a)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn contrary to conditions of permit</td>
<td>5(b)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn contrary to ban</td>
<td>5(c)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $500</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $350</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $650</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn contrary to order</td>
<td>5(f)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $500</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $350</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $650</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule 9

**Truck Route Bylaw 1811-1988**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck off truck route</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck exceeding temporary load restrictions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $500</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $350</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $650</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule 10

**Fire Prevention Bylaw 3281-1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Permit</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain extinguisher</td>
<td>5 (a)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extinguisher</td>
<td>5 (b)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire alarm not operable</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice communication not operable</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
<td>A1 Penalty $250</td>
<td>A2 Early Payment Penalty $175</td>
<td>A3 Late Payment Penalty $325</td>
<td>A4 Compliance Agreement Available No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 10 (cont’d)

**Fire Prevention Bylaw 3281-1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain fire alarm</td>
<td>5 (d)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain standpipe</td>
<td>5 (e)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain hose system</td>
<td>5 (e)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain sprinkler system</td>
<td>5 (f)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain suppression system</td>
<td>5 (g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain emergency lighting</td>
<td>5 (h)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain exit sign</td>
<td>5 (h)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain egress</td>
<td>5 (i)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fire safety plan posted</td>
<td>5 (j)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No occupant load posted</td>
<td>5 (k)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many occupants</td>
<td>5 (l)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to provide fire vehicle access</td>
<td>5 (m)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain fire vehicle access</td>
<td>5 (m)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to furnish record</td>
<td>5 (n)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No smoke alarm</td>
<td>5 (o)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain fire separation</td>
<td>5(p)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain closure</td>
<td>5 (p)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No address displayed</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No number displayed</td>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No permit</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain hydrant</td>
<td>7(2)(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to submit records</td>
<td>7(2)(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant not clear or accessible</td>
<td>7(2)(c)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No brass protective cap</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to secure building</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to comply with order</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No permit</td>
<td>11(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SCHEDULE 11

**Soil Deposit Bylaw 3550-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit soil without permit</td>
<td>5(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE 12

Soil Removal Bylaw 3088-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove soil without permit</td>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 13

Sewer Bylaw 5033-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to install/maintain interceptor</td>
<td>16(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interceptor maintenance</td>
<td>16(3)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep interceptor records</td>
<td>16(4)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to retain interceptor records</td>
<td>16(5)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit of interceptor residue to sewer</td>
<td>16(6)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational vehicle waste</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucked Liquid Waste</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited waste, Restricted waste</td>
<td>23(1)(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Cooling Water</td>
<td>23(1)(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontaminated water discharge</td>
<td>23(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited Waste</td>
<td>24(1)(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Waste</td>
<td>24(1)(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharging operation waste</td>
<td>24(1)(c)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling/uncontaminated water</td>
<td>24(1)(d)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-conditioning water</td>
<td>24(1)(e)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water, runoff</td>
<td>24(1)(f)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilution</td>
<td>24(2)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident prevention</td>
<td>24(3)(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>24(3)(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee notification</td>
<td>24(3)(c)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof leaders</td>
<td>24(6)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to apply for wastewater discharge</td>
<td>25(3)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance</td>
<td>27(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass flow</td>
<td>27(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to notify</td>
<td>28(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to submit Schedule I</td>
<td>28(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remedy discharge</td>
<td>28(3)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to notify Engineer</td>
<td>28(4)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal of access</td>
<td>29(4)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of monitoring point</td>
<td>30(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring point maintenance</td>
<td>30(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper installation of monitoring point</td>
<td>30(3)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to inform Engineer</td>
<td>30(6)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>30(7)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to install water meter</td>
<td>30(14)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampering</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to manage waste in accordance with bylaw provisions</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to separate Recyclables and Compostables from Garbage within Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to separate Recyclables and Compostables from Garbage outside Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to deposit Garbage, Trade Waste, Recyclable Materials, Compostables, Greenwaste, Construction or Demolition Waste at an Authorized Facility</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning waste within Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning waste outside Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including prohibited materials for Curbside Collection, On-site Collection or Spring Clean-up</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early set-out of waste for Curbside Collection</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to utilize Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures outside of set-out timeframe</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to contain Spring Clean-up items</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early set-out of Spring Clean-up Garbage in bags</td>
<td>3.11.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remove excess Spring Clean-up items from curb within seven (7) days</td>
<td>3.11.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep Wildlife Attractants inaccessible to Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to store Garbage, Recyclables or Compostables in Wildlife Resistant Enclosures or Wildlife Resistant Containers</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep barbecues clean or stored in a Wildlife Resistant Enclosure</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving pet food outside or setting up bird feeders between April and November</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain backyard composters in a way that does not attract Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep ripe fruit inaccessible to Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep bee hives inaccessible to Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep pets and small livestock indoors or contained in a Wildlife Resistant Enclosure from dusk to dawn</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to store livestock feed in Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to provide Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures to tenants</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures closed, locked or in proper condition</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 15

### Good Neighbour Bylaw 5524-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause a nuisance</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieving oneself in public</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erecting tent in public place</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent and obscene language</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent activity</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting that causes an obstruction</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light that disturbs</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make noise which disturbs</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit noise which disturbs</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplified sound which disturbs</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal which disturbs</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkster that disturbs</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction noise</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to comply with terms of permit</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of noxious or offensive odour</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner allowing graffiti to be placed</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person placing graffiti</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit of litter</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of refuse</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsightly property</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste overflowing from container</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlocked waste container</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping of yard waste</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of water</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrolled flow of water</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious weeds</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive lawn growth</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage by trees</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remove demolition debris</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remove derelict vehicle</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain boulevard</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain fence</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to contain livestock</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing infestation</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of water on land</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of water in excavation</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of wildlife attractants</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding dangerous wildlife</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area free of bird seed</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area free of fallen fruit</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause a Nuisance</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 16

### Public Use of Parks Bylaw 5001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In contravention of the prohibited activities in Section 4 of the bylaw without a special use permit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or use of any type of firearms</td>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or use of bows and arrows</td>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of use of any other weapons including, but not limited to, knives, bear spray or other animal repellents, or other similar weapons</td>
<td>4.c</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or use of any type of fireworks or explosives</td>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of loud and/or vulgar language</td>
<td>4.e</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting down of trees</td>
<td>4.f</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erection or use of tents of any kind</td>
<td>4.g</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting of campfires</td>
<td>4.h</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping of refuse</td>
<td>4.i</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying, selling or consuming alcohol or any controlled substances</td>
<td>4.j</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping of any domesticated animals</td>
<td>4.k</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>4.l</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit any dog to run at large in any park, except for a designated “off-leash park”</td>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive or permit any private motorized vehicle to enter into or upon any park</td>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick, cut down, dig or pull up, or knowingly injure or destroy in whole or in part any flower, plant, shrub, or tree in any park</td>
<td>5.c</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroy, damage, move or deface any bench, table, playground equipment, refuse container or any other public property situated in any park</td>
<td>5.d</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw, deposit, drop or leave in any park any glass, plastic, bottle, can, container, paper, food, garbage or litter, except in containers provided for that purpose</td>
<td>5.e</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPPER FRASER VALLEY BYLAW NOTICE DISPUTE ADJUDICATION
REGISTRY AGREEMENT

This Agreement, dated the 1st day of February, 2018.

BETWEEN:

CITY OF CHILLIWACK
8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, BC  V2P 8A4
(“Chilliwack”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF HOPE
P.O. Box 609, Hope, BC  V0X 1L0
(“Hope”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF KENT
7170 Cheam Avenue, Box 70, Agassiz, BC  V0M 1A0
(“Kent”)

AND:

VILLAGE OF HARRISON HOT SPRINGS
Box 160, Harrison Hot Springs, BC V0M 1K0
(“Harrison”)

AND:

FRASER VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT
1 - 45950 Cheam Avenue, Chilliwack, BC  V2P 1N6
(“FVRD”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF MISSION
8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC V2V 4L9
(“Mission”)

WHEREAS:

A.  The Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act permits local governments to create a bylaw designating certain bylaw contraventions that can be enforced by way of bylaw notice as an alternative to traditional bylaw enforcement mechanisms;
B. The Act also permits two or more local governments to enter into an agreement, adopted by a bylaw of each local government that is party to it, to provide for the joint administration of a local government bylaw notice dispute adjudication system;

C. Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD, and Mission wish to:

(a) share the costs and administration of such a system; and

(b) enter such an agreement to establish such a system, to be called the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry, and to provide for the joint administration of the Registry.

NOW, THEREFORE in consideration of the mutual promises contained herein, the Parties agree as follows:

PART I - INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

Definitions

1. In this Agreement, the following definitions apply:

(a) “Act” means the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act;

(b) “Adjudication Fee” means the sum of $25.00 payable by each Party for each adjudication scheduled to be conducted by the Registry;

(c) “Agreement” means this Agreement;

(d) “Authorizing Bylaws” means the bylaws adopted by the Councils/Boards of each of the Parties authorizing this Agreement;

(e) “Committee” means the Intermunicipal Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry’s Administrative Committee;

(f) “Contribution Adjustment Amount” means, for each Party, the amount calculated in accordance with Section 22 herein in any year of the Term;

(g) “Membership Fee” means a base participation fee of $2,000.00 per municipality;

(h) “Parties” means all of Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission;

(i) “Party” means any one of Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission;

(j) “Registry” means the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry established by this Agreement;
(k) “Revenues” means any revenue actually received or estimated to be received, as the case may be, by the Registry, excluding Initial Contributions, Contribution Amounts or Contribution Adjustment Amounts;

(l) “Term” means the term of this Agreement as set out herein.

Establishment of the Registry

2. Subject to the Act and to the adoption of the Authorizing Bylaws, the Parties agree that the Registry is hereby established.

PART II - ADMINISTRATION

Administrative Committee

3. The Parties agree to establish the Committee to implement and administer the Registry.

4. The Parties agree that authority of the Committee will include but not be limited to:

   (a) preparing operational budgets; and

   (b) setting policy as authorized under this Agreement and the Act.

Representation

5. Each of the Parties will appoint one representative to serve on the Committee. The Parties agree that representatives will be paid employees of their respective local governments and will not be remunerated by the Registry.

PART III - ADJUDICATION

Screening Officers

6. The Parties agree that screening of notices prior to proceeding to adjudication will be established as a function of the Registry. Screening officers will be appointed jointly by the administrative committee. The parties agree to provide policies and guidelines on bylaw enforcement to be used in negotiating compliance agreements.

Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry

7. The Parties agree that a dispute adjudication system will be established as a function of the Registry, and that disputes will be heard by a bylaw notice dispute adjudicator in the circumstances prescribed in the Act and Authorizing Bylaws.

8. The Parties agree that the Committee will select a roster of adjudicators who may hear and determine disputes from the provincial roster of adjudicators to be established by the Attorney General.
9. Adjudicators will be assigned to individual disputes in the manner prescribed by any applicable regulation and policy established by the Committee.

PART IV - OPERATIONS

Location

10. The location of the Registry will be in the municipal offices of the City of Chilliwack, 8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A4.

Administrative Services

11. Chilliwack will provide and supervise all administrative services required by the Registry, subject to the following:

   (i) the collection of any fees, fines or penalties levied against an unsuccessful party in the dispute adjudication process will be the responsibility of the relevant municipality if not collected by the Registry immediately following the adjudication; and

   (ii) any penalty arising directly out of the bylaw notice itself may be paid to the relevant Party or to the Registry,

and any amounts collected by or paid to the Registry pursuant to (i) and (ii) will be credited to the relevant Party’s Contribution Adjustment Amount.

Financial Reporting

12. Chilliwack will ensure that its Director of Finance will conduct and oversee the financial reporting and record keeping of the Registry based on normal procedures, subject to the requirements outlined herein.

PART V - FINANCIAL PLANNING

Start-Up Costs

13. Each Party will be responsible for its own start-up costs. In the event the Provincial Contribution exceeds the agreed upon Registry start-up costs, each Party will receive a pro-rated proportion of such excess. In the event the agreed upon Registry start-up costs exceed the Provincial Contribution, each Party will pay on request to Chilliwack a pro-rated proportion of the shortfall.

Budget Year

14. The budget year of the Registry is the calendar year.
Operating Budget

15. To assist with the preparation of the following year’s operating budget, the Parties agree that, no later than April 15th of each year, the Committee will prepare the previous year’s annual statistical report setting out in detail the operational funds incurred by the Registry for the carrying out of its mandate and responsibilities, including:

(a) the estimated operational expenditures for:

   (i) office and administration including financial reporting and administrative services;
   (ii) screening officers;
   (iii) bylaw dispute adjudicators; and
   (iv) other functions of the Registry;

(b) the anticipated revenues (if any) of the Registry;

(c) the difference between estimated revenues and operational expenditures for the Registry; and

(d) the Contribution Amount required from each of the Parties.

Budget Approval and Adjustments

16. The Parties will consider and approve, or recommend amendments to, the Registry’s operating budget.

17. The Parties agree that all recommendations by them for adjustments to the Registry’s draft operating budget will:

(a) be reasonable and made in good faith; and

(b) ensure that a reasonable level of service quality can be maintained by the Registry.

Use of Funds

18. The Committee and Chilliwack may make only those expenditures during the budget year for the purposes and up to the amounts authorized in the approved operating budget. The Registry (or the Committee or Chilliwack on behalf of the Registry) will not incur any other indebtedness or liability, or make any further expenditure, except that:

(a) Chilliwack may make a further reasonable expenditure or contract a further indebtedness or liability that it deems necessary or prudent, subject to a $1,000.00 limit; and
(b) the Committee may:

(i) make a further reasonable expenditure or contract a further indebtedness or liability that it deems necessary or prudent, subject to a $10,000.00 limit;

(ii) re-allocate funds within categories of the operating budget as reasonably required; and

(iii) make a further expenditure or contract a further indebtedness or liability without limitation if approved in advance by all Parties.

PART VI - COST ALLOCATION

Funding Contributions and Adjustments

19. The Parties agree that costs relating to legal counsel, witnesses, screening officers and bylaw enforcement officers as they pertain to the dispute adjudication process, and to the activities of the Registry more generally, will be borne by the relevant Party which issued the bylaw notice in question and will not be borne by the Registry or by Chilliwack on behalf of the Registry.

20. Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission will, upon approval of the Registry’s operating budget by each of the Parties, pay to Chilliwack their respective Contribution Amounts for the upcoming budget year no later than April 30th of that budget year.

21. Chilliwack will, as soon following the end of a budget year as practicable, calculate the amount of each Party’s Contribution Adjustment Amount by:

(a) determining each Party’s proportion of the amount by which Actual Expenditures exceed Budget Expenditures for the relevant year, where the proportion is calculated on the fixed costs by using a three year rolling average of the number of disputed tickets; and

(b) by determining the proportion amount of the floating costs by using the number of disputed tickets in the past year.

22. Each of Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission will, within 30 days of receipt of notice of its respective Contribution Adjustment Amount, pay (if required) to Chilliwack the Contribution Adjustment Amount.

23. Chilliwack will pay (if required) any Contribution Adjustment Amount owing to Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission, as appropriate, within 30 days of preparation of a statement outlining the Contribution Adjustment Amounts of each Party or may, at the election of Chilliwack in each year except the final year, credit the amount owing to the Contribution Amount required from each Party for the following year.

24. Each Party will pay to Chilliwack, within fifteen days following each of March 31, June 30, October 31 and December 31 of each year of the Term, the Adjudication Fee for each adjudication scheduled in respect of that Party in the previous quarter.
Maintenance of Records

25. The Director of Finance of Chilliwack will:

(a) exercise the duties and powers of the officer responsible for financial administration as provided in the Community Charter, in maintaining the financial records for the Registry on behalf of the Parties;

(b) ensure that accounting and payroll records of the Registry are properly prepared and maintained, such records to include payroll, accounts payable, cash receipts and disbursements, accounts receivable, general ledger, subsidiary cost ledger, financial statements and reports and supporting documents to the foregoing;

(c) provide, when possible, any additional financial systems that have been requested by the Committee;

(d) direct employees and officers of the Registry to the extent necessary to ensure that the systems and procedures established for financial controls are in effect and are in accordance with the Community Charter.

Examination of Records

26. The Finance Officer(s) of any of Hope, Harrison, Kent, FVRD or Mission may, acting reasonably with regard to minimizing the administrative burden on Chilliwack, and no more frequently than once in each year of the Term, conduct audits or examinations to obtain information or determine that adequate financial controls are being maintained for the Registry. Chilliwack will cooperate with any reasonable request by any of Hope, Harrison, Kent, FVRD or Mission’s Finance Officer(s) for access to financial records, user statistics and other information of the Registry.

PART VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Insurance

27. Chilliwack will ensure that the Registry and its activities are covered under Chilliwack’s general liability policy, and will provide copies of all relevant insurance policies and changes thereto to the Directors of Finance of Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission, upon request.

Amendments

28. The Parties will, in good faith, negotiate any proposed amendment to this Agreement upon request of any Party, all amendments to be in writing and executed by the Parties.
**Dispute Resolution**

29. The Parties will submit any dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of this Agreement:

   (a) first, to the Committee to resolve the dispute;

   (b) second, if the Committee is unable to resolve the dispute within 60 days, to the Chief Administrative Officers of the Parties; and

   (c) third, if the Chief Administrative Officers are unable to resolve the dispute within 60 days, to the Inspector of Municipalities, or at the election of the Parties, to a commercial arbitrator appointed by agreement or, failing agreement, appointed pursuant to the *Commercial Arbitration Act*, for final determination, and the determination of the Inspector or arbitrator, as applicable, will be final and binding upon the Parties.

**Term**

30. This Agreement comes into effect on February 2, 2018 and continues in effect until December 31, 2019. Any Party may withdraw from this Agreement upon six months’ written notice to the other Parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission have executed this Agreement on the date first above written.

THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CHILLIWACK was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

[Signatures]

C/S

Mayor

Corporate Officer
THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF HOPE was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________
Mayor

__________________________________________
Corporate Officer

THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE DISTRICT OF KENT was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________
Mayor

__________________________________________
Clerk

THE CORPORATE SEAL of VILLAGE OF HARRISON HOT SPRINGS was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________
Mayor

__________________________________________
Corporate Officer

THE CORPORATE SEAL of FRASER VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________
Chair

__________________________________________
Administrator
THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE DISTRICT OF MISSION was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

C/S

Mayor

Corporate Officer
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
SUBJECT: 2017 Investment Performance Report

This report is to advise Council on the District’s investment holdings as at December 31, 2017, and the performance of the overall investment portfolio for the year. This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
To report on the District’s investment holdings as at December 31, 2017, and the performance of the overall investment portfolio for the year.

BACKGROUND:
As per the District’s Investment Policy FIN.20, staff report to Council on the District’s investment holdings on a quarterly basis, and annually on the performance of the overall investment portfolio.

In order of priority, the District’s investment objectives as per Investment Policy FIN.20 are:

1. Safety of investments (i.e. preservation of the initial investment, as well as earnings);
2. Liquidity (i.e. the ease of converting the investment into cash with minimal loss in value); and
3. Return on investment (i.e. the amount earned on the investment).

Thus, the policy’s primary focus is to minimize risk, followed by liquidity, and lastly maximizing investment returns. Finance Department staff uses a comprehensive cash flow model, which is based on the District’s approved financial plan, as a key component of implementing these investment objectives.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The following table summarizes the District’s investment holdings as at December 31, 2017 compared to December 31, 2016, and the performance of the portfolio for each of these years. It is important to note that the District’s portfolio balances vary significantly throughout the year to meet cash flow requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>Investment Earnings</td>
<td>Annualized Return on Investment</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General bank account</td>
<td>$10,813,495</td>
<td>$127,825</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>$4,911,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum savings</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>168,225</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>13,017,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashable term deposits</td>
<td>41,695,050</td>
<td>643,755</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>26,278,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cashable term deposits</td>
<td>38,286,530</td>
<td>881,673</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>38,970,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrual and extendible step-up notes</td>
<td>6,045,218</td>
<td>45,218</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial coupon bonds</td>
<td>3,023,764</td>
<td>30,939</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Short-Term Bond Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>3,062,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluding general bank interest earnings, the District’s investment portfolio has yielded an average annualized return of approximately 2.10% for the year ended December 31, 2017 (2.01% for the year ended December 31, 2016).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The total budgeted investment portfolio earnings for 2017 were $1,550,000 and the actual portfolio earnings were $1,898,036. Please note that a portion of these earnings are paid to (earned by), the District’s reserve funds and a portion is included in District’s general revenue. This favorable investment earnings budget variance was primarily due to the District having additional reserve funds available for investment. In addition to this, the actual percentage return on investments of 2.10% for the year was slightly better than the originally anticipated 1.90% used in the budget.

**COMMUNICATION:**

No communication action is required.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

As per the District’s Investment Policy FIN.20, this report summarizes the District’s investment holdings as at December 31, 2017, and the performance of the overall investment portfolio for the year.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
SUBJECT: Amendment to Financial Plan 2017 – 2021 Bylaw 5612-2016
ATTACHMENT(S): 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1)

This report highlights the budget amendments that Council has approved since the 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw was adopted in December of 2016. These approved budget amendments can now be incorporated into a Financial Plan (2017 - 2021) amending bylaw. As such the amending bylaw has been listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda for consideration of first three readings at the February 5, 2018 Regular Meeting of Council.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to formally record and amend the 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw to include the Council approved 2017 capital and operating budget amendments that have taken place since the adoption of this bylaw on December 21, 2016. This amending bylaw is to be considered for first three readings and is listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

BACKGROUND:
The Financial Plan (2017 - 2021) Bylaw 5612-2016 was adopted on December 21, 2016. Since the bylaw was adopted, several budget amendments have been approved by Council resolution for inclusion into the Financial Plan. In accordance with Section 165(2) of the Community Charter, the financial plan may be formally amended by bylaw at any time. This report is provided as a follow-up step to formally include all the 2017 budget amendments previously approved by Council, into a Financial Plan amending bylaw. Please note that any operating or capital impact to future years (2018 to 2021) that these budget amendments create are handled with the 2018 to 2022 Financial Plan that was adopted in December 2017.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The Financial Plan (2017 - 2021) Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1) covers budget amendments approved by Council for inclusion in the Financial Plan (2017 – 2021) since the bylaw was adopted on December 21, 2016, up to and including those amendments approved at the January 22, 2018 Council meeting.

The budget amendments approved by Council are summarized in this report and have been categorized into three main groups, operating budget amendments, contingency budget amendments and capital budget amendments. For additional information on any of the budget amendments listed in this report, the motion number is provided for Council’s reference.
2017 Operating Budget Amendments

The approved operating budget amendments, along with funding sources, are listed below in Table 1 and Table 2. These projects, previously approved, did not affect property taxes for 2017 as funding was either from reserves or from external grants.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>2017 Operating Budget Amendments Descriptions</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC16/680</td>
<td>Victim Services increased services</td>
<td>$ 68,000</td>
<td>Stabilization Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC16/624</td>
<td>New landfill operating contract increase budget</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/003</td>
<td>Speed reader board on Cedar Street</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/034</td>
<td>Re-budgeted and carry forward items as approved for projects starting in 2016 with completion date in 2017</td>
<td>22,884</td>
<td>Stabilization Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89,780</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/038</td>
<td>Setup of Multi Material BC Recycling program (Recycle BC)</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/120</td>
<td>Fraser Valley Tech Jobs Portal and Tech Sector implementation strategy carry forward of unused 2016 budget to 2017 budget</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/149</td>
<td>Parking enforcement pilot project</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/154</td>
<td>2018 Muse Awards support</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Adjustment Re-allocate budget estimates for Union contract wage settlement to various accounts</td>
<td>10,582</td>
<td>Water Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,535</td>
<td>Sewer Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>Drainage Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,512</td>
<td>Equipment Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,354</td>
<td>Forestry Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/294</td>
<td>Additional Inspection Services staff (Building Inspector)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/332</td>
<td>Regional water carry forwards for projects completing in 2017</td>
<td>34,065</td>
<td>Water Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/332</td>
<td>Regional sewer carry forwards for projects completing in 2017</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>Sewer Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/340</td>
<td>2017 Mission Folk Music Festival financial assistance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/391</td>
<td>Downtown Incentive Program - extend program to Dec 31, 2019</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/393</td>
<td>Homelessness Partnering Strategy carry forward budget from 2016</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/514</td>
<td>Increase security at library</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/529</td>
<td>Extend parking enforcement pilot project</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/576</td>
<td>Land Use Contract termination project</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/611</td>
<td>Business licence regulation and fee review update</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Closed Council motions throughout the year</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>Policing Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>Sewer Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>Water Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final four operating budget amendments listed in Table 2 represent a re-allocation of budget from one project to another within the General Operating Fund and do not affect property taxes for 2017. The negative values for these four indicate the project budget that was reduced.
### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Transferring 2017 Operating Budgets Between Accounts</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC17/009</td>
<td>Fee for Service Grant increase</td>
<td>50,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/009</td>
<td>Transferred budget from Community Special Events</td>
<td>-18,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/009</td>
<td>Transferred budget from Community Enhancement Grants</td>
<td>-32,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/514</td>
<td>Debt Reserve Fund</td>
<td>230,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/514</td>
<td>Transferred from Stabilization Reserve - Segregated Fund</td>
<td>-230,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Adjustment</td>
<td>Re-allocate budget estimates for Union contract wage settlement to various accounts</td>
<td>156,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Adjustment</td>
<td>Re-allocate budget estimates for Union contract wage settlement to various accounts</td>
<td>-156,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Closed Council motions throughout the year</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Closed Council motions throughout the year</td>
<td>-45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017 Contingency Budget Amendments

Included in the general operating budget are the District Contingency and Mayor’s Contingency accounts. The District’s Contingency account started the year with a balance of $38,000 that is available for unexpected or emergent costs. Table 3 below, lists the 2017 approved requests to be funded from the District’s contingency account.

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>2017 General Operating Contingency Budget</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC16/620</td>
<td>Mission Sustainable Housing Committee meetings clerical support</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/090</td>
<td>Mission Soapbox Derby grant</td>
<td>(4,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/122</td>
<td>Mission International Cultural Association Funding</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/270</td>
<td>Royal Canadian Legion Branch 57 Community Event Grant</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/323</td>
<td>Middle Development Instrument</td>
<td>(2,220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/358</td>
<td>Boundary Survey for Licence of Occupation for Community Pier</td>
<td>(7,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/497</td>
<td>Challenge Day 2017 - Fraser House Society</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Ending Balance $6,080

The Mayor’s Contingency account started the year with a balance of $2,000 that is available for the Mayor to allocate at his discretion. The costs are posted directly to this account. Table 4 below, lists the 2017 request funded from the Mayor’s Contingency account.

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>2017 Mayor’s Contingency Budget</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mission International Culture Assoc. - 2017 Oyama gifts contribution</td>
<td>(500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Stormwater works on right of way</td>
<td>(1,170)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Ending Balance $330
### 2017 Capital Budget Amendments

The capital budget amendments, along with the funding source, are listed in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>2017 Capital Budget Amendments Descriptions</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC16/596</td>
<td>2017 asset management planning program grant</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/004</td>
<td>Updating online GIS (Webmap)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/034</td>
<td>Capital Plan carry forward budgets as approved for projects starting in 2016 with completion date in 2017</td>
<td>589,193</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>501,425</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,141,847</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>Arterial Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>Land Sale Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94,270</td>
<td>Information Services Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Cemetery Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,273,370</td>
<td>Gas Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,064</td>
<td>Community Amenity Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82,221</td>
<td>Major Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>490,969</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,336</td>
<td>Gaming Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72,200</td>
<td>Appropriated Surplus - Carbon Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113,512</td>
<td>Forestry Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,867</td>
<td>Stabilization Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>Appropriated Surplus - Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>436,811</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138,203</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>282,744</td>
<td>Drainage Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>929,581</td>
<td>Equipment Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/080</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation management software</td>
<td>90,015</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/081</td>
<td>Mission Rotary Sports Park score clock</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/091</td>
<td>Stave West Forest and Recreation Area initiatives</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>Forestry Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/125</td>
<td>Updating GIS Orthographic Photos</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/128</td>
<td>Stave Lake Street improvements conceptual design, advanced from 2018</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Arterial Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,640</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/129</td>
<td>Fraser River forcemain sanitary crossing design-build, advanced from 2019</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144,540</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/194</td>
<td>Fraser River forcemain sanitary crossing project</td>
<td>12,668</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,254,181</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,898,023</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/221</td>
<td>Hatzic Sanitary Pump Station upgrade increase budget</td>
<td>385,790</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/263</td>
<td>Reduced infrastructure projects due to joining Recycle BC at the Abbotsford Mission Recycling Depot</td>
<td>-45,571</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/265</td>
<td>Landfill capital projects advanced from 2018 to 2017</td>
<td>1,076,490</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/294</td>
<td>Vehicle, workstation, and computer for additional Building Inspector</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/300</td>
<td>Facilities master plan</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/332</td>
<td>Regional Utilities capital carry forwards approved by JSSC</td>
<td>1,013,017</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,586,753</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251,739</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/365</td>
<td>Keystone Avenue Bridge replacement increase budget and advance project from 2018 to 2017</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Arterial Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/366</td>
<td>Fire records software upgrade and database relocation</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/367</td>
<td>Fire Station #1 renovations</td>
<td>129,250</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>2017 Capital Budget Amendments Descriptions Con’t</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC17/418</td>
<td>Hatzic Park improvements</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Developer Contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/425</td>
<td>Enhancing webmap performance</td>
<td>28,903</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/500</td>
<td>House demolition at 32921 Dewdney Trunk Road</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>Land Sale Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,760</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC17/039</td>
<td>Landfill Phase D West Construction increase budget</td>
<td>478,501</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Closed Council motions throughout the year</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>Arterial Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351,450</td>
<td>DCC Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>Land Sale Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Refuse Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capital budget amendments listed in Table 6 represent a re-allocation of budget from one project to another. The negative values for these capital budget amendments indicate the project budget that was reduced and redirected to a new project.

TABLE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Reallocating 2017 Capital Budgets Between Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC17/034</td>
<td>Corporate PC replacement</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>Information Services Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Corporate telephones</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>(reallocate budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/034</td>
<td>Watermain Condition Assessment/Replacement</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Corrosion assessment ductile iron water</td>
<td>-35,000</td>
<td>(reallocate budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/262</td>
<td>Equipment capital budget changes</td>
<td>457,000</td>
<td>Equipment Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from other equipment capital purchases</td>
<td>-457,000</td>
<td>(reallocate budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/448</td>
<td>Norrish Creek intake repairs</td>
<td>29,076</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Regional Water Capital Contingency</td>
<td>-29,076</td>
<td>(reallocate budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC17/581</td>
<td>Ainsworth Road watermain break</td>
<td>45,989</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Regional Water Capital Contingency</td>
<td>-45,989</td>
<td>(reallocate budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC18/030</td>
<td>Norrish Sand Filtration Replacement</td>
<td>90,620</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Regional Water Capital Contingency</td>
<td>-46,279</td>
<td>(reallocate budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Dickson Lake raft modifications</td>
<td>-16,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Eastern Wells Hydrogeological study</td>
<td>-27,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications directly associated with this report as the budget amendments were previously approved by Council and the financial implications were considered at that time.

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
In accordance with Section 165(2) of the Community Charter, the financial plan may be amended by bylaw at any time. This report is provided as a follow-up step to formally include all 2017 budget amendments previously approved by Council into a Financial Plan amending bylaw.

The Financial Plan (2017 - 2021) Bylaw 5612-2016 was adopted on December 21, 2016. Since that time there have been several 2017 operating and capital budget amendments that Council has approved for inclusion into the 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan.
Staff are asking Council to consider giving first three readings to the 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1) as listed under the bylaws for consideration section.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
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DISTRICT OF MISSION
BYLAW 5709-2018-5612(1)

A bylaw to amend District of Mission
2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw 5612-2016

WHEREAS pursuant to the provisions of Section 165 of the Community Charter, the Council for the District of Mission may, by bylaw, before the 15th day of May in each year, before the annual property tax bylaw is adopted, adopt a financial plan;

NOW THEREFORE the Council for the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be known and cited for all purposes as "District of Mission 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1) ".

2. "District of Mission 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw 5612-2016", is hereby amended by:

(a) deleting in its entirety Schedules B, C, D and E and replacing them with Schedules B, C, D and E attached to and forming part of this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this xx day of February, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this xx day of February, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this xx day of February, 2018
ADOPTED this xx day of xxx, 2018

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR          MICHAEL YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
## Schedule “B” of Bylaw No. 5709-2018-5612(1)  
2017 Detailed Financial Plan

### General Operating Adjustments Drainage Operating Water Operating Sewer Operating Refuse/Recycling Forestry General Capital Drainage Capital Water Capital Sewer Capital Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Property taxation</th>
<th>-29,972,934</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-1,596,389</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-31,569,324</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-121,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-44,791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-166,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of services and regulatory fees</td>
<td>-7,777,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-61,115</td>
<td>-6,255,518</td>
<td>-4,856,565</td>
<td>-4,446,000</td>
<td>-379,538</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
<td>-37,000</td>
<td>-28,497,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers</td>
<td>-2,848,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-41,176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,898,023</td>
<td>-9,812,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-815,911</td>
<td>-253,100</td>
<td>-289,312</td>
<td>-1,913,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-667,183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2,095</td>
<td>-268,307</td>
<td>-209,036</td>
<td>-35,752</td>
<td>-44,908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,627,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>-1,619,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8,012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,627,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer in-kind contribution for capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2,842,104</td>
<td>-554,962</td>
<td>-296,584</td>
<td>-784,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td>-42,885,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,781,489</td>
<td>-6,531,837</td>
<td>-4,837,897</td>
<td>-4,892,317</td>
<td>-4,515,908</td>
<td>-4,078,729</td>
<td>-808,062</td>
<td>-685,896</td>
<td>-9,633,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Administration and finance</th>
<th>4,922,943</th>
<th>-4,737</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>44,369</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4,962,575</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General government and fiscal services</td>
<td>1,981,482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>267,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,249,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective services</td>
<td>16,599,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>272,341</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,872,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and public works</td>
<td>6,783,262</td>
<td>-164,946</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,504,782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,123,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit services</td>
<td>2,920,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,920,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-321,819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,124,235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>509,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,311,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development services</td>
<td>2,659,114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82,853</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,741,967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, recreation and cultural services</td>
<td>7,247,202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700,033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,947,231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1,443,353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,457,594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>267,088</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>277,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Utility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-518,079</td>
<td>2,543,973</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305,422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,331,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,002,998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,560,735</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>390,694</td>
<td>3,948,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-905,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,367,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,285,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry enterprise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-130,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,893,976</td>
<td>5,355,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal recoveries</td>
<td>-3,003,202</td>
<td>3,064,202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-61,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>41,822,135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,543,973</td>
<td>4,499,735</td>
<td>4,367,490</td>
<td>5,124,235</td>
<td>4,193,222</td>
<td>3,643,471</td>
<td>305,422</td>
<td>390,694</td>
<td>1,893,976</td>
<td>68,784,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Reserves, capital and debt | Tangible capital assets purchased | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,456,454 | 576,270 | 4,031,833 | 11,273,969 | 26,338,527 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Tangible capital assets contributed by developers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,842,104 | 554,962 | 296,584 | 784,678 | 4,478,328 |
| New debt/temporary borrowing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Repayment of debt | 594,859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 594,859 |
| Transfers to reserves | 6,678,442 | 0 | 226,691 | 3,255,272 | 1,590,629 | 207,096 | 366,584 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,324,714 |
| Amortization | -4,690,066 | 0 | -899,176 | -1,223,170 | -1,120,222 | -241,014 | -43,898 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -8,308,146 |
| Reserves/surplus used for capital funding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -12,863,301 | -628,592 | -4,033,215 | -4,319,209 | -21,844,317 |
| Reserves/surplus used to fund operations | -1,519,269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -196,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1,717,269 |
| **Total reserves, capital and debt** | 1,063,366 | 0 | 762,484 | 2,032,102 | 470,407 | -231,918 | 322,686 | 435,258 | 502,640 | 295,202 | 7,739,438 | 11,866,697 |
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Schedule “C” of Bylaw No. 5709-2018-5612(1)
2017 - 2021 Summary Financial Plan
2017
Revenue
Property taxation

2018

2019

2020

2021

Total

-31,569,324

-32,710,422

-33,609,914

-34,507,370

-35,444,143

-166,681

-166,681

-166,681

-166,681

-166,681

-833,405

-28,497,504

-28,279,952

-28,941,137

-29,615,567

-30,311,350

-145,645,510

Government transfers

-9,812,849

-2,833,242

-2,834,603

-2,835,978

-2,837,366

-21,154,038

Amortization of restricted revenue

-3,272,036

-5,183,536

-2,275,256

-8,564,647

-3,391,385

-22,686,860

Investment income

-1,227,281

-1,224,560

-1,282,331

-1,294,984

-1,308,088

-6,337,244

Other revenue

-1,627,046

-1,669,296

-1,639,636

-1,689,802

-1,741,329

-8,367,109

Developer in-kind contribution for capital

-4,478,328

-4,334,077

-4,409,428

-4,486,286

-4,564,681

-22,272,800

-80,651,049

-76,401,766

-75,158,986

-83,161,315

-79,765,023

-395,138,139

Administration and finance

4,962,575

5,213,206

5,142,163

5,250,724

5,330,175

25,898,843

General government and fiscal services

2,249,092

1,912,044

1,935,068

1,952,979

1,985,240

10,034,423

16,872,292

16,943,386

17,464,309

18,031,043

18,589,949

87,900,979

Engineering and public works

8,123,097

7,675,888

7,801,695

8,455,456

8,109,021

40,165,157

Transit services

2,920,942

2,979,274

3,038,859

3,099,637

3,161,629

15,200,341

Waste management

5,311,716

4,476,137

4,525,974

4,643,866

4,736,742

23,694,435

Development services

2,741,968

2,357,036

2,404,090

2,452,085

2,501,040

12,456,219

Parks, recreation and cultural services

7,947,231

7,390,652

7,724,881

9,381,356

8,151,676

40,595,796

Library

1,457,594

1,475,082

1,509,590

1,553,978

1,571,508

7,567,752

277,089

231,216

235,806

240,487

245,261

1,229,859

Drainage utility

2,331,317

2,041,119

2,083,157

2,083,617

2,215,504

10,754,714

Water utility

3,948,432

3,650,221

3,718,537

3,903,646

4,088,386

19,309,222

Sewer utility

5,355,603

4,550,624

4,371,245

4,565,233

5,185,055

24,027,760

Forestry enterprise

4,285,404

3,844,279

3,915,842

3,988,327

4,062,764

20,096,616

Total expenses

68,784,352

64,740,164

65,871,216

69,602,434

69,933,950

338,932,116

-11,866,697

-11,661,602

-9,287,770

-13,558,881

-9,831,073

-56,206,023

26,338,527

15,299,672

8,900,861

15,388,261

10,230,942

76,158,263

4,478,328

4,334,077

4,409,428

4,486,286

4,564,681

22,272,800

0

0

0

0

0

0

594,860

619,102

507,934

527,406

547,626

2,796,928

Transfers to reserves

12,324,714

13,030,459

13,549,547

13,852,270

14,163,524

66,920,514

Amortization

-8,308,146

-8,381,336

-8,455,257

-8,529,919

-8,605,326

-42,279,984

Reserves/surplus used for capital funding

-21,844,317

-12,511,755

-8,976,759

-11,500,724

-10,410,862

-65,244,417

Reserves/surplus used to fund operations

-1,717,269
11,866,697

-728,617
11,661,602

-647,984
9,287,770

-664,699
13,558,881

-659,512
9,831,073

-4,418,081
56,206,023

Principal

594,860

619,102

507,934

527,406

547,626

2,796,928

Interest associated with debt

243,300

182,551

164,250

164,250

164,250

918,601

838,160

801,653

672,184

691,656

711,876

3,715,529

Local Improvements
Sale of services and regulatory fees

Total revenue

-167,841,173

Expenses

Protective services

Cemetery

Annual (surplus) deficit

Reserves, capital and debt
Tangible capital assets purchased
Tangible capital assets contributed by developers
New debt/temporary borrowing
Repayment of debt - principal (see note below)

Information details:

Total payments
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$11,273,969</td>
<td>$1,893,976</td>
<td>$1,532,422</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$9,826,897</td>
<td>$2,024,670</td>
<td>$32,975,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$14,436,052</td>
<td>$939,068</td>
<td>$23,377,188</td>
<td>$6,246,257</td>
<td>$766,684</td>
<td>$1,153,726</td>
<td>$34,340,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$18,317,446</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$1,532,422</td>
<td>$9,826,897</td>
<td>$1,153,726</td>
<td>$36,253,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$21,090,308</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$1,532,422</td>
<td>$9,826,897</td>
<td>$1,153,726</td>
<td>$38,253,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$23,043,001</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$10,772,037</td>
<td>$1,532,422</td>
<td>$9,826,897</td>
<td>$1,153,726</td>
<td>$40,253,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan**

- Cedar Valley Environmentally Sensitive Parkland Acquisition
- Cedar Valley Environmentally Sensitive Parkland Development
- Parks, Recreation & Culture
- Planning
- Police
- Subtotal Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan

**Equipment Replacement Capital Plan**

- Landfill
- Abattoirs/Mission Recycling Depot
- Subtotal Equipment Replacement Capital Plan

**Forestry Capital Plan**

- Subtotal Forestry Capital Plan

**Drainage Utility Capital Plan**

- Drainage Capital
- Cedar Valley Drainage DCCs (Restricted Revenue)
- Subtotal Drainage Utility Capital Plan

**Water Utility Capital Plan**

- Cedar Valley Water DCC
- Water Capital - Local
- Water Capital - Regional
- Regional Water Supply DCC
- Subtotal Water Utility Capital Plan

**Sewer Utility Capital Plan**

- Sewer Capital - Local
- Sewer Capital - Regional
- Regional Sewage Treatment DCC
- Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital Plan

**Total**

- Annual Totals

---

1. **TCA** = Tangible Capital Assets
## PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Funds</td>
<td>$6,933,036</td>
<td>$5,726,908</td>
<td>$3,954,766</td>
<td>$6,054,335</td>
<td>$3,920,632</td>
<td><strong>$26,589,677</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>1,049,761</td>
<td>1,108,869</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2,158,630</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>41,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>41,176</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal General Capital Plan</td>
<td>8,323,973</td>
<td>6,835,777</td>
<td>3,954,766</td>
<td>6,054,335</td>
<td>3,920,632</td>
<td><strong>29,089,483</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCs</td>
<td>815,911</td>
<td>4,209,367</td>
<td>1,387,200</td>
<td>1,428,793</td>
<td>1,617,742</td>
<td><strong>9,459,012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>25,233</td>
<td>109,009</td>
<td>55,737</td>
<td>58,503</td>
<td>39,864</td>
<td><strong>288,347</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>79,538</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>79,538</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</td>
<td>920,682</td>
<td>4,318,376</td>
<td>1,442,937</td>
<td>1,487,296</td>
<td>1,657,606</td>
<td><strong>9,826,897</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Management Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Closure Liability Account</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>403,220</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Reserve Fund</td>
<td>1,546,188</td>
<td>90,984</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>91,888</td>
<td>90,080</td>
<td><strong>1,945,380</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Waste Management Capital Plan</td>
<td>1,949,408</td>
<td>90,984</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>91,888</td>
<td>90,080</td>
<td><strong>2,348,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle and Equipment Reserve Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,986,141</td>
<td>953,498</td>
<td>339,417</td>
<td>1,822,384</td>
<td>850,932</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,952,371</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestry Reserve Fund</strong></td>
<td>322,942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>322,942</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>387,744</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td><strong>973,744</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCCs (Restricted Revenue)</td>
<td>253,100</td>
<td>883,476</td>
<td>99,990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>1,236,566</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>46,608</td>
<td>8,924</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>56,542</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Sale Reserve Fund</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>9,240</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>185,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Drainage Utility Capital Plan</td>
<td>881,692</td>
<td>1,007,400</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td><strong>2,461,092</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>4,033,215</td>
<td>1,922,569</td>
<td>1,841,755</td>
<td>1,428,694</td>
<td>1,526,854</td>
<td><strong>10,753,086</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCs</td>
<td>289,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232,415</td>
<td>2,408,822</td>
<td>1,381,767</td>
<td><strong>4,312,316</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td><strong>500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Water Utility Capital Plan</td>
<td>4,422,527</td>
<td>2,022,569</td>
<td>2,174,170</td>
<td>3,937,516</td>
<td>3,008,621</td>
<td><strong>15,565,402</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>4,319,209</td>
<td>2,561,995</td>
<td>2,872,834</td>
<td>1,929,919</td>
<td>3,757,500</td>
<td><strong>15,441,458</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCs</td>
<td>1,913,713</td>
<td>4,693</td>
<td>209,651</td>
<td>4,727,032</td>
<td>391,876</td>
<td><strong>7,246,965</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>6,898,023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>6,898,023</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>37,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital Plan</td>
<td>13,167,945</td>
<td>2,566,688</td>
<td>3,082,485</td>
<td>6,656,951</td>
<td>4,149,376</td>
<td><strong>29,623,446</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,975,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,795,291</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,352,015</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,165,370</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,902,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,190,232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule “E” of Bylaw No. 5709-2018-5612(1)
#### 2017 Change in Net Financial Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for the year</td>
<td>11,866,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(30,816,855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>8,308,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gain) / Loss on sale of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds on sale of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>198,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net financial assets/net debt</td>
<td>(10,443,034)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10,443,034)
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
SUBJECT: 2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix “A” – 2017 Capital Carry Forward Requests
Appendix “B” – 2017 Operating Carry Forward Requests

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
1. That the 2017 capital budget carry forwards attached as Appendix “A” to the report entitled “2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests” from the Manager of Accounting Services dated February 5, 2018, be approved;
2. That the 2017 operating budget carry forwards attached as Appendix “B” to the report entitled “2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests” from the Manager of Accounting Services dated February 5, 2018, be approved; and
3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly (final dollar amounts will depend on year-end balances).

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the various 2017 budget carry forward requests from departments for specific projects.

BACKGROUND:
Each year departments may have some budgeted projects that are, for various reasons, not completed within that budget year. Some projects span over more than one year creating budget timing issues that need to be accounted for in the financial plan. Other projects cannot be started until external factors, such as development and decisions by other levels of government, are known. Departments can request that the unspent budgeted funds be carried forward into the next fiscal year, so that the projects that have been started, can be completed.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The attached Appendix “A” summarizes the 2017 capital budget carry forward requests, as submitted by departments. This list represents timing differences between fiscal years only; no overall budgets have been increased. Departments may request to carry forward unspent capital expenditure budgets if the project has started before year-end and there are actual expenditures or outstanding commitments against the project. In cases where projects are still required, but will not start in 2018, they are being requested to be carried forward and re-budgeted into a future year. The urgency, resource availability, and surrounding development for each project have been reviewed in determining the appropriate timing of when these project works would commence. It should be noted that the final dollar amounts of carry forwards will depend on year-end balances, and are subject to change.
Capital Budget

Approximately 27.9% of the approved 2017 Final/Amended Capital Budget of $32,975,309 was spent in 2017. Table A below shows the actual 2017 capital expenditures compared to the Final/Amended Budget for each capital program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Final/Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>% of Capital Plan Completed</th>
<th>Budget Carry Forward Available</th>
<th>Budget Carry Forwards Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Capital</td>
<td>$9,244,654</td>
<td>$4,378,387</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>$4,866,267</td>
<td>$4,357,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Capital</td>
<td>881,692</td>
<td>277,443</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>604,249</td>
<td>511,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Capital</td>
<td>1,949,408</td>
<td>198,244</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1,751,164</td>
<td>1,673,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Capital</td>
<td>322,942</td>
<td>118,406</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>204,536</td>
<td>203,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capital</td>
<td>2,748,576</td>
<td>1,571,903</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>1,176,673</td>
<td>1,077,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital</td>
<td>9,909,466</td>
<td>991,523</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8,917,943</td>
<td>8,912,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Capital</td>
<td>2,986,140</td>
<td>1,396,208</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>1,589,932</td>
<td>1,589,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - excl. Regional Capital</td>
<td>28,042,878</td>
<td>8,932,114</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>19,110,764</td>
<td>18,325,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Capital*</td>
<td>1,673,952</td>
<td>101,547</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1,572,405</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewer Capital*</td>
<td>3,258,479</td>
<td>160,108</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3,098,371</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,975,309</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,193,769</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,781,540</strong></td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Regional Water & Sewer budget carry forwards, once determined, will be going to a future 2018 Joint Shared Services Committee (JSSC) meeting for approval.

Staff are requesting a total of $18,325,238 to be carried forward from the 2017 budget to 2018 and future years. Table B below shows the breakdown of the total of carry forwards by year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$17,857,620</td>
<td>$189,122</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$278,496</td>
<td>$18,325,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major capital projects, greater than $100,000, requested to be carried forward by capital program, are as follows:

General Capital Program:
- $527,292 for the Paving Program
- $414,976 for the First Ave Streetscapes
- $409,000 for the Parkland Improvements
- $407,815 for the Artificial Turf Field (installation of new score clock, fencing on south and west property lines and remaining landscape works to be undertaken in 2018)
- $300,000 for the Hatzic Park Improvements
- $255,177 for Parkland purchases
- $209,243 for the Stave Lake Improvements Concert Design
- $155,000 for the Intersection at Cedar & 7th (re-budget remaining funds to 2022 for future intersection improvements)
- $138,740 for the Signals at Stave Lake Street & Cherry Avenue intersection
- $121,252 for the Fire Hall #1 Renovations

Drainage Capital Program:
- $150,000 for the Drainage Master Plan
- $119,091 for the Drainage Model – Flow Monitoring

Waste Management Capital Program:
- $1,151,095 for the Stage 1 & 2 Development & Construction Landfill
- $403,220 for the Stage 1 Closure Landfill

Forestry Capital:
- $136,318 for the Stave West Forest & Recreation Area

Water Capital:
- $519,466 for the Water Infrastructure Condition Assessment/Replacement Program
- $238,000 for the Water Main on Dalke Avenue – West of Dewdney Trunk Road 350m
- $150,000 for the Water Utility Master Plan

Sewer Capital:
- $8,372,432 for the 750mm siphon river crossing (Fraser River)
- $366,711 for the Sewer Infrastructure Condition Assessment/Replacement Program

Equipment Capital:
- $450,000 for the Freightliner Tanker Truck Replacement
- $349,986 for the Peterbilt Tanker Truck Replacement
- $222,042 for the Roadside Mower Replacement
- $193,333 for the Backhoe & Tool Carrier Replacement

Individual equipment purchases may have budgets allocated differently depending on the operational needs. These purchases fit within the overall equipment capital program’s budget and intent. For example, budget savings on individual equipment purchases may be allocated to other similar or complementary projects as long as the overall approved equipment capital program total dollar value is not exceeded. Fleet is responsible for balancing the individual needs of their customers, the departments, within the approved budget.

Operating Budget
The attached Appendix “B” includes the operating budget carry forwards of $249,370 being requested by departments. Similar to the capital carry forwards, these operating carry forwards only reflect timing differences between fiscal years; no overall budgets have been increased. Operating carry
forwards are only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as projects of a non-recurring nature. Projects unable to be completed during the year that have a dedicated funding source such as a reserve, grant, or deposit account are requested to be re-budgeted in the following year using this identified funding source. Projects that are funded by general revenue (i.e. do not have a dedicated funding source) are classified as a carry forward item into 2017 through appropriated surplus.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
In order for projects to be considered to be carried forward the department must be within their overall authorized budget. Both the capital and operating carry forwards only reflect timing differences between fiscal years; no overall budgets have been increased. The amounts requested to be carried forward are all within the funding authorized in the 2017 Financial Plan.

COMMUNICATION:
Departments will be advised on Council’s decision regarding the projects requesting 2017 budget to be carried forward.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
It is recommended that Council consider approving projects, where work has begun or in cases with actual expenditures or outstanding commitments against the project, as identified by departments in Appendix “A” and Appendix “B” and if approved, that the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly. In cases where projects are still required but will not start in 2018, these projects are being requested to be carried forward and re-budgeted into a future year. The urgency, resource availability, and surrounding development for each project have been reviewed in determining the appropriate timing of when project work would commence. It should be noted that the final dollar amounts of carry forwards will depend on year-end balances, and are subject to change. Both the capital and operating carry forwards only reflect timing differences between fiscal years; no overall budgets have been increased. The amounts requested to be carried forward are all within the funding authorized in the 2017 Financial Plan.

SIGN-OFFS:

Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Reviewed by: Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
## 2017 Capital Carry Forward Requests

Projects Requesting Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Final / Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Available for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Dollars Requested for Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Capital:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Telephones</td>
<td>70100</td>
<td>$30,631</td>
<td>$9,119</td>
<td>$21,512</td>
<td>$21,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate LAN/WAN upgrades</td>
<td>70101</td>
<td>79,161</td>
<td>69,934</td>
<td>9,227</td>
<td>9,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier replacement (5yr cycle)</td>
<td>70112</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>53,181</td>
<td>36,819</td>
<td>36,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management information systems enhancements</td>
<td>70118</td>
<td>22,111</td>
<td>15,751</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>6,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Capital (info systems)</td>
<td>70120</td>
<td>8,930</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>6,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web content management</td>
<td>70201</td>
<td>12,637</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>6,501</td>
<td>6,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Capital - Corp Admin</td>
<td>70204</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Table/Chairs for Council Chambers</td>
<td>70224</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Local Area Plan</td>
<td>71057</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>74,772</td>
<td>74,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 &amp; 2 contaminated site assessments</td>
<td>78011</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Development Plan</td>
<td>78022</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Commercial Land Expansion Strategy</td>
<td>78023</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>22,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Avenue Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>78025</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>85,024</td>
<td>414,976</td>
<td>414,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Fire Fighting Equipment</td>
<td>70608</td>
<td>51,970</td>
<td>48,382</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>3,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout gear</td>
<td>70615</td>
<td>43,646</td>
<td>36,441</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>7,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Records Mgt Software Upgrade</td>
<td>70627</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector capital budget</td>
<td>70711</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool, Weight Room, Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>70916</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>17,023</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Building Amenities</td>
<td>72016</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>6,442</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>4,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Slide Tube Retrofit</td>
<td>72019</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Roof Replacement</td>
<td>72022</td>
<td>98,485</td>
<td>85,949</td>
<td>12,536</td>
<td>12,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Refrigerant change out</td>
<td>72023</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Arena Condenser</td>
<td>72024</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Software Upgrade</td>
<td>72025</td>
<td>125,015</td>
<td>40,904</td>
<td>84,111</td>
<td>84,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Handling Unit Repair</td>
<td>72026</td>
<td>15,734</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>9,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC Mechanical Replacement</td>
<td>72028</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>46,059</td>
<td>28,941</td>
<td>28,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works HVAC Component Replacement</td>
<td>71037</td>
<td>23,358</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>19,962</td>
<td>19,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library HVAC Component Replacement</td>
<td>71038</td>
<td>13,127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,127</td>
<td>13,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 Capital Carry Forward Requests
Projects Requesting Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Final / Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Available for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Dollars Requested for Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hall #2 Energy Efficient Lighting Upgrades</td>
<td>71049</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hall #3 Energy Efficient Lighting Upgrades</td>
<td>71051</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Overhead Doors</td>
<td>71052</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>5,159</td>
<td>5,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hall #1 Carbon Monoxide Extraction</td>
<td>71062</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hall #1 HVAC Component Replacement</td>
<td>71063</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>12,898</td>
<td>12,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hall #3 HVAC Component Replacement</td>
<td>71064</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>3,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7337 Welton St. HVAC Components</td>
<td>71065</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>71066</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 1 Renovations</td>
<td>71067</td>
<td>129,250</td>
<td>7,998</td>
<td>121,252</td>
<td>121,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatzic Cemetery Scattering Garden</td>
<td>71082</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Furniture / Office Modifications</td>
<td>71083</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Acquisition - 33174 Tunbridge</td>
<td>70825</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>13,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9429 Wiebe Street</td>
<td>70836</td>
<td>255,177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255,177</td>
<td>255,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31215 Silverdale Avenue</td>
<td>70837</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>3,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8915 Cedar Street</td>
<td>70838</td>
<td>20,909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,909</td>
<td>20,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9035 Emiry Street</td>
<td>70839</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>54,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment/landscaping</td>
<td>70950</td>
<td>75,542</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>75,355</td>
<td>75,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic tables and benches</td>
<td>70951</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>2,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, existing - upgrade</td>
<td>71009</td>
<td>64,540</td>
<td>34,611</td>
<td>29,929</td>
<td>29,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Trails Master Plan</td>
<td>71011</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>56,860</td>
<td>51,140</td>
<td>51,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Turf Field</td>
<td>71025</td>
<td>456,979</td>
<td>49,164</td>
<td>407,815</td>
<td>407,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose courts</td>
<td>71026</td>
<td>9,749</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,749</td>
<td>9,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRHP Admin Building - Boiler/AC</td>
<td>71059</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>9,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsmen East Playground Equip</td>
<td>71061</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatzic Park Improvements</td>
<td>71068</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Improvements</td>
<td>71069</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>409,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements Next To Subdivisions</td>
<td>42250</td>
<td>34,624</td>
<td>11,295</td>
<td>23,329</td>
<td>23,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stave Lake Street Improvements Concept Design</td>
<td>42691</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>26,757</td>
<td>209,243</td>
<td>209,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Cedar &amp; 7th</td>
<td>42704</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signals - Stave Lake &amp; Cherry</td>
<td>42778</td>
<td>167,538</td>
<td>28,798</td>
<td>138,740</td>
<td>138,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint W.C.E. Overpass</td>
<td>42789</td>
<td>11,688</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,688</td>
<td>11,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017 Capital Carry Forward Requests

### Projects Requesting Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Final / Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Available for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Dollars Requested for Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audible Ped. devices at intersections</td>
<td>42794</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>7,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving program</td>
<td>42800</td>
<td>3,219,418</td>
<td>2,692,126</td>
<td>527,292</td>
<td>527,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>42802</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>23,228</td>
<td>46,773</td>
<td>46,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Counters</td>
<td>46001</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Dust Monitoring Equipment</td>
<td>46025</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syncro Software Intersection Analysis</td>
<td>46045</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>46114</td>
<td>20,879</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>17,549</td>
<td>17,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management System</td>
<td>46118</td>
<td>62,734</td>
<td>38,146</td>
<td>24,588</td>
<td>24,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating GIS Orthographic Photos</td>
<td>46122</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>18,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handheld field data devices</td>
<td>44006</td>
<td>14,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,082</td>
<td>14,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED replacement</td>
<td>44007</td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td>11,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - General Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 7,876,969</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,519,649</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,357,320</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage Capital:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,357,320</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC Program Review &amp; Update</td>
<td>43077</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$11,850</td>
<td>$9,150</td>
<td>$9,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudin Creek Relocation</td>
<td>43090</td>
<td>28,265</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,265</td>
<td>28,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall management monitoring program</td>
<td>43106</td>
<td>82,825</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,825</td>
<td>82,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater modelling software</td>
<td>43115</td>
<td>33,496</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,496</td>
<td>33,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage model - flow monitoring</td>
<td>43130</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>10,909</td>
<td>119,091</td>
<td>119,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blott St. storm pipe installation</td>
<td>43131</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Master Plan</td>
<td>43132</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cade Barr and 14th Pipe Replacement</td>
<td>43133</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage infrastructure condition assessment and replacement</td>
<td>67001</td>
<td>8,844</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,844</td>
<td>8,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Drainage Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 534,430</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 22,759</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 511,671</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 511,671</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017 Capital Carry Forward Requests

Projects Requesting Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Final / Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Available for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Dollars Requested for Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Management Capital:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell C surface water management</td>
<td>46766</td>
<td>36,007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,007</td>
<td>36,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Closure</td>
<td>46768</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>403,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 &amp; 2 Development &amp; Construction</td>
<td>46769</td>
<td>1,348,476</td>
<td>197,381</td>
<td>1,151,095</td>
<td>1,151,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quonset</td>
<td>46791</td>
<td>22,704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,704</td>
<td>22,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>46795</td>
<td>17,028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,028</td>
<td>17,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forklift</td>
<td>46796</td>
<td>7,568</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,568</td>
<td>7,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue bag door repair</td>
<td>46798</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>4,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newnes Baler-Knives Refit</td>
<td>46803</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>4,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newnes Baler-Cylinder Rebuild</td>
<td>46806</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMRD Modify Drop-off Area (MMBC report)</td>
<td>46808</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>4,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving back receiving area</td>
<td>46811</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>5,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant floor assessment-rebar is showing</td>
<td>46812</td>
<td>9,460</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,460</td>
<td>9,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission plant cameras</td>
<td>46813</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>3,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Waste Management Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,870,407</td>
<td>197,381</td>
<td>1,673,026</td>
<td>1,673,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestry Capital:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Lake Forest Service Road Upgrade</td>
<td>39991</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$33,278</td>
<td>$66,723</td>
<td>$66,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stave West Forest &amp; Recreation Area</td>
<td>39997</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>78,682</td>
<td>136,318</td>
<td>136,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Forestry Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>111,960</td>
<td>203,040</td>
<td>203,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Capital:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain condition replacement</td>
<td>93004</td>
<td>$1,654,078</td>
<td>$1,069,612</td>
<td>$584,466</td>
<td>$519,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC update (water)</td>
<td>93005</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>16,214</td>
<td>11,786</td>
<td>11,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatzic Park Automatic Irrigation</td>
<td>93017</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>19,108</td>
<td>60,892</td>
<td>60,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Automatic Irrigation</td>
<td>93018</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>19,825</td>
<td>20,175</td>
<td>20,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Recirculating Spray Pad</td>
<td>93019</td>
<td>74,160</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74,160</td>
<td>74,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalke - West of DTR 350m</td>
<td>93021</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>238,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Utility Master Plan</td>
<td>93023</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemetering - Water</td>
<td>93090</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Water Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,267,394</td>
<td>1,124,759</td>
<td>1,142,635</td>
<td>1,077,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017 Capital Carry Forward Requests

Projects Requesting Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Final / Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Available for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Dollars Requested for Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750mm siphon river crossing (Fraser River)</td>
<td>48132</td>
<td>$8,610,872</td>
<td>$238,440</td>
<td>$8,372,432</td>
<td>$8,372,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Station Upgrading</td>
<td>98530</td>
<td>11,698</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,698</td>
<td>11,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC update (sewer)</td>
<td>98663</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>15,795</td>
<td>12,205</td>
<td>12,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Condition Assessment/Replacement</td>
<td>98664</td>
<td>405,133</td>
<td>38,422</td>
<td>366,711</td>
<td>353,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon lift station replacement pumps</td>
<td>98668</td>
<td>23,395</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,395</td>
<td>23,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatzic Sanitary Pump Station Upgrade</td>
<td>98676</td>
<td>584,585</td>
<td>523,410</td>
<td>61,175</td>
<td>49,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Master Plan</td>
<td>98678</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - Sewer Capital $9,753,683 $816,067 $8,937,616 $8,912,616

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Capital:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleet &amp; Equipment purchases</td>
<td>50910</td>
<td>$2,986,140</td>
<td>$1,396,211</td>
<td>$1,589,929</td>
<td>$1,589,929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - Equipment Capital $2,986,140 $1,396,211 $1,589,929 $1,589,929

Grand Total $25,604,023 $7,188,785 $18,415,238 $18,325,238

---

1 These totals do not reflect the entire capital budget as presented in Table A of the “2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests Report” as projects that are completed have not been shown in Appendix A.
## Appendix "B"
### 2017 Operating Carry Forward Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Approved/Amended Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Available for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Dollars Requested for Carry Forward &amp; Re-budget</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Explanation/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL OPERATING FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-budgeted items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Basic Skills</td>
<td>16080-020</td>
<td>35,904</td>
<td>29,374</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Program is ongoing and will continue into 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Partnering Strategy</td>
<td>25132-390</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>21,525</td>
<td>78,475</td>
<td>78,475</td>
<td>Grant/Gaming Reserve</td>
<td>Project is funded $50,000 by grant and $50,000 from Gaming Reserve Fund. The project is expected to continue into 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department Records Management Software Upgrade Training</td>
<td>26010-330</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>General surplus appropriated</td>
<td>One-time budget request and the training has been postponed to 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Licence Regulation and Fee Review Update</td>
<td>27350-410</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>General surplus appropriated</td>
<td>Project approved December 2017 and will be completed in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Project</td>
<td>30090-130</td>
<td>89,780</td>
<td>63,879</td>
<td>25,901</td>
<td>25,901</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Project completed in early 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Contract Termination Project</td>
<td>30091-410</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>General surplus appropriated</td>
<td>Project is in the beginning phase and most of the project is expected to complete in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Façade Review</td>
<td>30099-340</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>Part of this grant for downtown storefront improvements has been utilized this year. This carryforward will allow other businesses to participate. Council has approved to extend the program to December 31, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muse Awards</td>
<td>32019-410</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>Budget was approved in 2017 and awards program to carry over into 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Appraisals &amp; Advertising</td>
<td>35085-410</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>14,464</td>
<td>14,464</td>
<td>General surplus appropriated</td>
<td>Budget of $15,000 was approved in August 2016 and work is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Assessment &amp; Conveyancing</td>
<td>35086-410</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>General surplus appropriated</td>
<td>Budget of $25,000 was approved in August 2017 and work is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry forward items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Contingency</td>
<td>35920-170</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>31,920</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>Per RC17/638, the remaining balance in the 2017 general operating fund contingency account can be carried forward to 2018 and transferred to the Municipal Funds Grants account (204987).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operating Fund Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 410,684</td>
<td>$ 155,234</td>
<td>$ 249,370</td>
<td>$ 249,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Stacey Crawford - Economic Development Officer
SUBJECT: Economic Development Select Committee – Terms of Reference
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A: Proposed Amendments – Economic Development Committee Terms of Reference (Red Line version)
Appendix B: Proposed Amendments – Economic Development Committee Terms of Reference (Clean version)

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the proposed changes to the Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC) Terms of Reference be adopted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Following approximately 18 months of renewed activity and participation, the EDSC undertook a review of the committee’s Terms of Reference to assess the purpose, composition and appointment of membership, terms of appointment, and reporting structure to Council. The outcome of this administrative exercise resulted in a number of minor suggestions for Council’s consideration.

The more notable changes include an increase in meeting frequency, extending the term of the chair and vice-chair from a one year term to a two year term, and planned engagement with Council on at least two occasions per year.

The EDSC believe that these changes will enhance engagement, accountability and overall operational effectiveness of the committee.

As the Economic Development Select Committee is a Council appointed advisory body, the Terms of Reference for the EDSC are established by Council and can only be altered by Council.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of the report is to seek approval from Council to amend the EDSC Terms of Reference.

BACKGROUND:
The Economic Development Select Committee is a Council appointed advisory body providing recommendations to Council on economic development priorities, policies and matters that will foster and enhance business growth in the community.

Recently, the EDSC was re-formed and has enjoyed strong engagement with Council, providing input on a number of matters including industrial and commercial land use questions, zoning, transportation, tourism and a range of other economic development issues.

It is anticipated the EDSC will continue to strengthen their engagement and following a strong year of identifying and responding to emerging economic conditions, it was determined that the guiding policy
document for their activities should be reevaluated. As such, the Terms of Reference were reviewed to ensure the stated priorities, policies and matters that will foster and enhance business growth in the community were aligned to the needs of the committee to effectively undertake their duties.

The following outlines the noted changes in the Red Line version (Attached as Appendix A: Proposed Amendments – Economic Development Committee Terms of Reference (Red Line version)):

- Item 2. ii: a minor grammar change
- Item 6. v: this guideline has been removed in its entirety. This is a redundant clause as members are appointed by Council and any individual, or the committee in its entirety, may be removed by Council at any time.
- Item 7. ii: this changes the vice chair and chair to two year terms.
- Item 8. ii: this increases the meeting frequency to monthly, excluding summer.
- Item 8. iii: This addresses joint-meetings with council on a more prescribed basis. Where joint meetings occur, these would also be special meetings of Council.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

Objective 5 of Council’s 2016 – 2018 Strategic Plan is “Effective Economic Development”. These changes to the EDSC Terms of Reference will enhance the frequency of engagement and add certainty to the leadership of the committee. In turn, the committee will be better positioned to provide advice on economic development matters in Mission, which is crucial to ensuring the overall health of our municipality.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

COMMUNICATION:

No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

These proposed changes to the EDSC Terms of Reference will enhance the frequency of engagement and add certainty to the leadership of the committee. In turn, the committee will be better positioned to provide advice on economic development matters in Mission, which is crucial to ensuring the overall health of our municipality.

SIGN-OFFS:

Economic Development Officer

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
Appendix A

District of Mission
Economic Development Select Committee
Terms of Reference (2016)

1.0 Committee Mandate

The mandate of the Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC) is to provide recommendations to Council on policies, procedures and strategic direction for the purposes of fostering and promoting economic growth within the District of Mission.

2.0 Purpose of Committee

i. The Economic Development Select Committee is a Council appointed advisory body providing recommendations to Council on economic development priorities, policies and matters that will foster and enhance business growth in the community.

ii. Advice to Council will focus on the following areas:

   a. Business retention, expansion and attraction;
   b. Industrial land expansion;
   c. Competitiveness issues, policy and programs;
   d. Marketing and promotional programs and activities;
   e. Providing leadership on local business partnership initiatives; and
   f. Other issues as requested assigned by Council.

3.0 Goals

i. Without restricting the generalities of the foregoing, the Committee shall:

   a. Provide advice in the preparation and maintenance of an overall economic development strategy, which includes continuously assessing the present situation and capabilities and identifying emerging economic conditions; and
   b. Hear and consider representations by individuals, organizations or delegations of citizens with respect to economic development and make recommendations which are deemed to be in the best interests of all citizens; and
   c. Provide the economic development department with information and intelligence on the community’s markets, labour force, industrial and commercial sites and other input as required; and
   d. Act as a resource, on-call and available to businesses on a confidential basis to assist in feasibility assessments, proposals to Council and other initiatives as required by investors and management; and
   e. Provide input to Council on matters of industrial and commercial requirements, zoning, transportation, utility services, tax implications and industrial land sales and acquisition policy; and
   f. Propose programs for the enhancement of the image of the community and the development of other amenities related to economic development.
4.0 Committee Composition

i. Eligible members will be residents, taxpayers, business owners or managers in the District of Mission with the appropriate qualifications, availability, work experience, community involvement and knowledge that can provide independent advice and assistance on the achievement of the EDSC mandate, purpose and goals. A limited number (maximum of two) of non-residents or non-taxpayers may be considered where they hold academic qualifications or professional expertise not represented on the Committee.

ii. The membership of the EDSC shall consist of Eleven (11) voting members as follows:

   a. Ten (9) members-at-large representing diverse business sectors within Mission; and
   b. One (1) member from the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce.

iii. Non-voting members are encouraged to attend EDSC meetings to provide opinions, advice, expertise, information or other services. Non-voting participants of the EDSC include:

   a. Chief Administrative Officer or his/her designate;
   b. Manager of Long Range Planning or his/her designate;
   c. Economic Development Officer and/or Executive Assistant.

5.0 Delegated Authority

i. The Economic Development Select Committee members are appointed by Council.

ii. The EDSC is an advisory committee to Council and, unless otherwise authorized in writing by Council, does not have any delegated authority. Recommendations requiring implementation, reports or staff actions must first be considered by Council before any action by staff or the EDSC can be taken.

iii. These Terms of Reference for the Economic Development Select Committee are established by Council and can only be altered by Council.

6.0 Terms of Appointment

i. The term of appointment for each Committee member is two years commencing July 1st in the year they are appointed and terminating two years later on June 30th.

ii. Council has the discretion to extend a committee member’s appointment for additional terms.
iii. Members may be appointed by Council for shorter terms in consideration of special circumstances where a Committee member has prematurely vacated their term. Under these circumstances Council may directly appoint an individual, or the EDSC will recommend to Council an individual for consideration and approval. Those approved to fill a vacant position will serve out the remainder of the term they are filling.

iv. A member who is absent from three consecutive, or 50% of the regular meetings held within a twelve-month period of the Economic Development Select Committee is deemed to have resigned effective at the end of the third consecutive, or fifth missed such meeting, as the case may be. An exception for reasons of illness or an approved leave of absence may be granted by the Chair of the Committee.

v. Council may, at any time, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, revoke the appointment of a member of the Committee.

vi. Committee members shall serve without remuneration, but may be paid reasonable and necessary expenses that are directly related to the performance of their duties and in accordance with District policies.

7.0 Chairperson and Vice-Chair / Committee Appointments

i. The EDSC will annually elect a Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst themselves at the regular meeting occurring in May of each year. The Vice-Chair will act in the capacity of the Chair at any meeting where the Chair is absent.

vi. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall serve in their elected capacity for a term of one two years. The term of appointment for each position is two years commencing July 1st in the year they are appointed and terminating two years later on June 30th.

ii. The term of service shall be from July 1 to June 30 the following year, to a maximum of two consecutive years in either position.

iii. A Nominations Committee shall be formed sixty (60) days prior to the election to seek out candidates and do a skill assessment of the EDSC. The Nominations Committee shall be comprised of the current Chair, Past Chair, Economic Development Officer and one member-at-large who will present a list of current EDSC members who are willing to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair for the next term.

iv. The Nominations Committee will also be tasked with reviewing all candidates seeking term renewal, as well as new applicant submissions looking to fill anticipated vacancies. Recommendations will be presented to the EDSC for review and, upon acceptance, will be forwarded to Council for consideration and adoption.

8.0 Meetings

i. The EDSC will meet bi-monthly with additional meetings at the call of the Chair to address specific matters that have been referred for input and may be time sensitive.
Notice of meetings will be given in accordance with the District of Mission’s Procedural By-law.

ii. Regular meetings will be held at 8:00 a.m. on the 2nd Tuesday-Wednesday of the following months: January / March / May / July / September / November.

iii. An additional annual planning session will occur in October on a date to be set by the EDSC with an invitation extended to Council to participate. The annual plan will be presented to Council in December of each year, along with an annual report providing highlights of the year prior.

iv. In the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair, the committee will appoint, from its members, a Chair for that particular meeting, who shall be subject to all the normal responsibilities and privileges assigned thereto.

9.0 Reporting

i. The Economic Development Select Committee shall provide the minutes of meetings to Council for information purposes.

ii. The EDSC reports directly to Council, under the signature of the Chair or designate. EDSC reports, recommendations and communications will normally be directed to Council through the Economic Development Department in the form of a staff report, but the EDSC may also appear before Council as a delegation.

iii. The Economic Development Officer or Executive Assistant is responsible for preparing the staff report and presenting the report to Council along with the Chairperson, if required.

iv. The EDSC shall provide a yearly management and financial report to Council summarizing the accomplishments of the prior year and highlighting the key activities planned for the coming year to be undertaken by the EDSC.

10.0 Conflict of Interest

i. Committee members will respect the confidentiality of all matters discussed at EDSC meetings and all information shared with the EDSC by municipal staff or Council.

ii. Committee members must abide by the conflict of interest provisions of the Community Charter and District Council Procedures Bylaw as amended from time to time. If a Committee member attending a meeting considers that he or she is not entitled to participate in the discussion of a matter or to vote on a question in respect of a matter because the member has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the matter, or for any
other reason, the member must declare this and state the general nature of why he or she considers this to be the case and immediately leave the meeting or the part of the meeting during which the matter is under consideration.
1.0 Committee Mandate

The mandate of the Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC) is to provide recommendations to Council on policies, procedures and strategic direction for the purposes of fostering and promoting economic growth within the District of Mission.

2.0 Purpose of Committee

i. The Economic Development Select Committee is a Council appointed advisory body providing recommendations to Council on economic development priorities, policies and matters that will foster and enhance business growth in the community.

ii. Advice to Council will focus on the following areas:

   a. Business retention, expansion and attraction;
   b. Industrial land expansion;
   c. Competitiveness issues, policy and programs;
   d. Marketing and promotional programs and activities;
   e. Providing leadership on local business partnership initiatives; and
   f. Other issues as requested or assigned by Council.

3.0 Goals

i. Without restricting the generalities of the foregoing, the Committee shall:

   a. Provide advice in the preparation and maintenance of an overall economic development strategy, which includes continuously assessing the present situation and capabilities and identifying emerging economic conditions; and
   b. Hear and consider representations by individuals, organizations or delegations of citizens with respect to economic development and make recommendations which are deemed to be in the best interests of all citizens; and
   c. Provide the economic development department with information and intelligence on the community’s markets, labour force, industrial and commercial sites and other input as required; and
   d. Act as a resource, on-call and available to businesses on a confidential basis to assist in feasibility assessments, proposals to Council and other initiatives as required by investors and management; and
   e. Provide input to Council on matters of industrial and commercial requirements, zoning, transportation, utility services, tax implications and industrial land sales and acquisition policy; and
   f. Propose programs for the enhancement of the image of the community and the development of other amenities related to economic development.
4.0 Committee Composition

i. Eligible members will be residents, taxpayers, business owners or managers in the District of Mission with the appropriate qualifications, availability, work experience, community involvement and knowledge that can provide independent advice and assistance on the achievement of the EDSC mandate, purpose and goals. A limited number (maximum of two) of non-residents or non-taxpayers may be considered where they hold academic qualifications or professional expertise not represented on the Committee.

ii. The membership of the EDSC shall consist of Eleven (11) voting members as follows:

   a. Ten (10) members-at-large representing diverse business sectors within Mission;
      and
   b. One (1) member from the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce.

iii. Non-voting members are encouraged to attend EDSC meetings to provide opinions, advice, expertise, information or other services. Non-voting participants of the EDSC include:

   a. Chief Administrative Officer or his/her designate;
   b. Manager of Long Range Planning or his/her designate;
   c. Economic Development Officer and/or Executive Assistant.

5.0 Delegated Authority

i. The Economic Development Select Committee members are appointed by Council.

ii. The EDSC is an advisory committee to Council and, unless otherwise authorized in writing by Council, does not have any delegated authority. Recommendations requiring implementation, reports or staff actions must first be considered by Council before any action by staff or the EDSC can be taken.

iii. These Terms of Reference for the Economic Development Select Committee are established by Council and can only be altered by Council.

6.0 Terms of Appointment

i. The term of appointment for each Committee member is two years commencing July 1st in the year they are appointed and terminating two years later on June 30th.

ii. Council has the discretion to extend a committee member’s appointment for additional terms.
iii. Members may be appointed by Council for shorter terms in consideration of special circumstances where a Committee member has prematurely vacated their term. Under these circumstances Council may directly appoint an individual, or the EDSC will recommend to Council an individual for consideration and approval. Those approved to fill a vacant position will serve out the remainder of the term they are filling.

iv. A member who is absent from three consecutive, or 50% of the regular meetings held within a twelve-month period of the Economic Development Select Committee is deemed to have resigned effective at the end of the third consecutive, or fifth missed such meeting, as the case may be. An exception for reasons of illness or an approved leave of absence may be granted by the Chair of the Committee.

v. Committee members shall serve without remuneration, but may be paid reasonable and necessary expenses that are directly related to the performance of their duties and in accordance with District policies.

7.0 Chairperson and Vice-Chair / Committee Appointments

i. The EDSC will annually elect a Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst themselves at the regular meeting occurring in May of each year. The Vice-Chair will act in the capacity of the Chair at any meeting where the Chair is absent.

vi. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall serve in their elected capacity for a term of two years. The term of appointment for each position is two years commencing July 1st in the year they are appointed and terminating two years later on June 30th.

ii. .

iii. A Nominations Committee shall be formed sixty (60) days prior to the election to seek out candidates and do a skill assessment of the EDSC. The Nominations Committee shall be comprised of the current Chair, Past Chair, Economic Development Officer and one member-at-large who will present a list of current EDSC members who are willing to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair for the next term.

iv. The Nominations Committee will also be tasked with reviewing all candidates seeking term renewal, as well as new applicant submissions looking to fill anticipated vacancies. Recommendations will be presented to the EDSC for review and, upon acceptance, will be forwarded to Council for consideration and adoption.

8.0 Meetings

i. The EDSC will meet bi-monthly with additional meetings at the call of the Chair to address specific matters that have been referred for input and may be time sensitive. Notice of meetings will be given in accordance with the District of Mission’s Procedural By-law.
ii. Regular meetings will be held at 8:00 a.m. on the 2nd Wednesday of every month, excluding July and August when the committee will be in recess.

iii. Two of the regularly scheduled meetings will serve as a Special Meeting of Council where economic development priorities and annual reporting will be discussed.

iv. In the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair, the committee will appoint, from its members, a Chair for that particular meeting, who shall be subject to all the normal responsibilities and privileges assigned thereto.

9.0 Reporting

i. The Economic Development Select Committee shall provide the minutes of meetings to Council for information purposes.

ii. The EDSC reports directly to Council, under the signature of the Chair or designate. EDSC reports, recommendations and communications will normally be directed to Council through the Economic Development Department in the form of a staff report, but the EDSC may also appear before Council as a delegation.

iii. The Economic Development Officer or Executive Assistant is responsible for preparing the staff report and presenting the report to Council along with the Chairperson, if required.

iv. The EDSC shall provide a yearly management and financial report to Council summarizing the accomplishments of the prior year and highlighting the key activities planned for the coming year to be undertaken by the EDSC.

10.0 Conflict of Interest

i. Committee members will respect the confidentiality of all matters discussed at EDSC meetings and all information shared with the EDSC by municipal staff or Council.

ii. Committee members must abide by the conflict of interest provisions of the Community Charter and District Council Procedures Bylaw as amended from time to time. If a Committee member attending a meeting considers that he or she is not entitled to participate in the discussion of a matter or to vote on a question in respect of a matter because the member has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the matter, or for any other reason, the member must declare this and state the general nature of why he or she considers this to be the case and immediately leave the meeting or the part of the meeting during which the matter is under consideration.
DATE: February 5, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
SUBJECT: Status of Community Emergency Preparedness Grant Funding for a Mobile Reception Centre

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That a budget be established for $24,312 to purchase supplies to stock the emergency support services (ESS) mobile reception centre trailer and related training to be fully funded by the Community Emergency Preparedness Fund; and
2. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to request authorization from Council to establish a budget for the expenditure of $24,312 for the purchase of provisions for a mobile reception centre and related to training to be fully reimbursed by the Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) once the project is complete later in 2018.

BACKGROUND:
Under the Emergency Program Act, municipalities and First Nations communities are responsible for responding to emergencies in their areas, including providing emergency support services (ESS). The CEPF is a suite of funding programs intended to enhance the resiliency of local governments and their residents in responding to emergencies. Funding is provided by the province of BC and is administered by the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM).

At their November 20, 2017 regular meeting, Council resolved to support an application to the CEPF for $24,312 to fund the purchase of supplies for the mobile reception centre and related training.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The District’s application was successful and the $24,312 will be provided to the District once the approved expenditures and training have been completed and the required reporting has been submitted to the province. At this time, staff are requesting Council’s authorization to establish a budget for the expenditure.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
A mobile ESS trailer that can provide improved ESS is consistent with Council’s objective of Improved Public Safety.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no direct financial implications to the District, given that the full amount of $24,312 for this project will be reimbursed by the province, once the project is completed later in 2018.

COMMUNICATION:
Staff will announce the successful grant to the public through its normal channels.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) is a suite of funding programs intended to enhance the resiliency of local governments and their residents in responding to emergencies. Funding is provided by the province of BC and is administered by Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM). The District was successful in its application for $24,312 to fund purchasing supplies for a mobile reception centre and related training. Staff are requesting Council's authorization to establish a budget and begin the project.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Christine Brough, Executive Assistant
SUBJECT: Council Attendance at Conferences – Councillor Alexis’ Request
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix A – Email from Councillor Alexis and Information on Conference
Appendix B – District of Mission Policies ADM.06(PC)a Council and Staff Expense and ADM.07(C) Council Attendance at Conferences

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
1. That Councillor Alexis be authorized to attend the 2018 Business Improvement Areas of BC (BIABC) Annual Conference on behalf of Council; and
2. That expenses related to this conference be reimbursed as per District of Mission Policy ADM.06(PC)a and ADM.07(C).

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with background information, as requested, related to Councillor Alexis’ request to attend the 2018 Business Improvement Areas of BC (BIABC) Annual Conference on behalf of Council.

BACKGROUND:
The 2018 BIABC Annual Conference will take place in Kelowna from April 22-25, 2018. The cost and information is attached to this report as Appendix A.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Councillor Alexis has asked to attend the 2018 Business Improvement Areas of BC (BIABC) Annual Conference on behalf of Council. Because the Council budget for conferences is shared among Council members as a group rather than allocated to individual Council members to use at their discretion, staff have recommended that this request go back to Council for discussion and approval. Though this is not required under ADM.07(C), it is consistent with past practice. Councillor Alexis will speak to this request.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There is sufficient money in the 2018 budget to accommodate this request should it be the will of Council.

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SIGN-OFFS:
Christine Brough, Executive Assistant
Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
APPENDIX A

Email from Councillor Alexis to Council

I would like to attend the Business Improvement Annual Conference in Kelowna in April. I am not attending UMBC and will, therefore, not be spending my part of the budget. I was wondering if I could attend this conference instead. ~

Thank you.

**Pam Alexis**  
Councillor

**Information on Conference**

[http://conference.bia.bc.ca/](http://conference.bia.bc.ca/)

The Business Improvement Areas of BC (BIABC), in partnership with **International Downtown Association** and **Downtown Kelowna** present the 2018 BIABC annual conference, which is also an IDA spring regional conference.

April 22-25, 2018

**WHO SHOULD ATTEND**

- BC-based Business Improvement (BIA) Association Executive Directors/Managers
- Alberta-based Business Revitalization Zone (BRZ) Executive Directors/Managers
- U.S.-based Business Improvement District Executive Directors/Managers
- BIA/BRZ/BIA Staff at all Levels
- BIA/BRZ/BID Board of Directors
- Municipal Planners, Engineers, BIA/BRZ/BID Coordinators, Other Staff
- Municipal Elected Officials
- Provincial Elected Officials
- State Elected Officials
- Provincial Planners, Engineers, Community Relations, Cultural Development, Other Staff
- Municipal and Provincial/State Economic Development Staff

**COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Members</th>
<th>Early Bird</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full conference</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>Includes Sunday night reception, Best in the West Awards Luncheon, Tuesday Night Dinner Out and all meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Conference Workshop</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFERENCE ACCOMMODATIONS | DELTA OKANAGAN RESORT

Offering a dramatic, luxurious setting on Okanagan Lake in downtown Kelowna, this is the region's premier resort. It all begins with recently refreshed accommodations, many of which feature picturesque views of Okanagan Lake. Once you've rested up, venture out and explore the area's many nearby points of interest. Spend a day sampling delicious chardonnay or pinot gris wines in Canada's Wine Country or stroll through the scenic Kelowna City Park.

BIABC has negotiated special hotel room rates for conference delegates.

Room rates are:

- $189 Guest Room with a King or two Queen beds

Book by March 22, 2018 to guarantee rate and availability. Conference room rate is available after March 22nd but is subject to availability.
**POLICY:**

1. If a member of Council or staff incurs authorized expenses as a result of representing the District for any purpose, or engaging in District business, or attending a meeting, conference or educational program, such expenses will be paid or reimbursed upon provision of proof of expenditure, as follows:

   a) use of personal vehicle (Council Members) = $0.54 per kilometre* for travel outside the District of Mission

   b) use of personal vehicle (Staff Members) = $0.54 per kilometre* for travel both within and outside the District of Mission

   *Effective August 1, 2008 and that the rate henceforth reflect the Canada Revenue Agency Rate as set in January of each year

   c) other forms of transportation = actual cost (receipts required)

   d) accommodation, parking fees, business telephone calls, registration fees = actual cost (receipts required)

   e) per diem = $115.00 per day including meals and incidentals

      note - per diem claim to be reduced by the following amounts if any of the meals are provided:

      breakfast @ $15.00  lunch @ $20.00  dinner @ $50.00

   **Explanatory Note:**

   The current rated per diem for meals is paid except when the meal is included in the cost of the function. If lunch is provided at the function then the $20.00 for that day would be deducted from the daily per diem.

   The $30.00 incidental expense is paid after each 24 hour period for full travel days, otherwise only actual expenses are paid. If there is one day travel to the function and one day travel home, the $30.00 would be claimed only once. The only exception would be if there were 2 days travel each way, then 3 days incidentals would be claimed.

2. All expenses must be provided for in the District’s Financial Plan, and the relevant department head must authorize all staff expenses.
3. The Chief Administrative Officer or the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer must authorize expenses for the Mayor and Council members.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AGREEMENTS AND/OR BYLAWS:

Council Remuneration ADM.06(C)

*** END OF POLICY ***

RECORD OF AMENDMENTS/REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy #</th>
<th>Date Adopted</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Amended (Y/N)</th>
<th>Date Reissued</th>
<th>Authority (Resolution #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COU.14</td>
<td>2005-06-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2007-05-07</td>
<td>07/389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2008-08-05</td>
<td>08/672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2011-07-04</td>
<td>RC11/388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2011-07-18</td>
<td>RC11/421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU.14a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2012-02-13</td>
<td>CAO Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM.06(PC)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2017-01-01</td>
<td>CAO Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND:

In the course of conducting business, Council members must make important decisions on behalf of the citizens of Mission. Continuous learning and association building are important in carrying out this duty. As such, the District of Mission supports Council members attending conferences and/or educational opportunities relevant to Council responsibilities.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Policy is to provide funding for Council members to attend conferences and/or educational opportunities that are relevant to Council responsibilities.

POLICY:

1) An annual budget of $28,000 will be provided for any Council members to attend conferences and/or educational opportunities relevant to Council responsibilities. Any unspent conference funds may be carried forward to the next year’s budget from the first, second and third year of the Council term.

2) It is generally anticipated that Council will use these budgeted funds to annually attend both the Union of British Columbia Municipalities and Lower Mainland Local Government Association conferences along with any other conferences and/or educational opportunities that are relevant to Council responsibilities, including the annual Federation of Canadian Municipalities conference.

In the interest of fiscal responsibility, it is also anticipated that one or more Council members will be selected to attend these conferences and educational opportunities on a rotating bases over the four year term of Council, and will convey the acquired information to the rest of Council.

*** END OF POLICY ***
## RECORD OF AMENDMENTS/REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy #</th>
<th>Date Adopted</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Amended (Y/N)</th>
<th>Date Reissued</th>
<th>Authority (Resolution #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON.1</td>
<td>04-Feb-2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19-Apr-2010</td>
<td>RC10/198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM.07(C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-numbered</td>
<td>05-Jan-2016</td>
<td>to comply with new naming conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM.07(C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>01-Feb-2016</td>
<td>RC16/050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report is provided for Council's information only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to update Council on the grants the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department received in 2017.

BACKGROUND:
In order to help offset the costs of community programs and activities PRC staff review grant opportunities made available by various levels of government as well as private foundations and organizations. In 2017 a number of grants were received by the DOM through the Department, this report serves to summarize the grants received. A variety of grants have been received over the years and often Council is not aware of them if a Council resolution is not required as part of the application process or when the grant falls well within the Department’s approved mandate and scope. In these events funds are simply placed within the Department budget. In addition to grants the Department also seeks sponsorships and donations, often in smaller amounts, for specific activities and events such as Canada Day and Youth Week. This report will not include detail on these smaller contributions but instead focus on those larger grants received by the Department. This additional support allows staff to provide several activities at reduced rates or free to the public.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The following grants were received in 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Name</th>
<th>PRC Project Name</th>
<th>PRC Project Detail</th>
<th>Grant Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Health</td>
<td>Active Communities</td>
<td>Collaborative project with Mission Sports Council and Pacific Sport Fraser Valley to support community sports and recreation in advancing the True Sport values and Physical Literacy</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Program/Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Heritage</td>
<td>Mission 125 Anniversary Celebration</td>
<td>Support for arts, culture and heritage activities associated with the 125th anniversary celebrations</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Summer Jobs</td>
<td>Summer Students</td>
<td>Support for summer student wages – Recreation Program Assistant and Special Event Assistant</td>
<td>$4,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Recreation &amp; Parks Association</td>
<td>Family Day Festivities</td>
<td>Support for Family Day activities at the Leisure Centre</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Recreation &amp; Parks Association Before and After school Program Initiative</td>
<td>Club Kids Program Expansion</td>
<td>Support for Club Kids Afterschool Program – West Heights, Hillside and Central Schools</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Heritage</td>
<td>Mission Canada Day</td>
<td>Support for the Canada Day festivities in Fraser River Heritage Park</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way – Success By Six</td>
<td>Fun n’ Run Preschool Program</td>
<td>Wages for Fun n’ Run Program enabling it to be offered free of charge</td>
<td>$2,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada 150</td>
<td>Canada 150 Skating Day</td>
<td>Free public skate December 10, 2017</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Rural and Remote Homelessness Partnering Strategy Grant</td>
<td>Homelessness Strategy</td>
<td>Support the Mission Active Support Table (MAST), database development, homelessness and housing coordinator contract and supplies</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Hydro/Tree Canada</td>
<td>Community Park Tree Planting</td>
<td>Trees planted in Hatzic Cemetery, Hatzic Park and Sports Park</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumpstart Community Development Program</td>
<td>Try-it Sports Afterschool Program-Deroche Elementary</td>
<td>Afterschool sport program at Deroche Elementary</td>
<td>$2,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When seeking grants staff are cognizant of the additional work that may be required to search, apply, manage and report on grant fund projects. Some are much more onerous than others and this is weighed when considering any grant application. Additionally the ability to leverage other funds is considered.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

Bringing grant funds into the Department relates to two Council objectives:

1. To enhance lifestyle opportunities and community health and;

2. Excellence in financial management and planning.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Grants received by the PRC Department support ongoing operations and projects. The value of the 2017 grants is $143,113.

COMMUNICATION:

Many grants require, as a condition of acceptance of grant funds, noting the grant fund provider on collateral, in communications, etc. Staff follow the specific conditions required of each grant. Staff will endeavour to provide an annual update to Council on Department grants received.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

A variety of grants have been received by the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department in 2017. This report summarizes the grants received.

SIGN-OFFS:

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture
SUBJECT: Tennis in Mission- Follow-up Report
ATTACHMENT: July 4, 2017 Parks and Recreation Department Referrals

This report is provided for Council’s information only and there is no staff recommendation included.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information related to the costs to add an additional tennis court at Centennial Park as requested by the Mission Tennis Club.

BACKGROUND:

The Mission Tennis Club has asked staff and Council to consider adding a fourth tennis court at Centennial Park. The request has been reviewed by staff, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee and Council who asked that a cost estimate be provided to install a new court at Centennial Park as well as the costs to repair the courts at Heritage Park Centre (HPC). This report is provided in order to update Council on this matter.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The Mission Tennis Club have presented to Council, the Mission Sports Council as well as the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee on the need to develop a fourth court at Centennial Park. Mark Gervais, the President of the Mission Tennis Club presented at the Advisory Committee and there was additional discussion regarding repairs to the courts at HPC in addition to his request to add a fourth court at Centennial Park.

The Mission Tennis Club has 30 active members who use dedicated time at Centennial Park on Tuesday and Wednesday evening as well as Sunday morning from May to September. The Club has reached out to Tennis BC and is hoping to develop the sport further in the community and would like to host annual tournaments beyond what they currently support. In order to host tournaments the Club feels that there is a need to have four well maintained courts in a single location.

While staff did produce some initial costs to improve tennis in the community back in 2014, these were considered to be very preliminary. In order to provide more specific costing based on fixed quantities and current pricing staff retained the services of a consulting firm to review the existing tennis courts at both Heritage Park Centre and Centennial Park. The following estimates have been provided:

Add an additional tennis court at Centennial Park- $113,370.
Repair the courts at Heritage Park- $115,130.
Fully replace the surface of the courts at HPC- $161,970.
The cost differential between the repair option and the build new at Centennial Park is nominal and the main question is really related to what is the best investment and the one that will increase the sport participation in the community.

Mr. Gervais the President of the Tennis Club is a very passionate advocate of the sport and supports the development of the new tennis court at Centennial Park.

The Advisory Committee have recommended that the HPC courts be repaired in order to increase tennis in the community by four courts rather than only one. A copy of their previous recommendation is included in Attachment A.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

Council have indicated a desire to improve recreational assets in the community and any addition to tennis would support this goal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications at this time.

COMMUNICATION:

The Mission Tennis Club has been advised that this report is on Council’s agenda.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

This report is provided as an update on the questions regarding tennis in the community and an effort to seek Council’s direction on how they wish to proceed.

SIGN-OFFS:

Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture

Reviewed by: S. Key, Deputy Director Parks, Recreation & Culture

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
This report is provided for Council’s information only and there is no staff recommendation included.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an update on the delegations that have presented to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee over the last several months and to provide input to Council on these community requests.

BACKGROUND:
The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee have been charged with advising Council and staff on issues raised in the community related to the delivery of parks and recreational services. Some of the referrals are made by Council members and some are brought to the attention of the committee by staff, while others come directly from the community. This report is to provide Council with an update on two of the issues recently discussed by the committee which have were presented by community delegations.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Tennis Courts:
The Mission Tennis Club have presented to Council, the Mission Sports Council as well as the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee on the need to develop a fourth court at Centennial Park. Mr. Mark Gervais, the President of the Mission Tennis Club presented at the Advisory Committee meeting and while the Minutes reflected the outcome of that discussion there was no formal report from staff to Council. This report is provided to clarify the recommendation from the Advisory Committee contained in the November 2016 minutes and to recommend a course of action to close the loop on this item.

There are twelve tennis courts in the District that are in various conditions. The three courts in Centennial Park are in the best condition followed by the two courts at Hillside Park. A number of other courts would not be considered safe for active play at this time.

The Mission Tennis Club has 30 active members who use dedicated time at Centennial Park on Tuesday and Wednesday evening as well as Sunday morning from May to September. The Club has reached out to Tennis BC and are hoping to develop the sport further in the community and would like to host annual tournaments beyond what they currently support. In order to host tournaments the Club feels that there is a need to have four well maintained courts in a single location.

The tennis courts at Centennial, as noted previously, are in the best shape but there are only three. The presentation from the Tennis Club requested that funds be secured to develop a fourth court at the west end of the existing court configuration.
While the Club did not request any additional improvements beyond the addition of the fourth court an ideal tennis club configuration would also include lit courts as well as a club house that provided washrooms, dressing rooms, concession and meeting space.

The only location that currently has four courts is Heritage Park Centre, but these courts require repairs before they could ever be considered for tournament usage. While the courts at Heritage Park Centre are located on School District property they were, from all accounts, constructed for community use.

The Advisory Committee felt that repairing the Heritage Park Centre courts would allow for tournament play as well as provide a total of 7 useable courts for community use distributed throughout the community.

As a follow up to this delegation staff discussed at length the implications of expanding tennis at Centennial Park. The long term development of tennis will require more than a fourth tennis court as noted previously. Given all of the pressures on Centennial Park (tennis, disc golf, off leash area, lacrosse needs, etc.) staff feel that a more detailed discussion is needed and have therefore expanded the terms of reference for the current master plan to include a more detailed community review of the needs at Centennial Park so that all of the various community needs and pressures on the park are fully considered.

**Bike Skills Park:**

Rocky Blondin from the Fraser Valley Mountain Biking Association attended the April 11, 2017 Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting and presented a proposal to develop a bike skills course at the Leisure Centre. The course could be located either on the site of the old skateboard park or the other alternative was the treed area immediately north of the skateboard park.

The site of the old skateboard park has also been identified as a possible site to allow younger children to either skateboard or use their scooters on a refurbished surface. While there are several viable uses for the site there are also some challenges with the close proximity to private homes that have complained about use of the park for many years and were hoping for a reprieve when the new skateboard park was built.

The Advisory Committee support the concept of a bike skills park that will allow new riders to be introduced to the sport of mountain biking and become better acquainted with a sport that is extremely popular in Mission. While the concept of the facility is supported by the Committee there will need to be more detailed discussions to determine if the Leisure Centre property is the best location for this type of facility.

While both suggestions have their merit neither staff nor the Advisory Committee support moving ahead with these projects in the absence of a broader community discussion. While these projects have been recently identified by residents there are also concerns about the current number and state of off leash areas in the community, the request for a larger picnic shelter at Griner Park as well as a new playground area at Fraser River Heritage Park.

Given that the Parks, Recreation, Arts and Culture Master Plan is underway all of these various requests should become part of the overall discussion and consideration for future parks improvements, cultural needs and recreational opportunities in the community.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**

The development of a master plan for Centennial Park supports Council’s goal to increase and enhance recreation and lifestyle opportunities in the District.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The changes to the current master plan terms of reference, the inclusion of the Centennial Park master plan, can be managed within the current project budget.

COMMUNICATION:
The Mission Tennis Club and Mr. Blondin have both been advised that this report was to be presented to Council on July 4th. Both presentations have been brought to the attention of the Master Plan consulting team.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
This report is provided to Council to update them on several projects identified by user groups as well as to advise Council of the extended project mandate. All of the projects noted in this report have been identified as community requests and will be considered within the context and final recommendations related to the 2017 Parks, Recreation, Arts and Culture Master Plan and the Fraser River Heritage Park Master Plan.

SIGN-OFFS:

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jason Horton, Manager of Parks and Facilities
SUBJECT: South Arena Generator – Operating Budget

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Parks, Recreation and Culture operating budget be increased for 2018 to include an additional $14,700, with funding from General Fund Accumulated Surplus, to increase the maintenance levels of the #2 emergency generator at the Mission Leisure Centre that ensures cooling of the data room which supports Fire Hall #1/EOC operations and ensures un-interrupted ventilation from the south arena refrigeration plant;

2. That the $14,700 increase be incorporated into the District’s annual budget for 2019 and beyond; and

3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to amend the Parks, Recreation and Culture operating budget to include operating and fleet charges to operate the south arena emergency generator at the Mission Leisure Centre.

BACKGROUND:

The south arena emergency generator at the Mission Leisure Centre was installed as part of the 2005 renovation project. When the facility was re-opened following renovations, the generator was not included with the fleet equipment and no operating funds were included in the budget. The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department currently manage two other generators located on the Leisure Centre grounds; one for the north arena and the other for the Mission Community Activity Centre. Both of these generators are serviced regularly by Fleet Services, tested annually for CSA compliance and contribute to the fleet reserve for future replacement.

The generator at the Mission Community Activity Centre was included to have fleet servicing and CSA testing due to the building being the temporary fire hall. The north arena generator allows the Leisure Centre to act as a Reception Centre in the event of a community emergency and is serviced by Fleet and contributes to the reserve for future replacement. The south generator is not serviced with the same degree of regularity nor does it contribute to the reserve account. The generator is serviced yearly by a private contractor and emergency repairs are completed as required, there is no regular maintenance performed or fleet charges collected to purchase a future replacement.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Since 2005, Leisure Centre operating funds have been used to service the south arena generator and perform emergency repairs. At this time a CSA test is not being performed. This generator powers the server in the data room, the two air conditioning units that cool the server year round, the exhaust fan for the south refrigeration plant in the event of an ammonia leak, emergency lighting and exit lights for the south end of the Leisure Centre. The server at the Leisure Centre is currently the data center for the Fire Hall #1 and the EOC in the event that an emergency event occurs. In the event of a large scale power failure this generator would be critical to the operation of the EOC due to the server location in the Leisure Centre.

In order to better manage this asset staff believe that a regular maintenance program performed on all emergency generators is preferred over the as needed repairs that are currently being performed. In order to increase the service levels on the generator staff are recommending that additional funds be added to the Leisure Centre budget to offset the costs of regular inspections, maintenance and fleet contributions to offset the future replacement of the generator.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The upkeep of the south arena emergency generator at the Leisure Centre supports Council’s goal to “ensure ongoing maintenance and optimizing use” of community infrastructure.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The annual operating budget required is $14,700. This includes mandatory preventative maintenance ($1,000), weekly CSA checks ($5,200), required maintenance ($1,000) and fleet charges ($7,500). Future capital costs may be required when the south generator is replaced due to the fleet charges only starting in 2018, however this will depend on the timing of the eventual replacement.

Given the critical infrastructure that is powered by the south arena generator in the event of a power outage, staff are recommending that the $14,700 budget increase be funded from General Fund Accumulated Surplus for 2018, and be incorporated into the District’s annual budget for 2019 and beyond. General Fund Accumulated Surplus currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $4.5 million, as compared to a minimum recommended balance of $3.6 million.

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

COMMUNICATION:

This report has been shared with Fleet Operations to ensure that they are able to take on these additional tasks and that the operating budget is sufficient to cover ongoing costs.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

This report is provided to Council seeking additional operating funds to cover operating expenses and fleet charges to the south arena emergency generator located at the Mission Leisure Centre. This generator is critical to the protection of the data room at the Leisure Centre that supports Fire Hall #1 / EOC and the exhaust fans from the south refrigeration plant.
SIGN-OFFS:

Jason Horton Manager of Parks and Faculties

Reviewed by: M. Sinclair, Director Parks, Recreation & Culture

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jason Horton, Manager of Parks and Facilities
SUBJECT: January Ice Storm- Tree Clean-Up Efforts to Date

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Parks, Recreation & Culture operating budget be amended to include an additional $170,000 to offset the costs associated with tree trimming and removal costs associated with the recent ice storm, with funding from General Fund Accumulated Surplus; and
2. That Parks, Recreation & Culture staff be asked to submit a detailed follow-up report once all street trees have been re-inspected; and
3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to update Council on the costs resulting from the clean-up activities associated with the December 31st ice storm event and to seek approval for additional funds to clean up fallen trees throughout the community.

BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission and surrounding areas were impacted recently by severe weather conditions that resulted in freezing rain that lingered for several days. The freezing rain damaged thousands of trees and a number of properties, as well as causing numerous power outages across the community due to the extreme ice accumulation on wires and adjacent trees.

Many of the calls received over the course of the event were directly related to tree failures and trees damaging homes, power lines, fences, sheds and blocking access to roads and homes. While staff believe that most of the significant hazards have been addressed on public property there remain significant numbers of trees that are hung up on other trees lying across fences and littering parks and green spaces.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Staff continue to respond to tree calls as a result of the December 31st ice storm which significantly impacted Mission. Staff had made calls earlier in the week leading up to the storm to secure qualified contractors to respond to anticipated calls for service. Much of the necessary work had to be held off because the lingering ice made work too hazardous for crews. As soon as conditions allowed contractors and the parks crew began to assess and clean-up the debris.

The District owns significant areas of green space and these are located directly adjacent to built-up
areas and subdivisions. Areas particularly heavily hit and affected by downed trees were in Cedar Valley. The alders and birch were particularly affected by the heavy ice accumulation and many snapped off under the weight of the ice littering backyards and parks.

Street trees proved particularly vulnerable and staff estimated that almost 100% of the street trees were affected to a greater or lesser extent by this event. Staff continues to assess these trees as, for the most part, they did not pose a significant and imminent hazard.

Those trees that posed an imminent hazard have for the most part been dealt with and the contractors called in for emergency work have now been released. While imminent hazards have been addressed there remain a significant number of trees that are down and encroaching onto parks and adjacent properties that need to be addressed. The ice storm has also caused concerns regarding bank stability on Lane Creek trail due to tree plate failures localized on one of the banks. This has resulted in the temporary closure of the north east leg of the trail. A geotechnical firm has been hired to produce a report confirming the stability of the bank as well as mitigation measures. At the time of this report information on the potential financial impacts of this repair are unavailable.

Staff estimates the costs incurred to date are approximately $140,000 for clean-up alone. There will be other costs resulting from property damage, claims and repairs to community assets such as fences, signage, etc. The cost to replace trees affected by the ice in the urban areas could be as high as $200,000 depending on the results of the follow-up inspections. It should be noted that a tree replacement program could be introduced and trees replaced over a number of years. While replacing those trees that are the most severely impacted by the storm will help to restore our green infrastructure it will be far less significant than the older mature trees that were destroyed by this significant winter event.

In order to complete the needed work staff estimates that an additional $60,000 would be required in 2018. The figures provided above do not take into consideration any DOM staff time, which to date is $20,000 and with the additional work will climb to an additional $60,000. It should be understood that damage sustained by some trees may not become apparent for several years and many trees that were pruned may later have to be removed.

In summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs Incurred To-Date</th>
<th>Estimated Costs Remaining</th>
<th>Total Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracted services for clean-up</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Replacement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The protection and maintenance of urban trees speaks both to Council’s goal to ensure a high quality of life for its residents as well as the protection of the communities green infrastructure.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Under normal conditions the costs to remove or maintain District trees is absorbed into the parks operating budget. The current costs to deal with the 2018 ice storm far surpass normal expenditure levels more often in the range of $30,000 for the entire year. By adding the $170,000 to the current budget of $30,000, for a total budget of $200,000, staff feel that the remaining tree work can be covered by the existing budget while not impacting other service levels provided to the community through the parks operation. The wages spent to date fall within the normal operating budget for parks, the impact on the delivery of park services will be felt however as other work will not be completed as staff continue to focus on the clean-up and re-inspection of trees affected by the storm.

Staff recommend funding this one-time parks budget increase of $170,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus, which currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $4.5 million, as compared to the minimum recommended balance of $3.6 million.

BC Hydro have reached out and reminded the District that there are tree planting grants available and the District will be making an application in advance of the February deadline. Staff are also reviewing the suitability of contributions received through development towards tree replanting as an option to fund tree replacements, and will include that information in the report back to Council.

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

COMMUNICATION:

There is no additional communications required as a result of this report.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The 2018 ice storm has had a significant impact on the District of Mission and will have a lasting impact on many of the community trees those planted along community streets as well as those located in the community’s extensive green belt areas.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jason Horton, Manager of Parks and Facilities
Maureen Sinclair, Director Parks, Recreation & Culture

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
SUBJECT: Engineering & Public Works Capital Project Updates

This report provides a year-end update on the status of the 2017 Engineering and Public Works capital projects. Most projects have reached substantial completion on or under budget.

PURPOSE:
This report is to provide Council with a year-end update on the 2017 Engineering and Public Works capital projects.

BACKGROUND:
The Engineering Department has committed to keeping Council up to date on the status of Engineering and Public Works capital projects. As part of that ongoing effort, staff will provide Council with mid-year and year-end reports. This is the year-end report for 2017.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
There were 17 significant Engineering and Public Works capital projects within the areas of roads, drainage, sewer, water distribution, miscellaneous and facilities.

Below is a brief summary of the significant capital projects approved by Council and managed by staff in 2017.

Roads
- **Paving Program**
  
  *Budget: $2,400,000 plus 2016 carry forward amount*

  The roads to be repaired and paved in 2017 were selected and works began in June. BA Blacktop was on site from spring through November, paving the following locations:

  - Cedar Connector north bound curb lane over watermain trench;
  - Dewdney Trunk Road from Pilgrim Street to the switchbacks east of the Stave Lake (hydro) Dam;
  - Eider Street from McRae Avenue to Crane Avenue;
  - Swan Avenue from Eider Street going east 160 m;
  - Stave Lake Street from Watt Street to municipal border; and
  - Taulbut Street from 7th Avenue to 14th Avenue.
The following locations have been deferred to 2018 or beyond due to scheduling challenges and the need to prioritize available funding:

- Badger Avenue and Antelope Avenue in coordination with watermain replacement;
- Cade Barr Street and 14th Avenue in coordination with drainage works;
- Dalke Avenue from Dewdney Trunk Road going west 330 m (including sidewalk);
- Wilson Street from municipal border going north 279 m;
- Dewdney Trunk Road from Lougheed Highway to Manson Street;
- Draper Street from Dewdney Trunk Road to Douglas Avenue; and
- Draper Street from Dewdney Trunk Road to Douglas Avenue.

- **Walkways and Sidewalks**
  
  *Budget: $300,000 plus 2016 carry forward amount*
  
  The sidewalks to be installed in 2017 were selected and works began in the spring of 2017. The following locations have been completed as of year-end:

  - Taulbut Street from Plumridge Avenue to 14th Avenue;
  - Cherry Avenue south side from the east boundary of Griner Park to the intersection of Cedar Street; and
  - Dewdney Trunk Road west side from Moffat Avenue going north 220 m.

- **Traffic Signal Detailed Design**
  
  *Budget: $81,500*
  
  Detailed designs for the following three intersections are now complete:

  - Stave Lake Street and Cherry Avenue;
  - Cade Barr Street and Best Avenue; and
  - 7th Avenue and Murray Street.

- **Keystone Bridge Replacement (Conceptual Design)**
  
  *Budget: $70,000*
  
  The District has engaged the services of Associated Engineering for the development of a conceptual design and cost estimate for the replacement of the existing bridge structure with a brand new bridge structure. These works were 75% complete by year end. A final report with cost estimate is expected in the first quarter of 2018. The cost estimate provided will assume a full road closure during construction.

- **1st Avenue Improvement Project (Design/Tender)**
  
  *Budget: $500,000*
  
  Staff have been working with ISL Engineering and Land Services, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, and BC Hydro to develop a detailed design package and set of tender-ready documents. All drawings and documents were prepared ahead of schedule, allowing the District to post a Prequalification on BC Bid in the form of an Expression of Interest. The District received ten submissions, of which staff then short-listed and requested bids from the five top scoring contractors. The bids from the shortlisted contractors will be reviewed in February with the intention
of awarding the construction contract in early March of 2018.

**Drainage**

- **Drainage Condition Assessment and Replacement, including Blott Street**
  
  *Budget: $35,000 plus 2016 carry forward amount*
  
  The following locations were identified as priorities for 2017 and are now complete:
  
  - Continued review and repairs of Sandpiper neighbourhood/area system.

  The following locations have been deferred to 2018 or beyond:
  
  - Cade Barr Street and 14th Avenue (postponed to coordinate with paving within 3 years).

- **Culvert Lining at 7th Avenue and Horne Street**
  
  *Budget: $360,000*
  
  These works were started in 2016 and completed during the 2017 fishery window. Though very challenging, the project was a success and came in within budget.

**Sewer**

- **Sewer Condition Assessment and Replacement**
  
  *Budget: $304,000 plus 2016 carry forward amount*
  
  - Works on Taulbut Street from Plumridge Avenue to 14th Avenue were completed as planned.
  
  - 1st Avenue trenchless repairs were uploaded to BC Bid and are expected to complete in 2018.

- **Fraser River Forcemain (Design/Tender)**
  
  *Budget: $300,000*
  
  A Request for Proposal for consulting services closed in early 2017. The contract was awarded to Onsite Engineering Ltd. As of year-end, qualified contractors had been selected, the detailed design was 70% complete, and all permit applications were filed with provincial and federal agencies.

- **Hatzic Pump Station Upgrade**
  
  *Budget: $537,700*
  
  This project which included new pumps, wet well modifications, valve chamber upgrades, a new electrical kiosk, and new larger generator, was awarded to Gradex Construction Ltd. and reached substantial completion in late December. The project went well and came in within budget.

**Water Distribution**

- **Watermain Upgrades**
  
  *Budget: $200,000 plus 2016 carry forward amount and developer contribution*
  
  - Looping of the existing water system from the bottom of the Cedar Connector, north of Fraser Crescent, up to the cap south of Ross Drive, was substantially completed by year end. A Pressure Regulating Valve station was also installed with this connection.
  
  - The Leisure Centre was provided with a loop between Grand Street and Taulbut Street.
• **Water Condition Assessment and Replacement**  
  *Budget: $1,000,000 plus 2016 carry forward amount*  
  The watermains to be replaced in 2017 were selected and works began in the spring of 2017. Unfortunately, the extended winter of 2016/17 delayed staff’s ability to begin projects until quite late in the spring. The following works were completed by year-end:
  
  - Replaced 150 mm asbestos cement pipe on Badger Avenue, Antelope Crescent, and Antelope Avenue with new 150 mm and 200 mm Ductile Iron pipe; and
  - Taulbut Street from Plumridge Avenue to 14th Avenue.

• **Water Metering at Wilson Street**  
  *Budget: $48,300*  
  A meter was installed for the mobile home park on Wilson Street. The new meter will help to identify leaks and will allow for fair and equitable billing.

**Miscellaneous**

• **Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**  
  *Budget: $72,000*  
  Charging stations were installed at Welton Common and Municipal Hall within budget.

**Facilities**

• **DDC System Upgrades**  
  *Budget: $26,000*  
  The heating and cooling digital controls in both the Public Works building and Municipal Hall were replaced, due to age, with brand new Delta Controls installed by ESC Automation. The works were completed on time and on budget.

**Waste Management**

• **Phase D West (New Landfill Cell)**  
  *Budget: $1,280,200*  
  Works were started in 2017 and are expected to complete in early 2018 within the approved budget.

**Noteworthy**

- The Drainage Model continues to be developed and calibrated.
- The Sanitary Sewer Model was completed in 2017.

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

**COMMUNICATION:**  
No communication action is required.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
There were 17 significant Engineering and Public Works capital projects approved by Council and managed by staff in 2017. All projects have progressed well and most have reached substantial completion within budget by year end. Those which have been carried forward into 2018 are expected to complete by mid-year within budget.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
SUBJECT: Prentis Avenue Roadworks Funding Request and Contract Award
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A – Map

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That a contract for Prentis Avenue Road Improvements be directly awarded to Tiegen Excavating Ltd. in the amount of $237,149 including PST and 10% contingency, excluding GST;
2. That the works be funded from the approved 2018 Paving Program budget; and
3. That the Director of Engineering and Public Works be authorized to execute the contract.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval to award a contract to Tiegen Excavating Ltd. for road improvements along Prentis Avenue, from Heritage Park Middle School to the south west boundary of 33837 Prentis Avenue. As per the District of Mission Purchasing Policy FIN.24, a Single Source Direct Award over $100,000 in value requires Council approval.

BACKGROUND:
The development of lands at the end of Prentis Avenue will necessitate the extension of servicing by the developer from Heritage Park Middle School all the way to the development lands, as well as the construction of roadworks including curb, sidewalks, and street lighting from 33837 Prentis Avenue north east into the new development. The road from Heritage Park Middle School to 33837 Prentis Avenue fronts Crown Land and school board land and is not the responsibility of the developer to improve. This section of Prentis Avenue should be improved to include new pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalk, and street lighting.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Staff would like to take advantage of the opportunity to roll additional works into the scope of the servicing associated with the development of lands at the end of Prentis Avenue. This additional scope includes pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalk, and street lighting fronting lands currently held by School District 75 and the Provincial Crown which measures approximately 145 lineal metres and will not be improved unless the District funds the desired improvements. As the developer’s contractor will be installing storm and sanitary works along this section of Prentis Avenue, there is an opportunity to fund additional scope in order to achieve a fully-renewed corridor from the school all the way to the new development which would include a continuous municipal standard concrete sidewalk behind a new municipal standard barrier curb with new municipal standard cobra-head street lights. The additional cost for these works represents best value to the District due to the savings realized by hiring the developer’s contractor who is already on site and the economies of scale that go with adding scope to
the contractor’s existing project. Working with the same contractor as the developer will eliminate tie-in costs, scheduling issues, coordination of works issues, and will ensure uniformity throughout the corridor. This scenario, which is very similar to a continuation of services scenario, will ensure efficiency, economy, and effectiveness to obtain the maximum benefits with the resources available.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
This report provides information that impacts Council’s three key goals and four key objectives.

Goals:
1. Securing our Finances, Assets and Core Infrastructure;
2. Planning for the Future; and
3. Building our Community.

Objectives:
1. Enhanced lifestyle opportunities and community health;
2. Improved public safety;
3. Excellence in financial management and planning; and
4. Optimized planning and management of assets and infrastructure.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications directly associated with this report, as staff are requesting approval to fund the works through the 2018 Paving Program within the approved budget. The Paving Program budget has adequate funds available to accommodate this project. As noted above, the recommended approach to complete the project includes directly awarding work in the amount of $237,149 to the developer’s contractor whom is performing the adjacent works, and as per the District of Mission Purchasing Policy FIN.24, a Single Source Direct Award over $100,000 in value requires Council approval.

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

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Prentis Avenue will be upgraded to a municipal standard as a result of the development of lands at the north east end. Between the development lands and Heritage Park Middle School, there is approximately 145 lineal metres of road frontage that will not be improved unless the District funds the desired improvements. As the developer’s contractor will be working along this section of road extending services, there is an opportunity to roll the desired improvements into the developer’s scope of work and realize the financial benefits associated with hiring the developer’s contractor who is already on site and the economies of scale that go with adding scope to the contractor’s existing project. Staff are recommending the improvements in the amount of $237,149 including PST and 10% contingency, excluding GST, be funded from the existing 2018 Paving Program budget and that Tiegen Excavating Ltd. be awarded the construction contract. As per the District of Mission Purchasing Policy FIN.24, a Single Source Direct Award over $100,000 in value requires Council approval.
SIGN-OFFS:

Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
Appendix A

Portion of Prentis Avenue for roadwork improvements
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services
SUBJECT: Update on Free Residential Yard Waste Drop-off at Mission Landfill

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the free yard waste drop off program for residents be extended to March 3, 2018; and
2. That the weekly curbside compostable collection container and yard waste bundle limit of a combined total of 10, be extended to March 3, 2018.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to obtain Council direction on extending the free residential yard waste drop-off period which is currently scheduled to end on February 11, 2018.

BACKGROUND:
A severe ice storm hit Mission on December 29, 2017. The weight of the ice on trees resulted in many branches breaking and trees toppling both on private and public property. Mayor and Council received a staff report on residential disposal options for fallen branches from the ice storm at the January 8, 2018 Regular Council Meeting. By Council Resolution RC18/012, Mayor and Council approved providing free yard waste drop-off for residents at the Mission Landfill from January 9, 2018 until February 11, 2018. Mayor and Council also directed staff to prepare a report for the February 5, 2018 Regular Council Meeting that would provide a recommendation on whether or not the free drop-off period should be extended.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
From January 9, 2018, to January 23, 2018, Mission residents dropped off 341 tonnes of yard waste for free at the Mission Landfill. This equates to a compost processing contractor cost of approximately $15,000. In addition to this amount, yard waste was also received from landscapers and other commercial contractors that were hired to clean up residential yards. Due to concerns with opening up the free residential yard waste program to commercial contractors, a policy was implemented that would reimburse residents using a commercial contractor up to one tonne of yard waste, which equates to $67 per residential property. For the period from January 9 to January 23, it is estimated that residents that used commercial contractors are eligible to receive up to approximately $5,000 in total. Therefore the total direct cost over the 15-day period is estimated at $20,000 which when extrapolated to February 11, is a cost of approximately $46,000.

Based on the costs observed to date, extending the free drop-off period from February 11 to March 3, is projected to cost an additional $27,000, for a total program cost of $73,000. Extending the program from February 11 to March 31 is projected to cost an additional $64,000, for a total program cost of $110,000.
Staff recommend extending the program to Sunday, March 3. Extending the free drop-off beyond March 3 risks regular yard clean up being included in the free drop-off at significant cost to the District. Staff also recommend extending the compostable collection container and yard waste bundle limit of 10 to March 3.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Extending the program from ending February 11 to March 3 is projected to cost an additional $27,000 and bring the total program cost to $73,000. These cost estimates could be considered as a worst-case scenario as they are based on the assumption that current drop-off levels continue, when in actuality it is expected that the use of the free drop-off will diminish over time as residents make progress on their clean up. A budget amendment is not proposed at this time due to the uncertainty of the final cost estimates. If the waste management program goes over budget, the shortfall will need to be funded from the refuse reserve fund. Staff will continue to monitor the costs in relation to this initiative.

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

COMMUNICATION:

If the program is extended, communication to residents would occur through the local newspaper, District website, social media, and at the Mission Landfill Scalehouse.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The free residential yard waste drop-off program at the landfill is well used and is expected to continue to be well used if available. The cost of the program to February 11 is extrapolated to be $46,000. Staff recommend extending the end date of the program to March 3 for an estimated additional cost of $27,000. Staff also recommend extending the weekly curbside compostable collection containers and yard waste bundles limit of 10 to March 3.

SIGN-OFFS:

Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport
SUBJECT: 7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A – Project Extents

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That out of the proposed four options listed in the Engineering Technologist III’s report dated February 5, 2018, Option 1 be supported to implement separated bike lanes on both sides of 7th Avenue from Stave Lake Street to Grand Street, and shared bike lanes on both sides from Grand Street to Cedar Street;

2. That the implementation cost of Option 1 in the amount of $145,000 be funded from the existing Paving Program budget;

3. That the required five year maintenance cost of Option 1 in the amount of $66,000 be added to the District’s Operating budget beginning in 2023 and every five years thereafter; and

4. To support the District’s grant application to BikeBC for their cost sharing program for 7th Avenue Bike Lanes, and should that be approved it would partially offset the funding required from the Paving Program budget.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Various District of Mission plans, and most recently the Cycling Task Force (Task Force), have determined that 7th Avenue is the most logical option for dedicated cycling lanes running in the east-west direction.

Multiple Council reports have been presented over the last two years in an effort to implement bicycle lanes on 7th Avenue. Some 7th Avenue residents and businesses have raised concerns in the past that predominantly were centered on the loss of parking in front of their properties. Council in their October 17, 2016 session requested staff to form a cycling task force consisting of leading cycling advocates in the community. The primary goal of the Task Force was to investigate practical cycling route options that could provide a safe east-west route in the District, while minimizing the impact on local residents, businesses, and other modes of transportation. Staff have met with members of the Task Force to review options and discuss alternatives.

Four options are presented in this report for Council consideration. Staff is recommending implementation of Option 1. Option 1 is recommended because it has the lowest capital cost among the available separated bike lane options, is one of the safest options, supports both the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Transportation Master Plan (TMP), addresses the concerns expressed by the business owners near Taulbut Street, and is eligible for BikeBC funding. It will also provide the most benefit to the cycling community, while keeping the potential unwanted impacts to others at a minimum level.

This report is additionally seeking Council’s support to apply for BikeBC funding for the selected option.
PURPOSE:
This report recommends that Council approve the installation of separated bike lanes along 7th Avenue, from Stave Lake Street to Grand Street, and shared bike lanes thereafter to Cedar Street. In addition, staff is seeking Council’s support for a BikeBC cost share grant application for the 7th Avenue Bike Lane project.

BACKGROUND:
7th Avenue is a collector roadway that runs east-west and extends between Mary Street in the east and Wren Street in the west. It has been designated as a truck route in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), has multiple bus routes along its length, and is where the Fire Station No. 1 is located.

A traffic study conducted in 2017 indicated that the average daily traffic volume along 7th Avenue is approximately 7,000 vehicles per day, and that the 85% of drivers are travelling at speeds of 57.5 km/h or less.

The OCP and the TMP identified bike lanes as a desirable amenity to the community. The TMP recommended five short-term cycling improvement projects in the District, where building-separated bicycle lanes on 7th Avenue from Cedar Street to Stave Lake Street was specified as the highest priority.

During the development of the TMP, public consultation was conducted through two public open houses. Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to express their concerns and provide feedback on all elements of the TMP, including the proposed bike lanes along 7th Avenue. Residents and stakeholders who attended the open houses did not express concerns regarding the recommendation to implement separated bike lanes along 7th Avenue, and were generally in favor of the infrastructure upgrade.

Based on the aforementioned plans, Council directed staff to proceed with the implementation of separated bike lanes along 7th Avenue.

The Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads identifies recommended lane widths for roadways based on research and engineering best practice. TAC recommends the following lane widths:

- Minimum travel lane width of 3.3 m is recommended where buses and larger truck are expected to regularly use a lane;
- Parking lanes should be 2.4 m wide, which can include the gutter portion of the curb; and
- The lowest practical limit for unbuffered bike lane width is 1.5 m wide. If a bike lane is next to parking, an additional 0.6m is recommended to account for door opening.

Figure 1 is a graphical representation of the safety concerns that would rise if separated bike lanes are implemented on 7th Avenue and parking lanes on both sides are kept. A 3 m wide fire truck has been included in Figure 1 for scale to demonstrate why 7th Avenue’s cross-sectional width is insufficient to accommodate minimum TAC recommendations. Under this configuration, separated bike lanes would cause conflict with cars parked in narrow lanes, buses and truck traffics, and hence raise safety concerns for cyclists.

Figure 1: Existing 7th Avenue cross section with two travel, parking, and bike lanes
To comply with TAC’s lane width guidelines, the 7th Avenue Bike Lane Project will require the removal of parking along one side of 7th Avenue to accommodate the necessary width for dedicated bike lanes.

On July 7, 2016, staff conducted a parking study along 7th Avenue from Stave Lake Street to Grand Street. The number of vehicles parked on both sides of 7th Avenue between Grand Street and Stave Lake Street was counted in the early morning, at noon, and again in the evening. The evening had the most vehicles parked at each of the three counts, with 13 vehicles parked on both the north and south sides, for a total maximum vehicles parked at any time of 26 vehicles.

The July 18, 2016, 7th Avenue Bike Lanes report to Council requested approval to install bike lanes from Stave Lake Street to Cedar Street, with parking limited to the south side to accommodate adequately sized bike lanes.

After, the report concerns were received from residents and the business at 33093 7th Avenue regarding the removal of parking along the north side of 7th Avenue. The raised concerns were mainly focused on potential loss of business, loss of employee parking, and safety concerns related to customers parking on the south side having to cross 7th Avenue.

Staff’s report to Council on August 15, 2016 put forward six options to implement separated bike lanes along 7th Avenue, and to address the residents and businesses concerns. The proposed options included:

1. Implement separated bike lanes on both sides of 7th Avenue between Stave Lake Street and Grand Street with parking only permitted on the south side. Between Grand Street and Cedar Street, the shared use lanes would remain and parking would be permitted on both sides of the road;
2. Extend the separated bike lanes from Stave Lake Street to Taulbut Street;
3. Maintain the status quo;
4. Implement time-restricted parking on the north side of 7th Avenue;
5. Shift the parking restriction from the north side to the south side of 7th Avenue at the business plaza located at 33093 7th Avenue; and
6. Implement parking restrictions on the south side of 7th Avenue.

Staff recommended to proceed with Option 2, as it supported both the OCP and the TMP, addressed the concerns expressed by the business owners at 33093 7th Avenue, and the effect on surrounding resident parking arrangements was consistent with the letters distributed along 7th Avenue. Council deferred the decision until public consultation could be conducted. Following the presentation to Council, letters were delivered to residents notifying them of the planned open house to present the available options and engaged the public in a dialogue on how to best proceed.

Staff prepared a questionnaire to gather input both at an open house and online for residents who could not attend. A total of 121 questionnaires were received. The following paragraphs summarize the findings. These findings, while showed local residents’ views, could not represent a statistically reliable survey of the whole community, as it rather represented the feedback of residents who were invested in the project enough to either attend the open house or fill in a questionnaire. For this reason, the following information should be reviewed as anecdotal evidence only.

The October 17, 2016, 7th Avenue Bike Lanes report to Council conveyed the results of the public consultation process. A brief summary of responses to the questionnaire is provided below.

- 66.4% of respondents supported the creation of a safe multi-modal transportation network including pedestrian and cycling networks in Mission, while 33.6% did not support this.
- 48.7% of respondents stated that the existing shared-use roads were adequate for encouraging cycling, while 51.3% stated they were not.
• 41.2% of respondents supported the concept of dedicated bike lanes on 7th Avenue, while 58.8% did not.

Of the respondents that supported dedicated bike lanes, the following were the reasons given:
• it is the most straightforward east-west connection and provides an easy route for cyclists to cross from Hatzic across to the west side of Mission;
• it is the route that respondent’s children already use to cycle to school or the Leisure Centre;
• it is an investment in encouraging cycling as a viable transportation option; and
• Mission lags behind many other municipalities in regards to cycling infrastructure.

Of those that opposed the dedicated bike lanes, the following reasons were supplied:
• loss of parking, including concerns regarding safety and security for themselves, their visitors and vehicles should they be required to park further away from their homes;
• lack of lane access to homes;
• Low cyclists volumes and doubts that bike lane usage will justify the loss of parking;
• Vehicle traffic volume along the route is too high to be safe for cycling; and
• Project is a waste of taxpayer funds.

On October 17, 2016, Council instructed staff to engage with a range of cyclists to review alternatives to the proposed bike lanes and develop recommendations for Council.

Based on this recommendation, a Task Force was created. On November 6, 2017 the Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives presented the Cycling Route Task Force Summary report to Council. The Task Force’s findings and recommendations were generally in line with those put forward through the OCP and previous master plans, with a few specific findings as follows:
• 7th Avenue is the single best opportunity for providing a safe and effective connection for cyclists east-west across the municipality, effectively connecting Hatzic to the High School and Sports Park, and provides the spine for building the cycling network in the future;
• Physically separated / buffered cycling lanes are the preferred option as they are the best means to encourage cycling, followed by marked shared-lanes on quiet, residential streets;
• 7th Avenue bike lanes is a crucial east-west connection to establish connectivity for both recreational and commuter cyclists; and
• Mission is far behind neighbouring municipalities in terms of the maturity of its cycling program, due to a lack of investment in cycling infrastructure or action taken on previous plans.

The Task Force also recommended pursuing grant funding to enable the creation of safe cycling routes in Mission that connect important destinations across the community.

The Province has a cost-sharing cycling infrastructure program called BikeBC aimed at encouraging healthy living and to help address climate change. The program provides 50% cost share for new infrastructure and infrastructure upgrade projects which form part of a municipality’s adopted cycling network plan. The deadline for applications for the 2018 cycle of funding is February 9, 2018.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The District’s OCP promotes the multimodal transportation system to support all modes of travel, including cycling. Although cycling trips currently make up less than 1% of daily trips in Mission, building safe cycling infrastructures, such as separated bike lanes, would encourage residents to bike more.

The District’s TMP identified separated bike lanes from Stave Lake Street to Cedar Street as the top priority bike lane project in Mission. This report addresses 7th Avenue Bike lanes from Stave Lake Street to Grand Street.

Once the proposed separated bike lanes are implemented on 7th Avenue, an engineered and paved bike lane can be constructed at Heritage Park in the future to replace the current bike route to connect Hatzic neighbourhood to Mary Street. This project would take the pressure off of motor vehicle traffic along 1st Avenue and as a result, is potentially eligible for grants from ICBC, and the provincial and federal governments.

In regards to 7th Avenue between Taulbut Street and Grand Street, there are provisions in the foreseeable future regarding the property at 33093 7th Avenue. The District owns the aforementioned property and in approximately 10 years, once the lease expires, the District can explore options other than leasing the land in its current format. This move would give the District the opportunity to look into possibilities to allow for separated bike lanes along this section of 7th Avenue. These possibilities include, but are not limited to, widening the road at this location or reconfiguring the building footprint to allow for more onsite parking spots for the businesses.

West of Grand Street is Mission Secondary School. In an effort to minimize the impact on local businesses and parents picking up/dropping off their children at the school, the shared-use lanes will remain from Grand Street to Cedar Street at this time. Mission Secondary School is exploring the option of expanding their building footprint, during which a redevelopment permit will be submitted to the District. Staff recommend that the District negotiate for road expansion with the School District and other property owners at that time to allow for widening the 7th Avenue from Grand Street to Cedar Street. This would allow the District to upgrade the bike route in that segment from shared to separated lanes and achieve bike lane consistency for cyclists along the length of 7th Avenue.

The second high priority bike lane project, as identified in the TMP, is 7th Avenue from Cedar Street to Wren Street. This project can be implemented within the next 3 to 4 years when the Hatzic neighbourhood to Mary Street bike lane project is implemented.

With the implementation of these projects along 7th Avenue, the Hatzic neighbourhood will be connected to Wren Street, hence promoting a safe east-west cycling commute that can alleviate/substitute car traffic passing through Downtown Mission.

Parking Lane Removal Impact on the Residents

In order to evaluate the potential impact of removing north-side parking lane along the 7th Avenue, staff conducted a parking study in 2016, by counting the number of cars parking on both sides of 7th Avenue between Stave Lake Street and Grand Street at approximately 6:00 am, noon, and 7:30 pm. This report assumes the same parking pattern is still binding in this area.

It was assumed that most cars parked in the early morning have been parked overnight and hence represent mainly local residents’ vehicles. Also, the number of parked cars at noon and evening hours likely represents a combination of residents’ and their guests’ vehicles. The result of the study indicated that while residents and their guests appear to have no preference on which side of 7th Avenue to park, they are slightly biased towards parking on the south side of the road. As a result, staff recommend that the north side parking lane be removed. The Task Force also expressed their preference for north side parking removal versus the south side.

The project area at 7th Avenue, from Grand Street to Stave Lake Street, is approximately 1,200 m long, and the maximum number of cars parked during different times of the day is 26. This suggests that
even with one parking lane along 7th Avenue, there is roughly up to 46 m of parking lane available per
car on the average and as a result, staff do not expect that removing one parking lane would cause any
negative impact on availability of parking spots in the street for the residents and their guests.

Project Cost

The Class C cost estimate of each option is presented below. The estimate includes pavement
markings, bike signs, curbing, delineators, and asphalt paving as applicable to each option, as well as
PST and a 15% contingency. GST is not included in the estimated costs.

BikeBC funding may be available for the project at a 50% cost share rate.

Options

Staff previously proposed a number of options to implement dedicated bike lanes along 7th Avenue.
These options were reviewed and assessed later by the Task Force. Staff met with members of the
Task Force on January 10, 2018 to discuss their proposed option. Through this process, options were
refined and are presented below.

Four options are presented in this report for Council consideration. All of the options include on-street
bike lanes between Stave Lake Street and Taulbut Street, with north side bike lane(s) transitioning to
behind the sidewalk from Taulbut Street to Grand Street. The shared-use lanes between Grand Street
and Cedar Street would remain, and parking would be permitted on both sides of the road (Appendix A).

Once implemented, the proposed bike lanes will connect to the existing shared bike lanes along
7th Avenue, which extend from Stave Lake Street to Heritage Park.

The following paragraphs summarize four feasible options that were considered by staff and the Task
Force. Figures 2 to 4 are included in the body of the report to provide graphical representations of the
proposed cross sections. The green of the bike lane is illustrative only. Green pavement markings will
only be used at locations with conflict points.

Option 1: Separated bike lanes

This option includes separated bike lanes on the north and south side of 7th Avenue between Stave
Lake Street and Taulbut Street. Just west of Taulbut Street the north bike lane would transition to
behind the sidewalk. The existing parking on the north and south side of 7th Avenue would remain in this
location. Option 1 has a Class C cost estimate of $145,000, and would have a recurring five year
pavement marking replacement cost of $66,000.

Figure 2: Option 1 - separated bike lanes on the north and south side

Option 1 Advantages:

- Designated space for cyclists on roadway;
- Encourages cycling by increasing perceived comfort and safety;
- Appeals to a wide cross section of cyclists;
- Lower cyclist injury rate compared to streets without bike lanes;
Physically buffered by parking lane on the south side;  
0.6 m buffer reduces risk of “dooring”;  
Visually narrows the road which generally slows vehicle traffic;  
Least expensive separated bike lane option;  
Decreases risk of collisions with over-taking vehicles;  
Prevents double-parking, unlike a bike lane; and  
Supported by the Task Force.

Option 1 Disadvantages:  
Loss of some parking;  
Higher maintenance costs;  
Special consideration required at bus stops;  
May encourage side-by side riding due to available space; and  
Foreign objects now on the road;

Staff recommend that Council approve Option 1, as its advantages overweigh the disadvantages at the lowest cost.

Option 2: Two-way separated cycle track
This option includes a separated two-way cycle track on 7th Avenue between Stave Lake Street and Taulbut Street with parking only permitted on the south side. Just west of Taulbut Street, the cycle track would transition to behind the sidewalk. The existing parking on the north and south side of 7th Avenue would remain in this location. Two-way cycle tracks present a safety challenge, as drivers are not generally expecting cyclists to arrive from both directions, especially at intersections. Additional provisions will be required to improve safety at intersections. This option has the strongest support of the Task Force. Option 2 has a Class C cost estimate of $205,000, and would have a recurring five year pavement marking replacement cost of $100,000.

Figure 3: Option 2 - two-way separated cycle track on the north side
Option 2 Advantages:
- Designated space for cyclists on roadway;
- Encourages cycling by increasing perceived comfort and safety;
- Most attractive to a wide range of cyclists;
- Lower cyclist injury rate compared to streets without bike lanes;
- Greatly reduced risk of “dooring”;
- Visually narrows the road which generally slows vehicle traffic;
- Buffer between conflicting travel directions; and
- Strongly supported by the Task Force.

Option 2 Disadvantages:
- Safety at intersections and driveway crossings is an issue;
- Future high capital cost to increase safety levels at intersections (i.e., bike signals);
- Conflicting directions of travel less than 1.5 m apart;
- Higher maintenance costs;
- Need to include special considerations at bus stops to safeguard riders and cyclists;
- Stopped buses will temporarily obstruct traffic; and
- Highest initial capital cost.

Option 3: Narrow two-way separated cycle track

There was a request by Council to present an option where there is no loss of parking. Option 3 was designed to accomplish this by narrowing bike lanes well below TAC minimums for a two-way cycle track. This option as such will not be eligible for BikeBC funding, as it raises safety concerns for cyclists. This option includes a narrow separated two-way cycle track on 7th Avenue between Stave Lake Street and Taulbut Street, with parking permitted on both the north and south side. Just west of Taulbut Street, the cycle track would transition to behind the sidewalk. This option would maintain most of the parking along 7th Avenue. This option utilizes a two-way width that is not ideal. However, it may be sufficient in the short to medium term based on existing cycle volumes. Two-way cycle tracks present a safety challenge, as drivers are not generally expecting cyclists to arrive from both directions, especially at intersections. Additional provisions will be required to ensure that cyclists utilizing this cycle track are as safe as possible. Option 3 has a Class C cost estimate of $155,000, and would have a recurring five year pavement marking replacement cost of $58,000.

Figure 4: Option 3 - narrow two-way separated cycle track on the north side
Option 3 Advantages:

- Designated space for cyclists on roadway;
- Preserves parking along the route;
- Visually narrows the road which generally slows vehicle traffic; and
- Parked vehicles or large buffer between conflicting travel directions.

Option 3 Disadvantages:

- Safety at intersections and driveway crossings is an issue;
- No buffer between parked cars and cyclists to decrease dooring;
- Future high capital cost to increase safety levels at intersections (i.e. bike signals);
- Higher maintenance costs;
- May not be sufficient for high volume of cyclists;
- May encourage side-by side riding due to available space;
- Special consideration is required at bus stops;
- Stopped buses will temporarily obstruct traffic;
- Second highest initial capital cost; and
- Grant funding through BikeBC unlikely as the width of the cycle lanes does not meet the minimum width required by BikeBC.

Option 4: Maintaining shared bicycle lane along Stave Lake Street

This option will keep the existing shared bike lanes on 7th Avenue between Stave Lake Street and Cedar Street, with parking permitted on both sides. This option will require the reinstatement of “sharrow” (i.e., shared road) symbols on 7th Avenue between Stave Lake Street and Cedar Street. This option does not support either the District’s OCP or its TMP, nor does it have the support of staff or the Task Force. Staff does not consider Option 4 a viable option, as it is the bare minimum that can be done, does very little for cyclists, and even less to advance cycling as a viable transportation mode in Mission. The Class C cost estimate for this option is $10,000, and would have a recurring five-year pavement marking replacement cost of $10,000.

Option 4 Advantages:

- Preserves parking along the route; and
- Incurs no additional maintenance costs.

Option 4 Disadvantages:

- Does not encourage cycling;
- Perceived as unsafe and unpleasant for less experienced cyclists;
- Shared lanes should only be used on roadways with low vehicle volumes and operating speeds;
- Does not slow vehicles by visually narrowing the roadway;
- High incidence of “dooring”;
- Wrong-way riding;
• Sidewalk riding; and
• Motorists may squeeze cyclists against parked cars, or exhibit other aggressive behaviors.

Table 1 is a side-by-side comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of each option, quantified with 5 representing the ideal scenario, 1 representing the least ideal scenario, and 0 representing absolutely no support. The scores are summed in the last line of the table, with a best possible score of 50. Although certain criteria may warrant a heavier weighting, this is a simple side-by-side comparison to show how each option compares to the others.

Table 1: Comparison of 7th Avenue bike lane options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – One-way cycle tracks</th>
<th>Option 2 – Two-way cycle track</th>
<th>Option 3 – Narrow two-way cycle track</th>
<th>Option 4 – Reinstatement of shared lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling safety, comfort and convenience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection safety and comfort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slows vehicle traffic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit impacts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision risk and consequence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dooring” potential</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs (including grant eligibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital cost</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five year maintenance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated before, staff recommend proceeding with Option 1 as presented herein. Option 1 has the lowest capital cost of the separated bike lane options, supports both the OCP and the TMP, addresses the concerns expressed by the business owners at 33093 7th Avenue, and the effect on surrounding resident parking arrangements and is eligible for BikeBC funding. It will provide the most benefit to the cycling community, while keeping the potential unwanted impacts to others at a minimum level.

While Option 4 has been included in this report, both staff and the Task Force strongly recommend that it not be selected for implementation. The first step for Mission to move forward with a safe multi-modal transportation system is safe separated bike lanes.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This report addresses multiple Council Goals and Objectives. Encouraging safe multi-modal transportation supports Council’s value of balancing environmental, financial, and operational sustainability. It provides enhanced lifestyle opportunities and community health by encouraging active transportation methods. By providing a safer route for cyclists, it will improve public safety. From an asset management standpoint, this project supports the optimized planning and management of assets and infrastructure as pavement bike lanes are under less stress than vehicle or parking lanes, and as such, age slower.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial implications vary depending on the selected option, with Class C estimates for capital costs ranging from $10,000 to $205,000. Annual maintenance costs will increase once bike lanes are installed on 7th Avenue, due to the need to periodically repaint the pavement markings. The pavement marking budget would need to be increased to address the increase in pavement markings. The five-year replacement costs range from $10,000 to $100,000 depending on the option installed. Snow removal and street sweeping budgets may need to be increased as well, based on the set level of service.

Staff support Option 1 at a cost of $145,000, with funds coming from the 2018 Paving Program account. Maintenance costs for this option would be $66,000 every five years for the replacement of pavement markings.

The final cost of implementing the recommended projects may be less than stated above, as the District can apply to the BikeBC for up to 50% cost share. The funds received from the BikeBC would partially offset the funding required from the Pavement Management Program account. Funding through ICBC will also be solicited. Staff will report back to Council to advise whether or not the outside funding applications are approved, but for clarity it is important to note that staff are currently recommending proceeding with this project regardless of outside funding being approved.

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

COMMUNICATION:

The implementation of the proposed bike lanes along 7th Avenue between Grand Street and Stave Lake Street will be in close cooperation with the RCMP. Staff will also inform the local residents and public through mail, the District’s website, social media, and the Mission City Record.

SIGN-OFFS:

Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport

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

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
Appendix A

Separated Bike Lanes Project Extents
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Dale Unrau, Fire Chief
SUBJECT: Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy
ATTACHMENT: Appendix 1 - Fire Response Map
Appendix 2 - Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy, as attached to the report from the Fire Chief, be approved; and

PURPOSE:
This report outlines the Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy provided herein for Council’s consideration.

BACKGROUND:
Under paragraph 3(3)(b) of the Fire Services Act (B.C.), the Fire Commissioner is required to establish the minimum standards of training required for fire services personnel in British Columbia. In 2014 the Fire Commissioners Office released “Structure Firefighters Competency and Training Playbook.” The Playbook requires that the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) (District of Mission) will set the Service Level to be provided by its fire department, which in turn determines the minimum training Competencies that must be met by that department. The Playbook is flexible in that it establishes three levels of service that an AHJ can chose based on its size, population, and funding available to provide fire rescue services for their community.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The proposed policy will establish service level expectations and training standards for the Mission Fire Rescue Service (MFRS). The policy also defines the services that the MFRS does not provide or provides in a limited capacity. The Fire Chief for the District of Mission, or designate, is responsible for ensuring this policy is complied with through the use of appropriate MFRS operational guidelines as well as service/aid agreements, service contracts, and/or partner agencies. The Fire Chief will report back to the CAO on the readiness effectiveness and efficiency of the MFRS.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
The adoption of the proposed Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy would be consistent with Council’s goal for improved public safety through setting clear service level expectations for the MFRS and the community.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
While this report contains no specific request for funding, endorsement of this policy supports ongoing funding for training and resources necessary for MFRS to deliver the service level established in the policy.

COMMUNICATION:
MFRS members will be notified and receive training on all aspects of this policy.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
In 2014 the Fire Commissioners Office established a new Structure Firefighters Training and Competency Playbook. With the establishment of the Playbook each AHJ (District of Mission) was required to establish a service level for their community. The attached policy is consistent with the requirements of the Playbook and the service levels the MFRS is currently able to provide for the District of Mission.

SIGN-OFFS:

Dale Unrau, Fire Chief

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
"Once approved by CAO, type 'Reviewed' here"
Appendix 1

Legend

- Zone A
- Zone B
- Fire Protection Zone
BACKGROUND:

1. The District of Mission has directed that the Mission Fire Rescue Service (MFRS) operational model is to be primarily undertaken by a full time fire and rescue coverage supported by Paid on Call (POC) fire fighters. This model is consistent with the budgetary and operational capabilities and requirements of the District of Mission, as determined by Council.

2. MFRS operates pursuant to District of Mission Fire Rescue Service Bylaw 2457-1992. The Fire Chief, as appointed by Council, is responsible for the safe, effective and efficient operation and administration of the MFRS.

3. The British Columbia Fire Service Minimum Training Standards: Structure Firefighters – Competency and Training Office of the Fire Commissioner, 2nd Edition Amended May 2015 (Playbook), as set under paragraph 3(3)(b) of the British Columbia (BC) Fire Services Act is hereby recognized as the applicable Provincial Statute under which emergency response and training activities of MFRS will be based.

PURPOSE:

To provide direction to the District of Mission Fire Rescue Service (Mission Fire Rescue Service) on establishment and limitations of services authorized by Council.

POLICY:

1. OPERATIONAL STANDARD:

   a) MFRS is authorized to provide fire suppression activities in accordance with, and subject to, the limitations set out in the Full Service Operations Level for Zone A of the attached Schedule 1 and Exterior Operations Level for Zone B of attached Schedule 1, as generally described in the Playbook and considering any and all limitations contained within this Policy.
b) The District of Mission defines Assistance Response as aid provided in respect of fires, alarms, explosions, medical emergencies or incidents, floods, earthquakes or other natural disasters, escape of dangerous goods, rail transport or aeronautical incidents, motor vehicle or other accidents, or circumstances necessitating rescue efforts.

2. OPERATIONAL LIMITATIONS:

a) Availability for Assistance Response will be determined by the MFRS on a case-by-case basis and is dependent on the circumstances, availability of service, level of knowledge and skills and abilities of responding personnel, and resources available. The following levels of service for Assistance Response are not directly performed by MFRS:

i) No high angle (65 degree plus) and steep angle (35 degree plus) rope rescue capability – contracted through aid agreement or other agency/contractor, if available;

ii) No swift water entry or ice rescue capability - contracted through aid agreement or other agency/contractor, if available;

iii) No confined space rescue capability - contracted through aid agreement or other agency/contractor, if available; and

iv) No structural collapse rescue - contracted through aid agreement or other agency/contractor, if available.

v) Dangerous goods/hazardous materials (HazMat) technician response is not provided - contracted through aid agreement or other agency/contractor, if available.

b) The following components of Assistance Response are performed in a reduced/modified manner, by MFRS:

i) Entrapment rescue, such as vehicle extrication, capability is provided if the incident is determined by MFRS to fall within its level of training, skills and abilities and available resources. Specialized back-up from outside agencies, through agreement, is available if required.

ii) Low angle (up to 35 degree slope) rope rescue response will be provided by MFRS depending on the nature of the incident, the level of training skills, abilities, and the availability of resources. Specialized back-up from outside agencies, through agreement, is available if required.

c) Dangerous Goods / Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Operations Response:

i) Operations level response is dependent on the circumstances and is limited to
simple vehicle fuel leaks/fires and simple compressed gas leaks/fires or other incident where it is determined by the MFRS to fall within its level of training, skills, abilities and available resources; and

ii) For all other incidents of this type, an awareness level of response will be provided by MFRS depending on the nature of the incident, the level of training and skills, abilities, and the availability of resources. Specialized back-up from outside agencies, through agreement, is available if required.

d) Aviation Firefighting/Rescue:

i) MFRS response to aircraft incidents is limited depending on the circumstances of the incident and whether MFRS determines that the incident is within its level of training, skills, abilities, and available resources.

ii) Firefighting capabilities of MFRS are based upon use of traditional structural firefighting apparatus using firefighting foam application.

e) Wildland-Urban Interface and Forestry Firefighting:

i) MFRS response to forested land and wildland-urban interface incidents is limited depending on the circumstances of the incident, whether the incident is accessible by road, and whether MFRS determines that the incident is within its level of training, skills, abilities, and available resources. Firefighting response to these incidents beyond the capabilities of MFRS would be provided by BC Wildfire Service through a Provincial task number and Mutual Aid resources as available.

f) Marine Firefighting and Rescue:

i) Response to persons, vessels, aircraft or other vehicles in water bodies is limited to shore based fire suppression activities either from a dock or stable shoreline. Response to persons, vessels, aircraft or other vehicles in water bodies, as well as foreshore areas from the water side, is not provided - contracted through partner agency/contractor, if available.

3. TRAINING STANDARD:

a) MFRS shall train its principal responding members to the minimum competencies required by the Playbook for the full service operations level. The required training competencies, as described in the Playbook, will be achieved by all members within 36 months of start date.

b) During this 36 month training period new firefighters will sequentially progress through the Exterior, then interior operations service level training as described in the Playbook. During this qualification period firefighters will only be authorized to perform the competencies they have successfully achieved.

c) MFRS has and will continue to establish training programs, applicable operational
guidelines, policies, procedures, lesson plans and evaluation instruments that ensure compliance with the competencies and other requirements as described within the Playbook for all operational service levels.

d) The Fire Chief will establish regular review and compliance checks to ensure that the ongoing requirements of the Playbook are adhered to and that Council is made aware of any required changes to operations or training in a timely manner.

e) The Fire Chief will also establish training programs, applicable operational guidelines, policies, procedures and lesson plans for all departmental service delivery areas not specifically described within the Playbook Standard. These include, but are not limited to: incident command; personnel accountability; health and safety; confined space incident response; low angle rope rescue; vehicle rescue; water-borne emergencies; large animal rescue; and emergency vehicle operations.

4. NON-SUPPRESSION LIMITATIONS:

The District of Mission Fire Rescue Service Bylaw 2457-1992 describes activities related to fire prevention as including development and building plan review, fire and safety inspections, fire investigations and fire and life safety education.

a) The following components of Fire Prevention, are not directly performed by MFRS at this time:

i) MFRS does not provide a registered professional review or assurance of fire protection system design drawings. Limited plan review will be conducted by various departments within the District of Mission and its contractors, as applicable.

b) The following components are performed in a reduced/modified manner by MFRS:

i) Inspections of properties at the Mission Institution (medium and minimum security facilities). Given the federal jurisdiction involved, MFRS personnel will accompany Federal Corrections staff on inspections of occupancies. The Institutions will then ensure that enforcements of violations are carried out.

ii) Investigation of major incidents, particularly those that involve serious injury or death. Such investigation should be provided with assistance from other jurisdictions such as law enforcement, Worksafe and the Office of the Fire Commissioner, as well as contractor agencies, as applicable.

iii) Any decision to undertake and conduct an investigation of major fire incidents is within the discretion of MRFS depending on the circumstances of the incident, the required level of training and skill and available resources.

5. ACCOUNTABILITY:

a) The Fire Chief for the District of Mission, or designate, is responsible for ensuring this policy is complied with through the use of appropriate MFRS operational guidelines as well as service/aid agreements, service contracts, and/or partner
agencies.

b) In relation to any particular incident/assistance response, MFRS shall undertake only those emergency activities for which its actual responding members at the incident are properly trained and equipped. If additional assistance is required such assistance will be promptly requested from the most appropriate qualified agency/organization.

c) The Fire Chief may limit fire suppression activities of MFRS to Interior or exterior operations service level in circumstances where it is determined, due to turn-over of members or other circumstances that MFRS cannot ensure ongoing full service operations level response.

d) Where the Fire Chief has made a determination under section 7(c), he or she shall immediately inform the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), including reasons for the decision. The Fire Chief may elect to recommence providing full service operations level response when he or she considers it warranted, and shall inform the CAO when making such decision.

6. REVIEW

The Fire Chief shall, on a regular basis or as directed, report to the CAO on the readiness, effectiveness and efficiency of MFRS. The Fire Chief will ensure ongoing compliance with the contents of the policy and all other applicable bylaws, statutes or regulations.

Additional Related Legislation/Standards/Policies/Bylaws/Agreements:


- Computer Aid Dispatch Service Agreement, with Fraser Valley Regional District dated 12 December 1995 and any amendments thereto.

- Fraser Valley Regional District Fire Dispatch Operating Guidelines, dated September 17, 2013 and any amendments thereto.

- Mutual Aid Agreement for Fire Service Emergencies between the District of Mission and the District of Maple Ridge and the Township of Langley and the City of Pitt Meadows, 2009 and any amendments thereto.

- Mutual Aid Agreement for Fire Service Emergencies with the City of Abbotsford, dated 18 June 2010 and any amendments thereto.

- Mutual Aid Agreement for Emergencies with Fraser Valley Regional District (representing the North Fraser Volunteer Fire Department), dated 4 June 2006 and any amendments thereto.
• Automatic Aid Agreement between the District of Maple Ridge and the District of Mission, dated 7 April 2015 and any amendments thereto.

• First Responder Agreement with the Province of BC, dated 17 August 2010 and any amendments thereto.

**RECORD OF AMENDMENTS/REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy #</th>
<th>Date Adopted</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Amended (Y/N)</th>
<th>Date Reissued</th>
<th>Authority (Resolution #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQU.02</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQU.07</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIR.01</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIR.02</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIR.03</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIR.07</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: January 10th, 2018
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)

Request for funding assistance for the Fraser Valley Children's Festival and the IGNITE youth program – MISSION ARTS COUNCIL

referred meeting date for delegation: February 5th, 2018

Alternative meeting date for delegation: __________________________

Please refer to the Council Meeting Schedule on the District’s website for dates of Council Meetings

_________________________ Cassy Crawford and Donna Duvall MISSION ARTS COUNCIL

Name(s) of presenter(s) Name of group/organization (if applicable)

Are you requesting any financial or in-kind assistance from Council? X Yes □ No

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

We are seeking funding assistance in presenting the Fraser Valley Children’s Festival and the IGNITE Youth Program. In previous years funds have been rolled into our FEE for SERVICE. This year with new programs lobbying for the FFS the Children’s Festival and Ignite youth funds were not included. For the past several years funding support for the Children's Festival was $5000 and in 2017 we received assistance of $3000 for IGNITE youth. We are requesting assistance of $5000 for the Childrens Festival and $5000 for IGNITE YOUTH for 2018.

Have you spoken with District staff about this request? X Yes □ No

If yes, what was the result? A request for a delegation form was sent to us.

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.
Whereas: the Province of British annually recognizes the importance of protecting and conserving our rich and diverse history by proclaiming Heritage Week;

Whereas: Heritage Week is held in Mission to inspire citizens to embrace, explore and discover their community’s storied past in the great mosaic that is Canada; and

Whereas: The theme for Heritage Week 2018 is *Heritage Stands the Test of Time—a celebration of indigenous cultural heritage*

Be it resolved that the District of Mission hereby proclaims February 19 - 25, 2018 as

**“Heritage Week”**

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this 5th day of February, 2018

_______________________________________________  __________________________________________________
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 pm on Monday, February 5, 2018 to consider the following proposed bylaws:

1. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5691-2017-5050(270) (R17-029 – Wonnacott)

   The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into two (2) lots of a minimum 0.70 hectare (1.73 acre) lot size and allow for a secondary dwelling use on each lot.
   
   This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:
   
   Parcel Identifier: 024-488-267
   
   Lot 2 Section 1 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan LMP41845 from Rural (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7) Zone.
   
   The location of the subject property is 30883 Silverhill Avenue and is shown on the following maps:

2. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5698-2017-5050(275) (R17-034 - Clarkson)

   The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate a secondary dwelling use in the form of a secondary suite.
   
   This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:
   
   Parcel Identifier: 025-741-705
   
   
   The location of the subject property is 32920 Boothby Avenue and is shown on the following maps:

3. DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDING BYLAW 5701-2018-5050(270) (R17-029 - Clarkson)

   The purpose of the Bylaw is to allow for the development of up to fifty-one (51) fee simple urban compact lots.
   
   This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Official Community Plan 4052-2008 for the following legally described properties:
   
   Parcel Identifier: 011-452-692
   
   Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990
   
   Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
   
   Lot 35 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 55248 Except Plan BCP45873
   
   Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
   
   Lot 17 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24630 Except Plan BCP45872
   
   Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
   

   The locations of the subject properties are 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677 & 8689 Cedar Street and are shown on the following location maps:

Copies of the proposed bylaws and reports relevant to these bylaws may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, from Friday, January 26, 2018 to Monday, February 5, 2018. 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 pm on Friday, February 2, 2018.

You may forward your submission by:

- Mailing or delivering to the Corporate Officer’s Office, P.O. Box 20, 8645 Stave 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 23th day of January, 2018.
January 23, 2018

Dear Owner/Occupant:

**Re: Public Hearing Notification**

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 30883 Silverhill Avenue, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at **7:00 pm on Monday, February 5, 2018** 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 ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5691-2017-5050(270) (R17-029 – Wonnacott)**

   The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into two (2) lots of a minimum 0.70 hectare (1.73 acre) lot size and allow for a secondary dwelling use on each lot.

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

   **Parcel Identifier: 024-488-267**

   Lot 2 Section 1 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan LMP41845

   from **Rural 16 (RU16) Zone** to **Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone**.

   The location of the subject property is **30883 Silverhill Avenue** and is shown on the following maps:
A copy of the proposed bylaw and report relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, from Friday, January 26, 2018 to Monday, February 5, 2018. 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 pm 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: December 18, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a 2-lot subdivision at 30883 Silverhill Avenue
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Plan of Subdivision
Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Comments
CIVIC ADDRESS: 30883 Silverhill Avenue
APPLICANT: John Wonnacott
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Rural Residential OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: September 11, 2017
LOCATION: Keystone
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the rezoning application for the property located at 30883 Silverhill Avenue and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has 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 January 8, 2018.

SUMMARY

A development application was received from John Wonnacott for the property located at 30883 Silverhill Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the property from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision with the potential for secondary dwelling unit on each lot.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Site Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>30883 Silverhill Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Uses</td>
<td>Rural Residential (Single Family Dwelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>3.60 hectares (8.9 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official Community Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Rural Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Zoning Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Rural 16 (RU16) Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>One Single Family Dwelling with a Secondary Dwelling Unit on each lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North &amp; South</th>
<th>Rural Residential (Single Family Dwelling)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East &amp; West</td>
<td>Rural Residential (Single Family Dwelling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is 3.61 hectares (8.92 acres.) in size and is located north of the intersection of Silverhill Avenue and Barrett Street, in the Keystone neighbourhood. There is an existing single-family dwelling that will remain. District mapping indicated the presence of a watercourse that runs roughly parallel with the west property line.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is designated Rural Residential in the OCP and is zoned Rural 16 (RU16) Zone. The proposal for rezoning to the RR7s Zone will allow the subdivision of the land into two (2) parcels and allows for a secondary dwelling unit on each property in the form of a coach house, garden cottage or secondary suite. The proposed RR7s Zone requires a minimum lot size of 0.7 hectares (1.73 acres). As shown in Appendix 3, proposed lot A is 2.6 hectares (6.42 acres) and proposed lot B is 1.01 hectares (2.49 acres) above the minimum lot size requirement of 0.7 hectares (1.73 acres).

The proposed rezoning conforms to OCP Policy 2.3.1 which states that larger lot sizes shall be retained in the Rural Residential areas to support hobby farming and rural lifestyles. The proposed rezoning also conforms to Policy 2.3.3 which considers rezoning to provide secondary dwelling units on properties designated Rural or Rural Residential.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located a rural residential neighbourhood comprised of single family dwellings on large lots. The two (2) lot subdivision with secondary dwelling units will fit within the context of the surrounding properties and is believed to have little or no impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Servicing:

Municipal water and sanitary service is not available to the property. A hydrologist’s report prepared by a professional engineer with expertise in ground water supply, will be required to ensure that the well(s) supplying water to each proposed lot meets the provisions of Council Policy WAT.19 – Well Water Quality – Aesthetic and Health Parameters. In addition, Fraser Health has specific requirements related to water system operators which would apply if more than one dwelling is serviced by a single well. Confirmation that the water supply is approved for a secondary dwelling unit will be required at time of building permit review. The property owner will also be required to provide confirmation from a Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioner (ROWP) that an onsite sewage treatment system can be installed on each proposed lot to accommodate

Proposed access will be from Silverhill Avenue. No upgrades to Silverhill Avenue are required.

Tree Retention:

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of four (4) trees, two (2) trees for each of the two (2) 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 caliper 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. No tree is permitted to be removed within an identified streamside protection and enhancement areas (SPEA).
Environmental Protection:
District mapping identifies two watercourses on the subject property. One watercourse runs approximately parallel with the west property line. The second watercourse runs across the north-west course of the property. A restrictive covenant that protects the Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA) is already registered to title; therefore, a Riparian Area Regulation (RAR) is not required.

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 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 a development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided 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). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 500 metres (1,640 ft.) of 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 will be made available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.

REFERRALS
Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the project, as shown in Appendix 4.

REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING
The Final Reading of the amending bylaw(s) will be held until the following have been satisfied:
1. The community amenity contribution that has been volunteered in the amount of $2,815 ($2,815 per new lot) is received.
2. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
1. Approval of Development Permit DP17-029 (Geo Technical) is delegated to staff for approval.
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: 30883 Silverhill Avenue

PID: 024 488 267

Legal: Lot 2 Section 1 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan LMP41845
Appendix 2

Subject Property: 30883 Silverhill Avenue
Owner: John & Glenda Wonnacott
Applicant: John & Glenda Wonnacott
Zoning: RU16
OCP Designation: Rural Residential
CIVIC ADDRESS: 30883 Silverhill Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: RU16  PROPOSED ZONE: RR7s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water service is not available on Silverhill Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary service is not available on Silverhill Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm service is not available on Silverhill Avenue. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Silverhill Avenue provides paved access to the site. No upgrades are required.

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

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Brent Schmitt, Director of Engineering & Public Works (Acting)

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
January 23, 2018

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Public Hearing Notification

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 32920 Boothby Avenue, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on Monday, February 5, 2018 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 ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5698-2017-5050(275) (R17-034 - Clarkson)

   The purpose of the Bylaw is to accommodate a secondary dwelling use in the form of a secondary suite.

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

   Parcel Identifier: 025-741-705
   Lot 51 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster Plan BCP7108


   The location of the subject property is 32920 Boothby Avenue and is shown on the following maps:
A copy of the proposed bylaw and report relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, from Friday, January 26, 2018 to Monday, February 5, 2018. 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 Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 pm 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: January 22, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 32920 Boothby Avenue
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Parking Plan

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32920 Boothby Avenue

APPLICANT: Marilyn Clarkson

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

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: October 13, 2017
LOCATION: Cedar Valley
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to rezone 32920 Boothby Avenue to RC465s to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5698-2017-5050(275) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for February 5, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Marilyn Clarkson for the property located at 32920 Boothby Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite within an existing house.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is located in the Cedar Valley area. The subject property fronts Boothby Drive and is situated to the east of Henderson Street. District mapping does not indicate the presence of a watercourse or slopes on the property.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Urban Residential in the OCP and is zoned RC465. The proposal to rezone to the RC465 Zone will allow a secondary dwelling unit.

The proposed rezoning conforms to OCP Policy 2.4.4 which encourages rezoning for secondary dwelling units as a form of infill housing. Secondary dwelling units may be considered on lots that are large enough to accommodate the following associated elements: on-site parking, private outside space, separate entrance that is clearly secondary to the primary dwelling and scale of the secondary dwelling must clearly be ancillary to the primary use.

The subject property is 510 m² (5490 ft²) in size which exceeds the minimum lot size of 465 m² (5005 ft²) in the proposed RC465s Zone.

The proposed secondary suite is 54.4 m² (586 ft²) which is less than the maximum allowance of 90.0m² (968.8 ft.) permitted under the Zoning Bylaw. The applicant has supplied a site plan that shows an unobstructed parking stall and a floor plan that shows a separate entrance for the suite, both of which are requirements of the Zoning Bylaw. A site plan showing the parking pad location is attached as Appendix 3.

Staff are aware of a Building Scheme registered on title as BV367335 which expired on December 31, 2015, which indicated that no secondary suites would be permitted. The District of Mission is not a signatory to this document and enforcement of this restriction, up until it expired, would have been a civil matter between the developer of the lands and the property owner.

The Inspection Services Division will ensure the proposed secondary suite meets the requirements of the BC Building Code, including fire separation, during the Building Permit review and plan check process.
Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within an urban residential neighbourhood comprised of single family dwellings on larger lots. The proposed secondary dwelling unit will fit within the context of the surrounding properties and is believed to have little impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. Typically, complaints that arise from secondary suites relate to inadequate off-street parking. As noted, this proposal meets the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

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 rezoning application.
REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:
The 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.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32920 Boothby Avenue

PID: 025-741-705

Legal: Lot 51 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster Plan BCP7108
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 32920 Boothby Avenue
Owner: Marilyn Clarkson
Applicant: Marilyn Clarkson
Zoning: RC465
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Appendix 3

Parking Plan
January 23, 2018

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Public Hearing Notification

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677 & 8689 Cedar Street, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on February 5, 2018 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:

DISTRICT OF MISSION OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDING BYLAW 5701-2018-4052(54) (OCP17-005 – Omega Engineering & G. Skrzyniarz)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to allow for the development of up to fifty-one (51) fee simple urban compact lots.

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

Parcel Identifier: 011-452-692
Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990

Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
Lot 35 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 55248
Except Plan BCP45873

Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
Lot 17 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24630
Except Plan BCP45872

Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

from Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area to Urban Compact and Environmentally Sensitive Area as shown on Schedule “A”.

236
The locations of the subject properties are 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677 & 8689 Cedar Street and are shown on the following location maps.

DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5702-2018-5050(276) (R17-020 – Omega Engineering & G. Skrzyniarz)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to allow up to fifty-one (51) fee simple urban compact lots and to allow for up to twenty eight (28) fee simple rowhouse 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: 011-452-692
  Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990
- Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
  Lot 35 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 55248
  Except Plan BCP45873
- Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
  Lot 17 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24630
  Except Plan BCP45872
- Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
  Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Multiple Family 52 Rowhouse (MR52), Residential Compact 465 (RC465), Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) and Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zones as shown on Schedule “B”.

Schedule A

![Location Map]
The locations of the subject properties are **32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677 & 8689 Cedar Street** and are shown on the following location maps:

**LOCATION 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 bylaws and report relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, from Friday, January 26, 2018 to Monday, February 5, 2018. 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 pm 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

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: January 22, 2018,

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Marcy Bond, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit Applications for the properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue and 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street

ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Conceptual Lot Layout
Appendix 4 – Proposed OCP Amendments
Appendix 5 – Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments
Appendix 6 – Current OCP Designations
Appendix 7 – Developers Rationale
Appendix 8 – Suite Ready requirements
Appendix 9 – Engineering Department Comments
Appendix 10 – Pedestrian Trail Standard Requirements
Appendix 11 – Draft Development Permit DP17-027
Appendix 12 – Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32661 Egglestone Avenue and 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street

APPLICANT: Greg Skrzyniarz and Omega Engineering

OCP: Some aspects of this application are not in conformance with the current Multiple Family, Environmentally Sensitive Area and Apartment OCP designations.

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: December 7, 2017

LOCATION: Cedar Valley
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the Official Community Plan amendment and zoning amendment for the four (4) properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street, to allow for the development of up to seventy-nine (79) units consisting of fifty-one (51) compact lots and twenty-eight (28) row houses.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amending Bylaws 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 February 5, 2018

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 no cash in lieu contribution for parkland applicable to the subdivision of the properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677 and 8689 Cedar Street be taken as per allowances under Section 510 *Local Government Act* and that instead the developers’ volunteered contribution be accepted and applied toward park improvements in Tunbridge Park.

SUMMARY

A development application has been received for the properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street (Appendix 2). This application seeks to amend the Official Community Plan and Zoning boundaries of the site to allow for the development of up to seventy-nine (79) units, consisting of fifty-one (51) compact lots (some with secondary dwelling unit allowances) and twenty-eight (28) row houses. A conceptual lot layout is shown on Appendix 3.
The proposed OCP amendments are identified on Appendix 4, with the proposed zoning boundary amendments identified on Appendix 5. Council approval will be required for the Multi-Unit Development Permit for the row houses to ensure that the form and character of the dwellings on these lots are constructed consistent with the Multi-Unit Residential Development Permit Area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Site Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cedar Valley, Cedar Street and Egglestone Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Uses</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>5.02 hectares (12.40 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official Community Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Use Designations</td>
<td>Attached Multi Unit Residential, Urban Compact and Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Suburban 36 (S36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To facilitate the development of row houses and compact lots, and to preserve an Environmentally Sensitive Area to allow for a walking trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>Townhouses and compact lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Row houses and single family lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Townhouses and vacant (Across cedar Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The development site consists of four parent properties totaling 5.02 hectares (12.40 acres). The site has road frontage along Cedar Street, Egglestone Avenue and Fennell Street (Appendix 2). The site is located within the Cedar Valley Area of Mission and within Phase 1 of the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan.

The property is relatively flat with one watercourse located adjacent to the north property line which requires protection under the Riparian Area Regulations. In addition to this watercourse, the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan also identifies a north-south strip of land as environmentally sensitive.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT (Bylaw 5670-2017)
The development site is currently subject to two OCP designations; Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Areas as shown on the OCP map, Appendix 6. To achieve the lot layout as shown on Appendix 3, the developer is proposing to amend both OCP designations as shown in Appendix 4.

Existing Official Community Plan Designations
The goal is always for land to develop under the current OCP designations. However, in some cases there is support for amending designations based on market demand, development viability and community benefit as well as broader goals and objectives of the District.

Summary of Proposed Amendments to the OCP
The table below provides detail on the current OCP designations, the proposed designations and the proposed housing form and zone under each OCP designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current OCP Designation</th>
<th>Proposed OCP Designation</th>
<th>Proposed Built Form</th>
<th>Proposed Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attached Multi Unit Residential</td>
<td>Urban Compact</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>Reduce area of ESA</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Row Houses are consistent with the Attached Multi Unit Residential designation in the OCP and therefore no OCP amendment is required to allow the row house development within the site.

Proposed Amendment to Environmentally Sensitive Designated Lands
The Environmentally Sensitive designation as created under the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan was primarily intended to protect significant environmental assets including terrestrial and aquatic habitats in addition to permitting passive recreational uses, such as wildlife viewing and walking. Where appropriate, constructed features within such lands are limited to walking trails, footbridges and educational kiosks.
The total amount of ESA lands as shown on the Current OCP map (Appendix 6) is 1.13 hectares (2.81 acres). The developer, with support from their QEP, is proposing to reduce the amount of environmental sensitive lands protected to approximately 1,050 sq. metres. Based on the QEP reports the watercourse along the east/west ESA corridor will be protected with a 2.0 metre stream side protection and enhancement area (SPEA) and the watercourse along the north/south corridor no longer exists.

While staff are supportive of reducing portions of these ESA designated lands based on the report provided by the QEP, staff are not in support of removing all these protected lands within the development site as these lands, although not considered environmentally sensitive, can provide other tangible benefits to the surrounding residents and community overall.

For this reason, staff have negotiated with the developer to protect the SPEA along the north property boundary with the developer agreeing to the construction of a pedestrian connection from Fennell Street through to Machell Street (Appendix 3). The developer has also agreed to maintain a portion of the north/south ESA for a pedestrian linkage within the new neighbourhood.

The developer is also providing compensation for the removal of this marginal habitat, as per the Cedar Valley Environmental Plan, and has agreed to provide compensation in the form of a pedestrian path and bridge into Tunbridge Park. The final design and location of the bridge and path will be determined by the Parks Recreation and Culture Department in conjunction with the Engineering Department.

**Proposed Amendment to Townhouse Designation**

The developer is proposing to amend the OCP designation from Attached Multi Unit Residential to Urban Compact as shown on Appendix 4. The redesignation of these lands will allow for the up to fifty-one (51) compact single family lots.

While the proposed amendment to compact lots will result in a decrease in overall density, the proposed compact lot housing form will follow the development pattern of the existing compact developments to the west and south and provide a housing form that has proven viable in Mission.

The developer has provided a detailed rationale for the requested OCP and zoning amendments attached as Appendix 7.

**Staff recommendation**

Staff support all the OCP amendments sought by the applicant as they are providing housing forms that are proven to be economically viable within Cedar Valley and that the housing styles will fit within the existing neighbourhoods. In addition, the developer is providing compensation for removal of the ESA land as well as a community benefit in the form of a pedestrian trail throughout the development.

**ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE** (Bylaw 5050-2009):

The parent parcels are currently zoned Suburban 36 (S36) zone, which allows for one single family dwelling on each parent parcel.

To allow the site to develop as shown on Appendix 3, the developer is proposing to amend the zoning of the properties from the S36 Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372), Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone, Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s), and Multiple Family 52 (MR52) Row House (MR52) Zone, as shown on Appendix 5.
**Target Zones**

The target zones would allow for the following housing forms and minimum lot sizes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Units/Lots</th>
<th>Housing form</th>
<th>Minimum lot size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone</td>
<td>1 lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>372 sq. metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone</td>
<td>28 Single Family Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td>465 sq. metres (5005 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone</td>
<td>22 Single family lots with a secondary dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>465 sq. metres (5005 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family 52 Row House (MR52) Zone</td>
<td>28 Row Houses (fee simple)</td>
<td></td>
<td>165-226 sq. metres (1776-2432 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lots</strong></td>
<td><strong>79 Lots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone*

Staff worked with the developer on a variety of lot layouts to achieve a development that would fit within the context of the surrounding neighbourhood, maximize lot yield and ensure good pedestrian and traffic movement within the development. As a result of these discussions and negotiations, the developer is proposing only one (1) lot to be zoned RC372 Zone.

While staff encourage the development of lanes in association with lots zoned RC372, there are situations, such as this, where the RC372 zone is appropriate and a lane may not be appropriate.

*Residential Compact 465 (RC465) and Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Secondary Dwelling Zones*

The developer is requesting a total of fifty (50) fee simple lots under a combination of the RC465 (28 proposed lots) and RC465s Zones (22 proposed lots), Appendix 5 identifies the lots intended to allow secondary dwelling.

The developer has agreed to the registration of a restrictive covenant, requiring those lots zoned to allow a suite be constructed to a “suite ready” standard, including the provision of a parking space for the secondary dwelling unit. The suite ready conditions that will be included in a Section 219 covenant are detailed on Appendix 8.

*Multiple Family 52 Row House (MR52) Zone*

The developer is requesting twenty-eight (28) fee simple lots under the MR52 Zone; Appendix 5 identifies the intended for row house development.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

*Neighbourhood Character*

The development site is surrounded by a combination of urban compact, urban residential and multi-family developments. The proposed development fits well within the surrounding built housing forms, including the compact lots to the west, row houses to the south and the townhouses to the north.
The road network within the development will be extended to complete the existing road network in the area. Specifically, Machell Street will be extended as shown on the conceptual lot layout (Appendix 3). The proposed road network will allow for through traffic between the existing neighbourhood and the new development as well as improved north south connectivity. The current Egglestone Avenue half-road will be completed to a full road standard, with houses fronting Egglestone Avenue to mirror the built-out development on the south side of Egglestone Avenue.

Municipal Services within the Development

From an Engineering point of view, there are no servicing requirements that need to be installed prior to the adoption of the zone amending bylaw. The Engineering Department comments are attached as Appendix 9.

Environmental Protection

The developer has submitted a report from a QEP based on the Riparian Area Regulations (RAR). The report from the QEP identified two ditches which run parallel to each other and then connect. The RAR report includes recommendations for a 2.0 metre Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA); the entire SPEA is located within the area shown as Park on Appendix 3.

While the RAR report did not identify any watercourse on the north/south ESA lands that required protection under RAR, the developer has agreed to maintain a portion of these lands for pedestrian connection purposes.

Tree Retention

Due to the density of the proposed development all trees within the development site will need to be removed. The arborist report submitted by Mike Fadum also identifies twelve 12 trees within the Environmentally Sensitive Area that require removal for either the trail construction or they have been identified as unhealthy and pose a hazard.

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant two trees per lot for the urban compact lots. The planting requirements for the row houses are addressed as part of the development permit process.

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

In accordance with Section 510 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, a developer contribution of up to five percent (5%) cash in lieu for parkland is applicable to the accompanying subdivision application. As these monies can only be used for parkland acquisition, staff are recommending that no parkland contribution be collected but that the equivalent value of money volunteered by the developer be accepted to allow the cash funds to be used to make improvements to Tunbridge Park. The Parks Recreation and Culture Department comments are attached as Appendix 12.

STREET NAMING (Policy STR.28 – Street Naming)

That is accordance with Section 39 of the Community Charter and Council Policy Street Naming STR28., a bylaw be prepared to provide a name for two road extensions and one new road as shown on Appendix 3 as follows;

1. Road extending south off of Machell Street as the logical extension of Machell Street.
2. Road extending east off of Carter Street as the logical extension of Carter Street.
3. Road extending east off of Fennell Street and north of Carter Avenue as Cunningham Avenue.
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

The overall development is subject to two development permits: Multi-Unit Residential Development Permit Area and the Intensive Residential Development Permit. The Multi-Family Development Permit requires Council approval whereas approval of the Intensive Residential Development Permit for the single family dwellings has been delegated to the Director of Development Services.

The row houses component of the development is subject to the Multi-Unit Residential Development Permit Area.

Some of the objectives of the development permit area include:

- To encourage a high visual design and functional standard of development for higher density residential uses.
- To maintain a development density that can support adjacent commercial land uses and the viability of infrastructure such as public transit.
- To provide a mix of housing forms, choices and affordability opportunities for new residents to Cedar Valley.

The developer has agreed to stagger the buildings on proposed Lots 25, 26, 27 and 28, bringing the houses to the minimum front lot line setback. This will allow for an enhanced street presence and larger more usable back yard.

The proposed Row House design meets or exceeds the Multi Unit Residential Development Permit Area guidelines as outlined in the OCP. The massing of the buildings, the exterior design and articulation, the utilization of high quality materials, and orientation of the units to the street, all communicate the intent for which the guidelines were written.

Highlights of the design include:

- steep roof pitches,
- incorporation of varying materials and gable treatments, and
- integration of different window and door styles on each unit to further promote individual distinction between the units.

As fee simple lots require each lot to have frontage onto a public road, the developer has worked diligently to design a development that maximizes lot yield and provides good street presence with the front porches facing the public road.

The developer is also providing four (4) units that will allow people to age in place by providing all living space on one floor, including bedroom and full bathroom.

Landscaping

The developer has achieved a high level of site aesthetics with the landscaping design within the row house development. The landscaping meets the requirements of the Multi-Family Development permit area.
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.

These CAC contributions are above and beyond the bridge construction into Tunbridge Park and the pedestrian linkages that the developer has volunteered to build throughout the development.

Provided Council resolves to do so, additional cash contributions will be provided in lieu of parkland contributions. The amount will be determined based on narrative appraisal to be submitted once the Preliminary Layout Approval letter is issued by the Approving Officer for the subdivision.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (Section 477 of the Local Government Act)

Pursuant to Section 477 of the Local Government Act, when an application is made to amend the OCP Council needs to consider whether the proposed amendments, would have an impact on the District’s Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan.

Staff have reviewed the potential financial implications and have determined there will be no significant impact to the District’s Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan with the proposed OCP amendments. While the change to the OCP designations for these lands will result in a temporary shortfall in development cost charge program revenue, this will be corrected through a future review of the Development Cost Charge Bylaw.

Similarly, while there is also an overall reduction to the in the monies collected for Community Amenity Contributions as per policy direction, the developer has agreed to in-kind works contribution the District by volunteering to construct a bridge into Tunbridge Park as well as providing pedestrian linkages within the development site to the surrounding neighbourhoods. These contributions will make up for any shortfall in community amenities contribution typically accepted with development.

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

COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted three (3) development notification signs 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.
A notice of Development Permit or 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
Staff reviewed the requirements of LAN.47 and recommend that referrals with respect to the OCP amendment be forwarded to School District No.75.

REFERRALS
Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 9.

Parks, Recreation and Culture
The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objection to the project. The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department comments are attached as Appendix 12.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING
The Final Reading of the 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 unit or lot is received.
3. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.
4. All pedestrian linkages as shown on Appendix 3 must either be constructed prior to adoption of the bylaws or secured through a servicing agreement registered on title.
5. Access to Tunbridge Park from Greene Place via a bridge must be completed or secured through a servicing agreement registered on title.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
1. Approval of Development Permit DP17-027 will be considered as part of the same Council agenda as the Official Community Plan and Zone Amending Bylaws are considered.

SIGN-OFFS:

Marcy Bond, Senior Planner

Reviewed by:
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

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>8677 Cedar Street</td>
<td>003-625-974</td>
<td>Lot 17, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 24630 Except Plan BCP45872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8653 Cedar Street</td>
<td>005-349-427</td>
<td>Lot 35, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 55248 Except Plan BCP45873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8689 Cedar Street</td>
<td>015-021-637</td>
<td>Parcel &quot;One&quot; (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32661 Egglestone Avenue</td>
<td>011-452-691</td>
<td>Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale for request to amend the OCP from Apartment to Row Homes & townhouse to compact single family on Cedar and Egglestone Sub-division.

Our primary goal of this development is to blend the new proposed homes seamlessly into surrounding neighbourhoods in a sustainable matter that creates a LIVABLE COMMUNITY.

While there are many stakeholders in this development, the owners of existing homes in the neighbourhood will be affected the most. They will have to endure 2 or more years of construction which will affect their quality of life. More importantly, the value of existing homes will be directly affected by the new homes that will be built next door.

We propose 28 new Row Homes north of the existing complex on the corner of Cedar Street and Egglestone Ave., connecting all the way to Burton Ave. The density and character of the new Row Homes will match the existing homes. Furthermore, we believe that Row Homes provide a needed form of housing that fills the gap between conventional townhouses and single detached homes. Our Row Homes provide many features of single detached homes such as: fenced and private back yard, 2 car side by side detached garage, 2 car side by side driveway, and fee simple ownership. Row Homes come in 3-plex and 4-plex configurations which allows for more efficient use of land. Smallest Row Home lots are 2600 sq. ft. For that reason, Row Homes are offered for sale at $250,000 discount to the same size single detached homes. Our proposal clearly addresses the issue of affordability while using land in a sustainable matter. Furthermore, we are offering 4 Row Homes with a master bedroom on the main floor called flex housing.

The second part of our development proposes to amend the OCP from townhouse to various forms of compact residential lots. Our main goal for this part of the development was to create a LIVABLE COMMUNITY that was a desirable place to live, play, and grow.

We propose: 28 RC465 lots, 22 RC465-S lots, and 1 RC372 lot. Our mix of lots and layout blends flawlessly into the existing neighbourhoods surrounding our proposal. The one RC372 lot on Machell Street matches the existing lots to the north of it. Furthermore, we are proposing 28 RC465 and 22 RC465-S lots. These lots match the density and character of lots to the west and south of our development proposal. To make this neighbourhood more livable, we propose that only 44% of the all RC465 lots to be designated as RC465-S to accommodate legal basement suites. We have worked very hard with the planning and engineering departments to make sure that we address parking and safety issues. Additionally, we have agreed to register a covenant outlining Legal Suite construction and parking requirements that will be registered on title of every RC465-S lot.

We also propose to create park land with pedestrian walkways going north-south and east-west through the entire neighbourhood. It will be a great place to take a stroll and enjoy the surrounding green space. Moreover, we offered to build a pedestrian bridge that will connect the existing neighbourhoods north of our development to Tunbridge Park. Thus, creating a network of trails that connect living spaces with new and existing parks.
We firmly believe that our proposal creates a sustainable and livable community. We propose a good mix of homes that addresses affordability issues and blends in with existing homes. Lastly, we believe that our park and pedestrian trail system will not only be beneficial to the future residents of our development but also for the entire surrounding area and the Cedar Valley.

Kindest Regards,

Greg Skrzyniarz
Suite Zone Lots

The following requirements will be registered on title with a covenant for those lots zoned to allow a secondary dwelling unit. Those lots where a suite is permitted must be constructed to meet the following requirements regardless of whether the building permit application includes a suite.

a. The floor plans of the single family dwelling must show location and size of any potential secondary suite and include the following:
   - A separate exit to the exterior of the principal single family dwelling.
   - An in-suite or shared laundry facility.
   - Exit protection of the suite area from the main unit of the single family dwelling.
   - An independent heating system, e.g. gas fireplace, second furnace, or electrical panel sized to accommodate electric heat for the suite.
   - Smoke and carbon monoxide detection, i.e. plan for inner-connection and photelectric units pre-wire in voids that are concealed under the current permit. Fire separation to be continuous.
   - Separate mechanical ventilation for the secondary suite – pre-duct in voids that are concealed under the current permit with fire separation around the ducting.
   - Headroom that meets current standard for rooms in the BC Building Code for occupancy purposes.

b. The full extent of any potential secondary suite ceiling must be finished with 5/8" Type-X drywall and any area not within the suite where the vertical fire separation is not continuous to the underside of the floor sheathing.

c. Where completed as part of the permitted construction of a potential secondary suite, vertical fire separations shall be finished with 5/8" Type-X drywall on both sides.

d. Where concealed by permitted finishes, fire stopping must be installed in the appropriate locations.

e. All windows for future bedrooms, whether part of a secondary suite or not, shall conform to egress requirements of the BC Building Code.

f. The site plan must make provision for one additional unencumbered parking space.

g. If the secondary suite and the principle dwelling are fully sprinklered to meet District of Mission Sprinklering Bylaw then sections b, c and e do not apply.
Appendix 9
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

December 20, 2017

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 8653, 8677 & 8689 CEDAR STREET / 32661 EGGLESTONE AVENUE

CURRENT ZONE: S36


DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
None.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
None.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
None.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
None.

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

Prepared by: Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by: Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works
• Tread Surface: granite aggregate or asphalt
• Tread Width: 3m
• Cleared Corridor Width: min. 5m
• Cleared Height: 2.5m
• Gradient Range: Max. 5% (8% over short distances)

• Design Features: Illumination for night use if appropriate (at trailheads, key intersections, and at intervals along trail where does not disrupt adjacent residential development, incorporate drainage swales, bollards/ baffle at trailheads, 5m buffer when adjacent to residences, universal access throughout, provide benches for resting
1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the Municipality applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this permit.

2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands within the Municipality legally described below, and any and all buildings, structures and development thereon:

   Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
   Lot 17 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24630
   Except Plan BCP45872

   Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
   Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

3. The above property has been designated as Development Permit Area L Cedar Valley Multiple Family Development Permit in the Official Community Plan.

   The said lands are zoned Multiple Family MR 52 Zone pursuant to “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009” as amended.

   “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw” as amended is hereby supplemented in respect of the said lands as follows:

   Building design, siting and landscaping plans to be as shown on Drawings Numbered:

   | Site Plan  | A-1.1 | Building 5 | A-6.4, A-6.5 |
   | Streetscape | A-1.2 | Building 6 | A-7.4, A-7.5 |
   | Building 1 | A-2.4, A-2.5 | Building 7 | A-8.4, A-8.5 |
   | Building 4 | A-5.4, A-5.5 | Landscape Plan | L-1 |

   which are attached hereto and form part of this permit.

   Specifically the following is required as part of Development Permit DP17-027:

   i. No exterior exit is permitted from the basement patio area to the back yard, (i.e. stairs are not permitted).
ii. The dwellings on Lots 25, 26, 27 and 28 shall be staggered so that they are at the minimum setback to the front lot line, thus following the curve of Machell Street and thereby providing for larger back yard space.

Minor changes to the aforesaid drawings that do not affect the intent of this Development permit and the general appearance of the buildings and character of the development may be permitted, subject to the approval of the Municipality.

4. 


(b) Access to and egress from the said lands shall be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans.

(c) Parking and siting thereof shall substantially conform to the plans.

(d) The following standards for landscaping are imposed:

(i) All landscaping works and planting materials shall be provided in accordance with the landscaping plan and specifications thereon, which form part of this permit and is attached hereto as Drawing Number L-1 prepared by C.Kavolinas & Associates Inc..

(ii) All planting materials provided shall be able to survive for a period of one (1) year from the date of the site approval by the Municipality.

5. As a condition of the issuance of this development permit, the Municipality must have in its possession, prior to issuance of a building permit for this development, security as set out below to ensure satisfactory provision of landscaping in accordance with the terms and conditions as set forth in Clauses 5 (b) and (c) below. It is acknowledged that, at the time of issuance of this development permit, the municipality does not have such security in its possession. Any prospective purchaser or developer should be aware that this requirement will need to be fulfilled prior to issuance of a building permit for the development outlined in this permit.

(a) An Irrevocable Letter of Credit in the amount of $[Click here to type Letter of Credit Amount] for the purpose of:

(b) A condition of the posting of the security is that should the Permittee fail to carry out the works or services as herein above stated, according to terms and conditions of this permit within the time provided, the Municipality may use the security to complete these works or services by servants, agents or contractors, and any surplus shall be paid over to the Permittee. If the security deposit is insufficient to cover the actual cost of completing the said works, then the Developer shall pay such deficiency to the Municipality immediately upon receipt of the Municipality’s bill for same.

(c) The Permittee shall complete the landscaping works required by this permit within six (6) months of the occupancy permit being issued for the building(s) / addition. Within this six (6) month period, the required landscaping must be installed by the Permittee, and inspected and approved by the Municipality.

If the landscaping is not approved within this six (6) month period, the Municipality has the option of continuing to renew the security until the required landscaping is completed or has the option of drawing the security and using the funds to complete the required
landscaping. In such a case, the Municipality or its agents have the irrevocable right to enter into the property to undertake the required landscaping for which the security was submitted.

If the landscaping is approved within the six (6) months or thereafter in accordance with the preceding paragraph, without the Municipality having to draw the security, 90% of the original security will be returned to the Permittee.

A holdback of 10% of the original security will be retained until a final inspection is undertaken within 12 months of the date of the original inspection approval was given to the landscaping. If the landscaping receives approval at final inspection, the 10% holdback will be returned to the Permittee. If, after the final inspection, approval of the landscaping is not given, the Municipality has the option of continuing to renew the security until the required landscaping is approved or has the option of drawing the security and using the funds to complete the required landscaping. In such a case, the Municipality or its agents have the irrevocable right to enter onto the property to undertake the required landscaping for which the security was submitted.

6. The land described herein shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this permit and any plans and specifications attached to this permit shall form a part hereof.

7. This permit shall lapse if the Permittee does not substantially commence the construction of the first phase of a phased development permitted by this permit within two (2) years of the date of this permit.

8. The terms of this permit or any amendment to it, are binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the land affected by this permit.

9. This permit is not 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 Permit is hereby issued by the Municipality signed by the Mayor and Deputy Chief Administrative 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
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REZONING & SUBDIVISION APPLICATION COMMENTS

DISTRICT OF MISSION – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES – BUILDING DIVISION COMMENTS

Referral Date: August 16, 2017

Subject Properties & Legal Descriptions:

- 32661 Egglestone Avenue
  Parcel Identifier: 011-452-692
  Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990

- 8653 Cedar Street
  Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
  Lot 35 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 55248 Except Plan BCP45873

- 8677 Cedar Street
  Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
  Lot 17 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 24630 Except Plan BCP45872

- 8689 Cedar Street
  Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
  Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

File Numbers: R17-020
S17-008  DP17-015 (single family) – 49 residential lots
S17-017  DP17-027 (multi-family) – 28 row house lots + 1 duplex

Proposal:
Rezone to allow the following:
- four (4) residential lots to be zoned Residential Compact 280 (RC280) Zone;
- twenty three (23) lots to be zoned Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone;
- twenty two (22) lots with secondary dwelling units to be zoned Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone;
- one (1) residential/duplex lot to be zoned Residential Two Unit 465 (RT465) Zone; and
- twenty eight (28) lots with attached rowhouse units to be zoned Multiple Family 52 Rowhouse (MR 52) Zone.

Comments:

All trails are be 2.5 m wide asphalt (Multi-Use Primary Trail) trail with a minimum 5m wide cleared corridor and with a 2.5m overhead clearance. The trail can be curvilinear rather than straight up the centre but be no closer than a meter to the fences of the adjacent private lots. The trail shall be constructed in accordance with Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw 5650-2017.

The shoulders can be top soiled and seeded with an appropriate grass seed mix as per the Sub-Division Guidelines. The Developer is also responsible to replant the corridor based on a planting plan submitted and approved by the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department.

Both sides of the corridor where the trail abuts private property, must be fenced with a black vinyl chain link fence as per the DOM standards. The Gaudin Creek corridor along the north side of the development is to be fenced with a post and rail fence to prevent access to the creek. No gates will be allowed.

Bollards must be installed on either side of the road at each road crossing to prevent vehicles from accessing the path. Signs should be installed on the road to warn cars of pedestrians crossing and on the path to warn pedestrians that cars are crossing. The DOM will assume responsibility for the maintenance of the trail corridors and bridge once all works are completed and have received final acceptance.

The Developer must provide a tree planting plan for boulevard trees for review. There should be a single tree per frontage and an additional tree where there are flankages.
The Developer further agrees to construct a pedestrian bridge to connect to Tunbridge Common. The bridge can be pre-fabricated or built on site but must comply to all relevant bridge codes and be a minimum of 2.5m wide with a slip free walking surface. The bridge and abutments must also meet any environmental and fisheries requirements.

In addition to the foregoing the Developer should be asked to remit funds in lieu of parkland that can be used to further develop Tunbridge Common Park which is the closest neighbourhood park to this site.

Signed: M. Sinclair Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture

Date: Revised November 20, 2017
The Minutes of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting held in Multi-Purpose Room #4 at the Mission Leisure Centre on Tuesday, November 14, 2017 commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Members Present: Paul Hockridge, Chair
Ed Hodson
Bob Ingram
Dan Schubert
Danica Stene

Members Absent: Manpreet Brar
Rich Vigurs
Laura Wilson

Others Present: Jason Horton, Manager of Parks and Facilities
Rachel Kleindienst, Booking Clerk
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by B. Ingram and seconded by D. Stene,
That the agenda of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting held on November 14, 2017 be approved as circulated.
CARRIED

3. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC, RECESS THE PUBLIC MEETING UNTIL 7:20 P.M. AND IMMEDIATELY CONVENE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Moved by B. Ingram and seconded by D. Schubert,
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)(a) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality
2. That the public portion of the meeting be recessed until 7:20 p.m.; and
3. That the Committee immediately resolve into the closed portion of their meeting
CARRIED

The meeting recessed at 7:10 p.m.

4. RECESS TO CLOSED COMMITTEE MEETING

5. RECONVENE
The Chair reconvened the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Members Present: Paul Hockridge
                Ed Hodson
                Bob Ingram
                Dan Schubert
                Danica Stene

Members Absent: Manpreet Brar
               Rich Vigurs
               Laura Wilson

Others Present: Jason Horton, Manager of Parks and Facilities
               Rachel Kleindienst, Booking Clerk
               Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture

6. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by B. Ingram and seconded by D. Schubert,
That the minutes of the October 12, 2017 meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee be approved.
CARRIED

7. BUSINESS ARISING

(a) Priority Projects Update

M. Sinclair updated the committee on the status of the projects that were discussed with Council at the October 19, 2017 joint meeting.

1. Off-Leash at Centennial Park
Quotes for cedar-split railing with non-climbable interior fencing have been received. The new fence will be constructed and then the old fence will be removed to avoid any time lapse for usage. The upgraded park will include a double-gate, common entry and separate areas for small vs. large dogs.
2. Picnic Shelter at Griner Park
M. Sinclair would like to reach out to the Indo-Canadian community for input on this item.
A tender still needs to be put through the District’s Purchasing Department.

3. Old Skateboard Park on Leisure Centre Grounds
This item will be re-visited in early 2018. A budget needs to be worked on and discussion with the Mountain Bike Association needs to take place to help determine direction.

4. Tennis Courts at Centennial Park and Heritage Middle School
The contractor quote for Heritage Park came in at a higher dollar value than adding a fourth court at Centennial. When looked at closer it was realized that the quote for the Heritage Park courts was for “removal and replacement of the surface” not for repair work, which was asked for.

(b) Master Plan Draft Executive Summary
The draft of the Master Plan Executive Summary was circulated to committee members. Concerns were raised over the “Top 5 Opportunities” listed for Arts and Culture as well as Parks and Recreation. The committee commented these two lists appear to be a summary of the most popular answers compiled from the surveys, not priority items for the District.
The committee also noted that a suggested timeline for the construction of future facilities should be included.

(c) Hatzic Playground Community Responses
A Facebook post was put on a couple of different sites asking for comments from the Hatzic Community regarding playground installation at Hatzic Park. One neighbour is extremely concerned with the location of the playground and the impact on their privacy. The park is considered a community park but is quite under-developed. A playground is a natural expectation for a community park and will serve the growing neighbourhood.

Moved by B. Ingram and seconded by E. Hodson,

That the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee have reviewed all comments from the community received from Hatzic Elementary and through social media as well as concerns raised by one of the adjacent neighbours and feel that the proposal to develop a children’s playground should proceed as planned.

CARRIED

8. NEW BUSINESS

(a) True Sport Nomination
A report to Council prepared by S. Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture, asking the District to declare the District of Mission as a True Sport Community was circulated.
Moved by D. Stene and seconded by B. Ingram,

That the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee recommend that Council adopt the resolution to declare the District of Mission as a True Sport Community.

CARRIED

(b) Popcorn at the Leisure Centre

A request has been made to serve popcorn at the Leisure Centre. Popcorn was served on a trial basis for approximately 6 hours (1pm – 7pm) on November 14, 2017. Staff explained that the Leisure Centre does not have dedicated cleaning staff during public hours. It was noted that there is a safety concern if popcorn kernels were to get wrapped around a skate blade. It was suggested that popcorn only be served during special events when extra staff can be brought in for cleaning.

(c) Membership

Three committee members have terms expiring at the end of 2017;
Manpreet Brar
Ed Hodson
Bob Ingram

E. Hodson and B. Ingram accepted a 3-year term with the committee.

An ad will be put in the newspaper asking for applications to fill the vacancy left by Jim Shaw. This will be 3-year term position.

9. NEXT MEETING

December 12, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in room #4 at the Mission Leisure Centre.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by E. Hodson and seconded by D. Stene,

That the meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.
The Minutes of the Economic Development Select Committee meeting held in the Boardroom at the Economic Development Department Offices at B7337 Welton Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Wednesday, January 10, 2018 commencing at 8:00 a.m.

Members Present: Rocky Blondin, Blondin Enterprises Inc., EDSC Chair
Wade Peary, Riverside College
Pia Ritch, Mission Community Skills Centre Society
Edgar Sarfeld, Vinegar Hill Consulting Co. Ltd
Dan Schubert, Schubert Plumbing & Heating Ltd
Raymond Szabada, Sumas Regional Consortium for High Tech. (SRCTec)
Beverly Toews, Fraser Pacific Enterprises Inc.
Ann Harper, Representative for the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (MRCC)

Members Absent: Lesa Lacey, Lacey Developments Ltd.
Craig Toews, University of the Fraser Valley (UFV)

Staff Present: Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer
Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning & Special Projects
Ron Poole, Chief Administration Officer
Clare Seeley, Executive Assistant
Dale Unrau, Fire Chief

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by A. Harper and seconded by W. Peary
That the following item be added to this agenda under “New Business”
4. (a) Opening Remarks - Rocky Blondin and;
That the order of New Business be revised with residential fire sprinklers moved above the planning update on the agenda.
That the amended agenda of the Economic Development Select Committee meeting held on January 10, 2018 be approved
CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by E. Sarfeld and seconded by A. Harper
That the minutes of the September 12, 2017 meeting of the Economic Development Select Committee be approved.
CARRIED
4. OPENING REMARKS

R. Blondin noted that the Downtown Core has many businesses reaching their one year anniversary and reminded the group that this is often a critical time in a business life cycle. He requested that as part of the retention and expansion objectives that the committee consider offering their support and assistance to these companies.

S. Crawford advised that this was a focus for the department in 2018 and that the Biz-e-news is covering new businesses this year, plus there will be a partnership for the 2018 Business Walks with the Chamber of Commerce.

5. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Residential Fire Sprinklers

This item of discussion was requested prior to the meeting by L. Lacey.

Under the new municipal bylaw (5679-2017) an approved fire sprinkler system is required in all new buildings, additions and renovations pursuant to building/sprinkler permit applications made after December 31, 2017.

The Fire Chief gave an overview of the new legislation, including a rundown of the provincial working committee which had consisted of key stakeholders such as the Canadian Home Builders Association, municipalities, fire departments and insurance underwriters. The main goal of the updates was to ensure consistency to housing construction across the province, with each municipality given the choice to opt-in to one of a four tier fire sprinkler requirement system.

The District included considerations such as urban and rural fire requirements, number of crew available, time to reach any given location, geographical constraints, increased density in the urban area and improvement to life safety.

Through research undertaken by the District it is understood that the costs are approximately $1 to $2 per sq.ft. for sprinkler installation, plus site servicing expenses estimated to add a further $1,700.00 to the overall costs.

It was noted that communication regarding the changes had been lacking, in part due to the tight timeline.

An invitation was extended to the committee to contact the Fire Chief with any follow up questions they may have, as well as to consider attending the Fire Chiefs' Association of BC Home & Family Sprinkler Summit on February 22, 2018 at the Langley Events Centre.

The Fire Chief left the meeting at 09: 27 a.m.

(b) Planning Update

2017 saw 131 development inquiries and 70 development applications.

G. MacKay gave a presentation of the 1st Avenue Improvement Project, which is currently scheduled for completion in August, 2018.

The committee acknowledged this as G. MacKay's last meeting with the EDSC and offered their thanks and appreciation for her contribution to the District, wishing her every success in her new position.
(c) Economic Development Update

Waterfront redevelopment is on hold until the current private lands for sale have a decision and clear direction.

The District met with the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC), it will be a challenge to get land out of the Agriculture Land Reserve (ALR) this has been communicated to the land owners. The District is awaiting the decision on Abbotsford’s ALR exclusion application and the completion of the OCP before looking at the next steps.

(d) EDSC Administrative Review

Noted changes to the current EDSC Terms of Reference, that the committee would like to seek approval from Council to change:

- 7.0 ii. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall serve in their elected capacity for a term of two years.
- 8.0 ii. Regular meetings will be held at 8:00 a.m. on the 2nd Wednesday of every month, excluding July and August when the committee will be at recess.
- 8.0 iii. Two of the regularly scheduled meetings will serve as Special Meeting of Council, where the EDSC meet with Council for discussion and reporting.

There is currently one seat available on the Committee. Recommendations on sectors to consider in the composition were the Downtown Business Association (DBA), manufacturing, tourism, retail and forestry.

A. Harper advised that she will no longer be a member of the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce Board in April, 2018 and at this time a new representative will be assigned to attend the EDSC meetings. She is willing to continue as a financial representative for the EDSC until the end of the current EDSC term in June, 2018.

It was noted that a nominations committee will be formed in March, 2018 to look at renewal or additional committee members for the July, 2018 election process.

Changes to agenda items:

- It was reflected that at the beginning of each meeting, a declaration of conflict of interest should be raised.
- The Planning Update Report will occur quarterly.

6. NEXT MEETING

EDSC Regular Meeting – Wednesday, February 14, 2018 at 8:00 a.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED COMMITTEE MEETING

Moved by D. Schubert and seconded by A. Harper

That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5699-2018-5050(276)

A 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 5699-2018-5050(276)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the properties located at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue and legally described as:

      Parcel Identifier: 018-137-938
      Legal Description: Lot A Section 35 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP9028

      Parcel Identifier: 018-137-946
      Legal Description: Lot B Section 35 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP9028

   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 ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES    MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR           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 5705-2018-5050(278)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 34884 Moffat Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier:  008-629-943
      Lot 71 District Lot 6 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan 39517
      from Urban Residential 930 (R930) Zone to Urban Residential 930 Secondary Dwelling (R930s) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this __ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES    MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR          CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5706-2018

A Bylaw to Amend (Discharge)
“District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw 416-1975”

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 548 of the Local Government Act, has the power to terminate a land use contract that applies to land within the jurisdiction of the local government;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission did, on the 2nd day of June, 1975 enact a bylaw cited as “Mission District Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 416-1975”;

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 5706-2018”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and the Comax Corporation of Canada Ltd., for the property legally described as:
     Parcel Identifier: 011-325-321
     Legal Description: Lot 10 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8517

     is hereby discharged.


READ A FIRST TIME this ____ day of ____, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this ____ day of ____, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING HELD this ____ day of ____, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ____ day of ____, 2018
APPROVED BY THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE this ____ day of ____, 2018
ADOPTED THIS _____ day of _____, 2018

RANDY HAWES, MIKE YOUNIE,
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5707-2018

A Bylaw to repeal “District of Mission
District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw 170-1972”

WHEREAS, the 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 548 of the Local Government Act, has the power to terminate a land use contract that applies to land within the jurisdiction of the local government;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission did, on the 7th day of August, 1972 enact a bylaw cited as “District of Mission District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 170-1972”;

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 Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and B.W.I. Properties Ltd., for the properties legally described as:
   Civic Address: 32793 Lougheed Highway
   Property Identifier: 011-941-669
   Legal Description: Lot 24 Except Firstly: Part Statutory Right of Way Plan 4862; Secondly: Part Dedicated Road Plan NWP87967; Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951
   Unaddressed property on Wardrop Street
   Property Identifier: 011-941-626
   Legal Description: Lot 23 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951

   is hereby discharged.


READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING HELD this _______ day of ____, 2018
APPROVED BY THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE this ____ day of _____, 2018
ADOPTED THIS __ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES
MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE
CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5708-2018-5050(279)

A 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 5708-2018-5050(279)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the following properties:

   Civic Address: 32793 Lougheed Highway
   Parcel Identifier: 011-941-669
   Legal Description: Lot 24 Except Firstly: Part Statutory Right of Way Plan 4862; Secondly: Part Dedicated Road Plan NWP87967; Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951

   Unaddressed property on Wardrop Street
   Parcel Identifier: 011-941-626
   Legal Description: Lot 23 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951

   from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this __ day of ___, 2018

ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2018
RANDY HAWES
MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE
CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5700-2018

A Bylaw respecting the enforcement of Bylaw Notices in conjunction with the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication Registry.

WHEREAS, the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act grants the District the authority to create this bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. TITLE
   This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018".

2. INTERPRETATION
   In this bylaw,
   "Act" means the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act;
   "District" means the District of Mission;
   "Registry" means the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry established pursuant to this Bylaw.

3. TERMS
   The terms in this Bylaw have the same meaning as the terms defined in the Act.

4. BYLAW CONTRAVENTIONS
   The bylaw contraventions designated in the Schedules attached to and forming part of this Bylaw may be dealt with by bylaw notice.

5. OFFENCE AND PENALTY
   The penalty for a contravention referred to in Section 4 of this Bylaw is:
   5.1 the penalty amount is set out in columns A1 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw, subject to subsection 5.2 and 5.3.
   5.2 the early payment penalty set out in columns A2 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw, if received by the Registry within 14 days of a person receiving or being presumed to have received the bylaw notice.
   5.3 subject to a late payment surcharge, in addition to the penalty under subsection 5.1, and is the late payment penalty set out in columns A3 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw, if payment is received more than 28 days after a person received or is presumed to have received the bylaw notice.
6. **PERIOD FOR PAYING A DISPUTED NOTICE**

6.1 Within 14 days of the date on which a person received or is presumed to have received the bylaw notice, a person who receives a bylaw notice, must:

a) pay the penalty in any manner prescribed on the reverse side of the bylaw notice; or

b) request dispute adjudication by completing the form on the reverse side of the bylaw offence notice and delivering it to the Registry Office at 8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A4.

6.2 A person may pay the indicated penalty after 14 days of receiving the bylaw notice, subject to the applicable surcharge for late payment in accordance with subsection 5.3, but no person may dispute the bylaw offence after 14 days of receiving the bylaw notice.

6.3 Where a person was not served personally with a bylaw notice and advises the District, in accordance with the requirements of section 25 of the Act, that a copy of the original bylaw notice was not received, the time limits for responding to a bylaw notice under Part 5 and section 6.1 of this bylaw do not begin to run until a copy of the bylaw notice is re-delivered in accordance with the Act.

7. **BYLAW NOTICE DISPUTE ADJUDICATION REGISTRY**

7.1 The Registry is established as a bylaw notice dispute adjudication system in accordance with the Act to resolve disputes in relation to bylaw notices.

7.2 The civic address of the Registry is: 8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, British Columbia, V2P 8A4.

7.3 The District is authorized to enter into, and the Mayor and Corporate Officer are authorized to execute, the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry Agreement attached to and forming a part of this Bylaw as Schedule B.

7.4 Every person who is unsuccessful in a dispute adjudication in relation to a bylaw offence notice or a compliance agreement under the dispute adjudication system established under this section, must pay to the District an additional administration fee of $25 for the purpose of the District recovering the costs of the adjudication system.

8. **SCREENING OFFICERS**

8.1 The position of Screening Officer is established.

8.2 The following are designated classes of persons that are appointed as Screening Officers:

a) Manager of Inspection Services or designate;
b) Any person appointed to the position of Screening Officer by the Administrative Committee established under the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry Agreement attached to and forming a part of this Bylaw as Schedule B.

9. **POWERS, DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF SCREENING OFFICERS**

9.1 The powers, duties and functions of Screening Officers are as set out in the Act, and include the following powers:

a) To communicate information respecting the nature of the contravention, the provision of the bylaw contravened, the facts on which the contravention allegation is based, the penalty for a contravention, the opportunity to enter into a compliance agreement, the opportunity to proceed to the bylaw notice dispute adjudication system and the fee or fees payable in relation to the bylaw notice enforcement process, where requested by a person against whom a contravention is alleged;

b) To communicate with any or all of the following for the purposes of performing their functions under this bylaw or the Act:

i. the person against whom a contravention is alleged or their representative;

ii. the officer issuing the notice;

iii. the complainant or their representative;

iv. District staff and records regarding the disputant’s history of bylaw compliance.

c) To prepare and enter into compliance agreements under the Act with persons who dispute bylaw notices, including to establish terms and conditions for compliance that the Screening Officer considers necessary or advisable, including time periods for payment of penalties and compliance with the bylaw.

d) To provide for payment of a reduced penalty if a compliance agreement is entered into, as provided in column A4 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw; and

e) To cancel bylaw offence notices in accordance with the Act or District policies and guidelines.

9.2 The bylaw contraventions in relation to which a Screening Officer may enter into a compliance agreement are indicated in column A4 of the Schedules to this Bylaw.

9.3 The maximum duration of a compliance agreement is one year.

9.4 Where a compliance agreement is entered into, the penalty payable for the offence shall be reduced to one half of the penalty for the offence as listed in Column A1 of each of the Schedules to this Bylaw.
10. **BYLAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS**

Persons acting as any of the following are hereby designated as Bylaw Enforcement Officers for the purposes of this Bylaw and the *Act*:

a) Special constables, officers, members or constables of:
   i. The provincial police force as defined in section 1 of the *Police Act*, or
   ii. A municipal police force;

a) Members of the Royal Canadian Mountain Police;

b) Bylaw Enforcement Officers, Building Inspectors, Animal Control Officers or other persons acting in another capacity on behalf of the District for the purpose of enforcement of one or more of its bylaws.

11. **FORMS OF BYLAW NOTICE**

The District may, from time to time, provide for the form or forms of the bylaw notice, provided the bylaw notice complies with the *Act*.

12. **SCHEDULES**

The following Schedules attached hereto form an integral part of this Bylaw:

- Schedule 1 – Commercial Vehicle Licensing Bylaw 1381-1984
- Schedule 2 – Traffic Regulation Bylaw 1698-1987
- Schedule 3 – Business Licence Bylaw 3694-2007
- Schedule 4 – Building Bylaw 3590-2003
- Schedule 5 – Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009
- Schedule 6 – Sign Bylaw 1662-1987
- Schedule 7 – Water Bylaw 2196-1990
- Schedule 8 – Burning Bylaw 2975-1996
- Schedule 9 – Truck Route Bylaw 1811-1988
- Schedule 10 – Fire Prevention Bylaw 3281-1999
- Schedule 11 – Soil Deposit Bylaw 3550-2003
- Schedule 12 – Soil Removal Bylaw 3088-1997
- Schedule 13 – Sewer Bylaw 5033-2009
- Schedule 14 – Solid Waste Management Bylaw 5526-2015
- Schedule 15 – Good Neighbour Bylaw 5524-2015
- Schedule 16 - Public Use of Parks Bylaw 5001-2008
13. **SEVERABILITY**

   If a portion of this Bylaw is found invalid by a court, it will be severed and the remainder of the Bylaw will remain in effect.

   READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of ___, 2018

   READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2018

   READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2018

   ADOPTED THIS __ day of ___, 2018

   RANDY HAWES, MAYOR       MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
### SCHEDULE 1

**Commercial Vehicle Licensing Bylaw 1381-1984**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A1 Penalty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating without a licence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to display licence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 2

**Traffic Regulation Bylaw 1698-1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A1 Penalty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place container within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place debris within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place landscaping within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place object within highway</td>
<td>3.02(g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct traffic</td>
<td>3.02(h)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit material on highway</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post bill or placard</td>
<td>3.09(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of snow/ice on sidewalk</td>
<td>3.10(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of rubbish on sidewalk</td>
<td>3.10(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag object on highway</td>
<td>4.01(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiked tires</td>
<td>4.01(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhanging load</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate noise making device without permit</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed 50 km per hour</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed posted speed</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed in lane</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct traffic</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobey instruction to weigh vehicle</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding on sidewalk</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate control of cycle</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless cycling</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to keep right</td>
<td>7.05(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing headphones</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park vehicle contrary to traffic control device</td>
<td>8.01(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on sidewalk</td>
<td>8.02(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on boulevard</td>
<td>8.02(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 1.5m of driveway</td>
<td>8.02(b)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in intersection</td>
<td>8.02(c)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 5m of hydrant</td>
<td>8.02(d)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on crosswalk</td>
<td>8.02(e)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of crosswalk</td>
<td>8.02(f)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of stop sign</td>
<td>8.02(g)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 2 (cont’d)

### Traffic Regulation Bylaw 1698-1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of traffic control signal</td>
<td>8.02(g)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 15m of rail crossing</td>
<td>8.02(h)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park to display vehicle for sale/repair vehicle</td>
<td>8.02(i)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park to advertise, grease, paint, wreck, store or repair, except where repairs are necessitated by an emergency</td>
<td>8.02(i)(ii)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park to display signs</td>
<td>8.02(i)(iii)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on highway to sell commodities</td>
<td>8.02(i)(iv)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on a bridge</td>
<td>8.02(k)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in tunnel</td>
<td>8.02(k)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in lane</td>
<td>8.02(l)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 1.5m of intersecting lane</td>
<td>8.02(n)(i)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 6m of intersection</td>
<td>8.02(n)(ii)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on a lane within 1.5m of intersection</td>
<td>8.02(o)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on yellow line</td>
<td>8.02(q)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct visibility of traffic control device</td>
<td>8.02(r)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No valid license plate</td>
<td>8.02(s)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime parking</td>
<td>8.02(t)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled parking zone</td>
<td>8.02(u)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to avoid time limit</td>
<td>8.02(v)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed 48 hours</td>
<td>8.02(w)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in any electric vehicle charging station stall at a public parking facility</td>
<td>8.02(x)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park on any portion of a boat launch</td>
<td>8.02(y)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in such a manner as to obstruct the free passage of traffic</td>
<td>8.02(z)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No valid insurance</td>
<td>8.02(aa)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within 5 meters of a community mailbox</td>
<td>8.02(bb)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park within a loading zone</td>
<td>8.02(cc)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park unattached trailer</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed time limit</td>
<td>8.04(a)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park between 3:00 am to 7:00 am in CC-D1 zones</td>
<td>8.04(b)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park in loading zone</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper diagonal parking</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park large vehicle in residential area</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park during snow removal</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park more than 30 cm from curb</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facing wrong direction</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobey Flag Person/School Patrol</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE 3

**Business Licence Bylaw 3964-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 Early Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A3 Late Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A4 Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No business licence</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession, trade, sale or distribution of shark fins or derivative</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to post licence</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 4

**Building Bylaw 3590-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 Early Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A3 Late Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A4 Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction without permit</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupy building without approval</td>
<td>5.2(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupy building contrary to permit</td>
<td>5.2(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamper with notice</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contrary to permit</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to fence pool</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 5

**Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 Early Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A3 Late Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A4 Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Use</td>
<td>103(A)(1)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 6

**Sign Bylaw 1662-1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 Early Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A3 Late Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A4 Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign without permit</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited sign</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE 7</td>
<td>Water Bylaw 2196-1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 1</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 2</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 3</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate water restriction – Stage 4</td>
<td>5.1(d)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE 8</th>
<th>Burning Bylaw 2975-1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited burn</td>
<td>5(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn contrary to conditions of permit</td>
<td>5(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn contrary to ban</td>
<td>5(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn contrary to order</td>
<td>5(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE 9</th>
<th>Truck Route Bylaw 1811-1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck off truck route</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck exceeding temporary load restrictions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE 10</th>
<th>Fire Prevention Bylaw 3281-1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Permit</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain extinguisher</td>
<td>5 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extinguisher</td>
<td>5 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire alarm not operable</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice communication not operable</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE 10 (cont’d)

**Fire Prevention Bylaw 3281-1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain fire alarm</td>
<td>5 (d)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain standpipe</td>
<td>5 (e)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain hose system</td>
<td>5 (e)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain sprinkler system</td>
<td>5 (f)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain suppression system</td>
<td>5 (g)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain emergency lighting</td>
<td>5 (h)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain exit sign</td>
<td>5 (h)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain egress</td>
<td>5 (i)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fire safety plan posted</td>
<td>5 (j)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No occupant load posted</td>
<td>5 (k)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many occupants</td>
<td>5 (l)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to provide fire vehicle access</td>
<td>5 (m)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain fire vehicle access</td>
<td>5 (m)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to furnish record</td>
<td>5 (n)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No smoke alarm</td>
<td>5 (o)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain fire separation</td>
<td>5(p)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain closure</td>
<td>5 (p)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No address displayed</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No number displayed</td>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No permit</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to maintain hydrant</td>
<td>7(2)(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to submit records</td>
<td>7(2)(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant not clear or accessible</td>
<td>7(2)(c)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No brass protective cap</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to secure building</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to comply with order</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No permit</td>
<td>11(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULE 11

**Soil Deposit Bylaw 3550-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Early Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment Penalty</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit soil without permit</td>
<td>5(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 12

**Soil Removal Bylaw 3088-1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove soil without permit</td>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SCHEDULE 13

**Sewer Bylaw 5033-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to install/maintain interceptor</td>
<td>16(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interceptor maintenance</td>
<td>16(3)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep interceptor records</td>
<td>16(4)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to retain interceptor records</td>
<td>16(5)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit of interceptor residue to sewer</td>
<td>16(6)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational vehicle waste</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucked Liquid Waste</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited waste, Restricted waste</td>
<td>23(1)(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Cooling Water</td>
<td>23(1)(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontaminated water discharge</td>
<td>23(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited Waste</td>
<td>24(1)(a)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Waste</td>
<td>24(1)(b)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharging operation waste</td>
<td>24(1)(c)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling/uncontaminated water</td>
<td>24(1)(d)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-conditioning water</td>
<td>24(1)(e)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water, runoff</td>
<td>24(1)(f)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilution</td>
<td>24(2)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident prevention</td>
<td>24(3)(a)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>24(3)(b)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee notification</td>
<td>24(3)(c)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof leaders</td>
<td>24(6)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to apply for wastewater discharge</td>
<td>25(3)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance</td>
<td>27(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass flow</td>
<td>27(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to notify</td>
<td>28(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to submit Schedule I</td>
<td>28(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remedy discharge</td>
<td>28(3)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to notify Engineer</td>
<td>28(4)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal of access</td>
<td>29(4)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of monitoring point</td>
<td>30(1)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring point maintenance</td>
<td>30(2)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper installation of monitoring point</td>
<td>30(3)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to inform Engineer</td>
<td>30(6)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>30(7)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to install water meter</td>
<td>30(14)</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampering</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule 14

**Solid Waste Management Bylaw 5526-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to manage waste in accordance with bylaw provisions</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to separate Recyclables and Compostables from Garbage within Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to separate Recyclables and Compostables from Garbage outside Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to deposit Garbage, Trade Waste, Recyclable Materials, Compostables, Greenwaste, Construction or Demolition Waste at an Authorized Facility</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$500 $350 $650 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning waste within Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning waste outside Curbside Collection Area</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including prohibited materials for Curbside Collection, On-site Collection or Spring Clean-up</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early set-out of waste for Curbside Collection</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to utilize Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures outside of set-out timeframe</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to contain Spring Clean-up items</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early set-out of Spring Clean-up Garbage in bags</td>
<td>3.11.3</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remove excess Spring Clean-up items from curb within seven (7) days</td>
<td>3.11.4</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep Wildlife Attractants inaccessible to Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to store Garbage, Recyclables or Compostables in Wildlife Resistant Enclosures or Wildlife Resistant Containers</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep barbecues clean or stored in a Wildlife Resistant Enclosure</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving pet food outside or setting up bird feeders between April and November</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain backyard composters in a way that does not attract Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep ripe fruit inaccessible to Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep bee hives inaccessible to Dangerous Wildlife</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep pets and small livestock indoors or contained in a Wildlife Resistant Enclosure from dusk to dawn</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to store livestock feed in Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to provide Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures to tenants</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to keep Wildlife Resistant Containers or Wildlife Resistant Enclosures closed, locked or in proper condition</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>$250 $175 $325 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause a nuisance</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieving oneself in public</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erecting tent in public place</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent and obscene language</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent activity</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting that causes an obstruction</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light that disturbs</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make noise which disturbs</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit noise which disturbs</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplified sound which disturbs</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal which disturbs</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkster that disturbs</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction noise</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to comply with terms of permit</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of noxious or offensive odour</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner allowing graffiti to be placed</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person placing graffiti</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit of litter</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of refuse</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsightly property</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste overflowing from container</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlocked waste container</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping of yard waste</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of water</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrolled flow of water</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious weeds</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive lawn growth</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage by trees</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remove demolition debris</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to remove derelict vehicle</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain boulevard</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain fence</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to contain livestock</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing infestation</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of water on land</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of water in excavation</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of wildlife attractants</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding dangerous wildlife</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area free of bird seed</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area free of fallen fruit</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause a Nuisance</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 16

**Public Use of Parks Bylaw 5001-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fine Effective 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In contravention of the prohibited activities in Section 4 of the bylaw without a special use permit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or use of any type of firearms</td>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or use of bows and arrows</td>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of any other weapons including, but not limited to, knives, bear spray or other animal repellents, or other similar weapons</td>
<td>4.c</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or use of any type of fireworks or explosives</td>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of loud and/or vulgar language</td>
<td>4.e</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting down of trees</td>
<td>4.f</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erection or use of tents of any kind</td>
<td>4.g</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting of campfires</td>
<td>4.h</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping of refuse</td>
<td>4.i</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying, selling or consuming alcohol or any controlled substances</td>
<td>4.j</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping of any domesticated animals</td>
<td>4.k</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>4.l</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit any dog to run at large in any park, except for a designated “off-leash park”</td>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive or permit any private motorized vehicle to enter into or upon any park</td>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick, cut down, dig or pull up, or knowingly injure or destroy in whole or in part any flower, plant, shrub, or tree in any park</td>
<td>5.c</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroy, damage, move or deface any bench, table, playground equipment, refuse container or any other public property situated in any park</td>
<td>5.d</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw, deposit, drop or leave in any park any glass, plastic, bottle, can, container, paper, food, garbage or litter, except in containers provided for that purpose</td>
<td>5.e</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPPER FRASER VALLEY BYLAW NOTICE DISPUTE ADJUDICATION
REGISTRY AGREEMENT

This Agreement, dated the 1st day of February, 2018.

BETWEEN:

CITY OF CHILLIWACK
8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A4
(“Chilliwack”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF HOPE
P.O. Box 609, Hope, BC V0X 1L0
(“Hope”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF KENT
7170 Cheam Avenue, Box 70, Agassiz, BC V0M 1A0
(“Kent”)

AND:

VILLAGE OF HARRISON HOT SPRINGS
Box 160, Harrison Hot Springs, BC V0M 1K0
(“Harrison”)

AND:

FRASER VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT
1 - 45950 Cheam Avenue, Chilliwack, BC V2P 1N6
(“FVRD”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF MISSION
8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC V2V 4L9
(“Mission”)

WHEREAS:

A. The Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act permits local governments to create a bylaw designating certain bylaw contraventions that can be enforced by way of bylaw notice as an alternative to traditional bylaw enforcement mechanisms;
B. The Act also permits two or more local governments to enter into an agreement, adopted by a bylaw of each local government that is party to it, to provide for the joint administration of a local government bylaw notice dispute adjudication system;

C. Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD, and Mission wish to:

(a) share the costs and administration of such a system; and

(b) enter such an agreement to establish such a system, to be called the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry, and to provide for the joint administration of the Registry.

NOW, THEREFORE in consideration of the mutual promises contained herein, the Parties agree as follows:

PART I - INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

Definitions

1. In this Agreement, the following definitions apply:

   (a) “Act” means the Local Government Bylaw Notice Enforcement Act;

   (b) “Adjudication Fee” means the sum of $25.00 payable by each Party for each adjudication scheduled to be conducted by the Registry;

   (c) “Agreement” means this Agreement;

   (d) “Authorizing Bylaws” means the bylaws adopted by the Councils/Boards of each of the Parties authorizing this Agreement;

   (e) “Committee” means the Intermunicipal Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry’s Administrative Committee;

   (f) “Contribution Adjustment Amount” means, for each Party, the amount calculated in accordance with Section 22 herein in any year of the Term;

   (g) “Membership Fee” means a base participation fee of $2,000.00 per municipality;

   (h) “Parties” means all of Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission;

   (i) “Party” means any one of Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission;

   (j) “Registry” means the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry established by this Agreement;
(k) "Revenues" means any revenue actually received or estimated to be received, as the case may be, by the Registry, excluding Initial Contributions, Contribution Amounts or Contribution Adjustment Amounts;

(l) “Term” means the term of this Agreement as set out herein.

Establishment of the Registry

2. Subject to the Act and to the adoption of the Authorizing Bylaws, the Parties agree that the Registry is hereby established.

PART II - ADMINISTRATION

Administrative Committee

3. The Parties agree to establish the Committee to implement and administer the Registry.

4. The Parties agree that authority of the Committee will include but not be limited to:

(a) preparing operational budgets; and

(b) setting policy as authorized under this Agreement and the Act.

Representation

5. Each of the Parties will appoint one representative to serve on the Committee. The Parties agree that representatives will be paid employees of their respective local governments and will not be remunerated by the Registry.

PART III - ADJUDICATION

Screening Officers

6. The Parties agree that screening of notices prior to proceeding to adjudication will be established as a function of the Registry. Screening officers will be appointed jointly by the administrative committee. The parties agree to provide policies and guidelines on bylaw enforcement to be used in negotiating compliance agreements.

Bylaw Notice Dispute Adjudication Registry

7. The Parties agree that a dispute adjudication system will be established as a function of the Registry, and that disputes will be heard by a bylaw notice dispute adjudicator in the circumstances prescribed in the Act and Authorizing Bylaws.

8. The Parties agree that the Committee will select a roster of adjudicators who may hear and determine disputes from the provincial roster of adjudicators to be established by the Attorney General.
9. Adjudicators will be assigned to individual disputes in the manner prescribed by any applicable regulation and policy established by the Committee.

PART IV - OPERATIONS

Location

10. The location of the Registry will be in the municipal offices of the City of Chilliwack, 8550 Young Road, Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A4.

Administrative Services

11. Chilliwack will provide and supervise all administrative services required by the Registry, subject to the following:

   (i) the collection of any fees, fines or penalties levied against an unsuccessful party in the dispute adjudication process will be the responsibility of the relevant municipality if not collected by the Registry immediately following the adjudication; and

   (ii) any penalty arising directly out of the bylaw notice itself may be paid to the relevant Party or to the Registry,

and any amounts collected by or paid to the Registry pursuant to (i) and (ii) will be credited to the relevant Party’s Contribution Adjustment Amount.

Financial Reporting

12. Chilliwack will ensure that its Director of Finance will conduct and oversee the financial reporting and record keeping of the Registry based on normal procedures, subject to the requirements outlined herein.

PART V - FINANCIAL PLANNING

Start-Up Costs

13. Each Party will be responsible for its own start-up costs. In the event the Provincial Contribution exceeds the agreed upon Registry start-up costs, each Party will receive a pro-rated proportion of such excess. In the event the agreed upon Registry start-up costs exceed the Provincial Contribution, each Party will pay on request to Chilliwack a pro-rated proportion of the shortfall.

Budget Year

14. The budget year of the Registry is the calendar year.
Operating Budget

15. To assist with the preparation of the following year’s operating budget, the Parties agree that, no later than April 15th of each year, the Committee will prepare the previous year’s annual statistical report setting out in detail the operational funds incurred by the Registry for the carrying out of its mandate and responsibilities, including:

(a) the estimated operational expenditures for:

(i) office and administration including financial reporting and administrative services;
(ii) screening officers;
(iii) bylaw dispute adjudicators; and
(iv) other functions of the Registry;

(b) the anticipated revenues (if any) of the Registry;

(c) the difference between estimated revenues and operational expenditures for the Registry; and

(d) the Contribution Amount required from each of the Parties.

Budget Approval and Adjustments

16. The Parties will consider and approve, or recommend amendments to, the Registry’s operating budget.

17. The Parties agree that all recommendations by them for adjustments to the Registry’s draft operating budget will:

(a) be reasonable and made in good faith; and

(b) ensure that a reasonable level of service quality can be maintained by the Registry.

Use of Funds

18. The Committee and Chilliwack may make only those expenditures during the budget year for the purposes and up to the amounts authorized in the approved operating budget. The Registry (or the Committee or Chilliwack on behalf of the Registry) will not incur any other indebtedness or liability, or make any further expenditure, except that:

(a) Chilliwack may make a further reasonable expenditure or contract a further indebtedness or liability that it deems necessary or prudent, subject to a $1,000.00 limit; and
(b) the Committee may:

(i) make a further reasonable expenditure or contract a further indebtedness or liability that it deems necessary or prudent, subject to a $10,000.00 limit;

(ii) re-allocate funds within categories of the operating budget as reasonably required; and

(iii) make a further expenditure or contract a further indebtedness or liability without limitation if approved in advance by all Parties.

PART VI - COST ALLOCATION

Funding Contributions and Adjustments

19. The Parties agree that costs relating to legal counsel, witnesses, screening officers and bylaw enforcement officers as they pertain to the dispute adjudication process, and to the activities of the Registry more generally, will be borne by the relevant Party which issued the bylaw notice in question and will not be borne by the Registry or by Chilliwack on behalf of the Registry.

20. Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission will, upon approval of the Registry’s operating budget by each of the Parties, pay to Chilliwack their respective Contribution Amounts for the upcoming budget year no later than April 30th of that budget year.

21. Chilliwack will, as soon following the end of a budget year as practicable, calculate the amount of each Party’s Contribution Adjustment Amount by:

(a) determining each Party’s proportion of the amount by which Actual Expenditures exceed Budget Expenditures for the relevant year, where the proportion is calculated on the fixed costs by using a three year rolling average of the number of disputed tickets; and

(b) by determining the proportion amount of the floating costs by using the number of disputed tickets in the past year.

22. Each of Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission will, within 30 days of receipt of notice of its respective Contribution Adjustment Amount, pay (if required) to Chilliwack the Contribution Adjustment Amount.

23. Chilliwack will pay (if required) any Contribution Adjustment Amount owing to Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission, as appropriate, within 30 days of preparation of a statement outlining the Contribution Adjustment Amounts of each Party or may, at the election of Chilliwack in each year except the final year, credit the amount owing to the Contribution Amount required from each Party for the following year.

24. Each Party will pay to Chilliwack, within fifteen days following each of March 31, June 30, October 31 and December 31 of each year of the Term, the Adjudication Fee for each adjudication scheduled in respect of that Party in the previous quarter.
Maintenance of Records

25. The Director of Finance of Chilliwack will:

(a) exercise the duties and powers of the officer responsible for financial administration as provided in the Community Charter, in maintaining the financial records for the Registry on behalf of the Parties;

(b) ensure that accounting and payroll records of the Registry are properly prepared and maintained, such records to include payroll, accounts payable, cash receipts and disbursements, accounts receivable, general ledger, subsidiary cost ledger, financial statements and reports and supporting documents to the foregoing;

(c) provide, when possible, any additional financial systems that have been requested by the Committee;

(d) direct employees and officers of the Registry to the extent necessary to ensure that the systems and procedures established for financial controls are in effect and are in accordance with the Community Charter.

Examination of Records

26. The Finance Officer(s) of any of Hope, Harrison, Kent, FVRD or Mission may, acting reasonably with regard to minimizing the administrative burden on Chilliwack, and no more frequently than once in each year of the Term, conduct audits or examinations to obtain information or determine that adequate financial controls are being maintained for the Registry. Chilliwack will cooperate with any reasonable request by any of Hope, Harrison, Kent, FVRD or Mission’s Finance Officer(s) for access to financial records, user statistics and other information of the Registry.

PART VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Insurance

27. Chilliwack will ensure that the Registry and its activities are covered under Chilliwack’s general liability policy, and will provide copies of all relevant insurance policies and changes thereto to the Directors of Finance of Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission, upon request.

Amendments

28. The Parties will, in good faith, negotiate any proposed amendment to this Agreement upon request of any Party, all amendments to be in writing and executed by the Parties.
Dispute Resolution

29. The Parties will submit any dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of this Agreement:

   (a) first, to the Committee to resolve the dispute;

   (b) second, if the Committee is unable to resolve the dispute within 60 days, to the Chief Administrative Officers of the Parties; and

   (c) third, if the Chief Administrative Officers are unable to resolve the dispute within 60 days, to the Inspector of Municipalities, or at the election of the Parties, to a commercial arbitrator appointed by agreement or, failing agreement, appointed pursuant to the Commercial Arbitration Act, for final determination, and the determination of the Inspector or arbitrator, as applicable, will be final and binding upon the Parties.

Term

30. This Agreement comes into effect on February 2, 2018 and continues in effect until December 31, 2019. Any Party may withdraw from this Agreement upon six months’ written notice to the other Parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Chilliwack, Hope, Kent, Harrison, FVRD and Mission have executed this Agreement on the date first above written.

THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CHILLIWACK was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

C/S

Mayor

Corporate Officer
THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF HOPE was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________

C/S

Mayor

__________________________________________

Corporate Officer

THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE DISTRICT OF KENT was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________

C/S

Mayor

__________________________________________

Clerk

THE CORPORATE SEAL of VILLAGE OF HARRISON HOT SPRINGS was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________

C/S

Mayor

__________________________________________

Corporate Officer

THE CORPORATE SEAL of FRASER VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________________

C/S

Chair

__________________________________________

Administrator
THE CORPORATE SEAL of THE
DISTRICT OF MISSION was hereunto
affixed in the presence of:

__________________________________  C/S
Mayor

__________________________________
Corporate Officer
DISTRICT OF MISSION
BYLAW 5709-2018-5612(1)

A bylaw to amend District of Mission
2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw 5612-2016

WHEREAS pursuant to the provisions of the Community Charter, the Council for the District of Mission may, by bylaw, before the 15th day of May in each year, before the annual property tax bylaw is adopted, adopt a financial plan;

NOW THEREFORE the Council for the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be known and cited for all purposes as "District of Mission 2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1)".

2. "District of Mission 2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw 5612-2016", is hereby amended by:

   (a) deleting in its entirety Schedules B, C, D and E and replacing them with Schedules B, C, D and E attached to and forming part of this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this >>> day of February, 2018

READ A SECOND TIME this >>> day of February, 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this >>> day of February, 2018

ADOPTED this >>> day of >>>>, 2018

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MICHAEL YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
### Schedule “B” of Bylaw No. 5709-2018-5612(1)
#### 2017 Detailed Financial Plan

**Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1)**

**2017 to 2021 Financial Plan**

### General Operating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General Operating</th>
<th>Internal Adjustments</th>
<th>Drainage Operating</th>
<th>Water Operating</th>
<th>Sewer Operating</th>
<th>Refuse/Recycling</th>
<th>Forestry</th>
<th>General Capital</th>
<th>Drainage Capital</th>
<th>Water Capital</th>
<th>Sewer Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-29,972,934</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,596,389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>4,922,943</td>
<td>-4,737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual (surplus) deficit</strong></td>
<td>-1,063,366</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>762,484</td>
<td>-2,032,102</td>
<td>-475,407</td>
<td>251,918</td>
<td>-322,886</td>
<td>-435,258</td>
<td>-502,640</td>
<td>-295,202</td>
<td>-7,739,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule “C” of Bylaw No. 5709-2018-5612(1)
#### 2017 to 2021 Summary Financial Plan

**Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1)**

**Page 3 of 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Annual (surplus) deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-80,651,049</td>
<td>-68,784,352</td>
<td>-11,866,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-76,401,766</td>
<td>-64,740,164</td>
<td>-11,661,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>-75,158,986</td>
<td>-65,871,216</td>
<td>-9,287,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>-83,161,315</td>
<td>-69,602,434</td>
<td>-13,558,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>-79,765,023</td>
<td>-69,933,950</td>
<td>-9,831,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-395,138,139</td>
<td>-338,932,116</td>
<td>-56,206,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

- Property taxation
- Local Improvements
- Sale of services and regulatory fees
- Government transfers
- Amortization of restricted revenue
- Investment income
- Other revenue
- Developer in-kind contribution for capital

### Expenses

- Administration and finance
- General government and fiscal services
- Protective services
- Engineering and public works
- Transit services
- Waste management
- Development services
- Parks, recreation and cultural services
- Library
- Cemetery
- Drainage utility
- Water utility
- Sewer utility
- Forestry enterprise

### Reserves, capital and debt

- Tangible capital assets purchased
- Tangible capital assets contributed by developers
- New debt/temporary borrowing
- Repayment of debt - principal (see note below)
- Transfers to reserves
- Amortization
- Reserves/surplus used for capital funding
- Reserves/surplus used to fund operations

**Information details:**

- Principal
- Interest associated with debt

**Total payments**
## PLANNED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>89,124</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Public Works</td>
<td>2,567,007</td>
<td>1,504,782</td>
<td>1,929,886</td>
<td>974,207</td>
<td>2,371,056</td>
<td>977,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Purchasing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>3,456</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>4,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire/Rescue Services</td>
<td>122,686</td>
<td>200,994</td>
<td>77,495</td>
<td>22,414</td>
<td>77,495</td>
<td>17,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government - Major Projects</td>
<td>864,793</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>365,796</td>
<td>35,041</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>23,849</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,241</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>16,364</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>267,610</td>
<td>267,610</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Recreation &amp; Culture</td>
<td>1,410,106</td>
<td>700,033</td>
<td>252,366</td>
<td>195,380</td>
<td>216,744</td>
<td>937,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82,853</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>34,856</td>
<td>47,498</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>34,856</td>
<td>78,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal General Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>5,412,742</td>
<td>2,912,230</td>
<td>3,528,881</td>
<td>1,306,894</td>
<td>2,522,295</td>
<td>1,432,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Environmentally Sensitive Parkland Acquistion</td>
<td>89,432</td>
<td></td>
<td>345,376</td>
<td></td>
<td>208,970</td>
<td>231,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Environmentally Sensitive Parkland Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Roads</td>
<td>9,119</td>
<td></td>
<td>964,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - All Areas</td>
<td>563,728</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,009,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>502,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Creek Parkway Parkland</td>
<td>258,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>731,707</td>
<td>780,341</td>
<td>1,533,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>920,682</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,318,376</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,442,931</td>
<td>1,877,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Management Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>981,263</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>475,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford/Mission Recycling Depot</td>
<td>55,625</td>
<td>34,080</td>
<td>18,984</td>
<td>54,240</td>
<td>19,888</td>
<td>18,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Waste Management Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>1,036,888</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>509,300</td>
<td>18,984</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>19,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Replacement Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>2,986,341</td>
<td></td>
<td>953,498</td>
<td></td>
<td>339,417</td>
<td>1,822,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestry Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Capital</td>
<td>311,684</td>
<td>305,422</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCCs (Restricted Revenue)</td>
<td>264,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>892,400</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Drainage Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>576,270</td>
<td>305,422</td>
<td>1,007,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Water DCC</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74,250</td>
<td>561,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capital - Local</td>
<td>2,166,047</td>
<td>344,529</td>
<td>1,352,448</td>
<td>65,792</td>
<td>1,433,017</td>
<td>79,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capital - Regional</td>
<td>1,540,814</td>
<td>43,698</td>
<td>587,663</td>
<td>16,666</td>
<td>414,834</td>
<td>11,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital - Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Supply DCC</td>
<td>86,973</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156,085</td>
<td>4,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Water Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>4,531,834</td>
<td>390,693</td>
<td>1,940,111</td>
<td>82,458</td>
<td>2,078,187</td>
<td>95,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital - Local</td>
<td>1,049,523</td>
<td>249,071</td>
<td>597,930</td>
<td>81,649</td>
<td>1,346,503</td>
<td>113,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital - Regional</td>
<td>1,326,582</td>
<td>1,352,341</td>
<td>928,654</td>
<td>944,687</td>
<td>690,938</td>
<td>704,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewage Treatment DCC</td>
<td>8,897,864</td>
<td>292,564</td>
<td>5,818</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>215,344</td>
<td>11,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>11,273,968</td>
<td>1,893,976</td>
<td>1,532,422</td>
<td>1,034,266</td>
<td>2,252,786</td>
<td>829,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26,338,527</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>6,233,563</td>
<td>2,495,620</td>
<td>8,900,862</td>
<td>2,451,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. TCA = Tangible Capital Assets

**Schedule “D” of Bylaw No. 5709-2018-5612(1)**

**2017 to 2021 Capital Plan Summary**

**2017 to 2021 Financial Plan Amending Bylaw 5709-2018-5612(1)**
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**Annual Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th><strong>Totals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$32,975,310</td>
<td>$17,795,291</td>
<td>$11,352,015</td>
<td>$20,165,370</td>
<td>$13,902,247</td>
<td>$96,190,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

332
## PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Funds</td>
<td>$6,933,036</td>
<td>$5,726,908</td>
<td>$3,954,766</td>
<td>$6,054,335</td>
<td>$3,920,632</td>
<td>$26,589,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>1,049,761</td>
<td>1,108,869</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,158,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>41,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal General Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>8,323,973</td>
<td>6,835,777</td>
<td>3,954,766</td>
<td>6,054,335</td>
<td>3,920,632</td>
<td>29,089,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCs</td>
<td>815,911</td>
<td>4,209,367</td>
<td>1,387,200</td>
<td>1,428,793</td>
<td>1,617,742</td>
<td>9,459,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>25,233</td>
<td>109,009</td>
<td>55,737</td>
<td>58,503</td>
<td>39,864</td>
<td>288,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>79,538</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>920,682</td>
<td>4,318,376</td>
<td>1,442,937</td>
<td>1,487,296</td>
<td>1,657,606</td>
<td>9,826,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Management Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Closure Liability Account</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>403,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Reserve Fund</td>
<td>1,546,188</td>
<td>90,984</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>91,888</td>
<td>90,080</td>
<td>1,945,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Waste Management Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>1,949,408</td>
<td>90,984</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>91,888</td>
<td>90,080</td>
<td>2,348,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle and Equipment Reserve Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,986,141</td>
<td>953,498</td>
<td>339,417</td>
<td>1,822,384</td>
<td>850,932</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,952,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestry Reserve Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322,942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>322,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>387,744</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>973,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCCs (Restricted Revenue)</td>
<td>253,100</td>
<td>883,476</td>
<td>99,990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,236,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>46,608</td>
<td>8,924</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Sale Reserve Fund</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Drainage Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>881,692</td>
<td>1,007,400</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>2,461,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>4,033,215</td>
<td>1,922,569</td>
<td>1,841,755</td>
<td>1,428,694</td>
<td>1,526,854</td>
<td>10,753,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCs</td>
<td>289,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232,415</td>
<td>2,408,822</td>
<td>1,381,767</td>
<td>4,312,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Water Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>4,422,527</td>
<td>2,022,569</td>
<td>2,174,170</td>
<td>3,937,516</td>
<td>3,008,621</td>
<td>15,565,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>4,319,209</td>
<td>2,561,995</td>
<td>2,872,834</td>
<td>1,929,919</td>
<td>3,757,500</td>
<td>15,441,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCs</td>
<td>1,913,713</td>
<td>4,693</td>
<td>209,651</td>
<td>4,727,032</td>
<td>391,876</td>
<td>7,246,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>6,898,023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,898,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Recoveries</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>13,167,945</td>
<td>2,566,688</td>
<td>3,082,485</td>
<td>6,656,951</td>
<td>4,149,376</td>
<td>29,623,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>$32,975,310</td>
<td>$17,795,291</td>
<td>$11,352,015</td>
<td>$20,165,370</td>
<td>$13,902,247</td>
<td>$96,190,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for the year</td>
<td>11,866,697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(30,816,855)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>8,308,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gain) / Loss on sale of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds on sale of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>198,978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10,443,034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase)/Decrease in inventories of property</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase)/Decrease in prepaid expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase)/Decrease in inventories of supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net financial assets/net debt</td>
<td>(10,443,034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5701-2018-5670(1)

A Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017"

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 5670-2017";

AND WHEREAS the Council deems it desirable and in the public interest to 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 5701-2018-5670(1)."

2. "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017", is hereby amended by:

   a) redesignating portions of the following properties:

   Civic Address: 8677 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
   Legal Description: Lot 17, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 24630 Except Plan BCP45872

   Civic Address: 8653 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
   Legal Description: Lot 35, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 55248 Except Plan BCP45873

   Civic Address: 8689 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
   Legal Description: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

   Civic Address: 32661 Egglestone Avenue
   Parcel Identifier: 011-452-691
   Legal Description: Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990

   from Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area to Urban Compact and Environmentally Sensitive Area as shown on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this bylaw; and

   b) amending the official community plan maps accordingly.
READ A FIRST TIME this 22nd day of January, 2018

COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF SECTION 477 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT given this ___ day of ___, 2018

READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018

PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2018

APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2018

ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES                      MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR                            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 5702-2018-5050(276)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the following properties:

   Civic Address: 8677 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
   Legal Description: Lot 17, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 24630 Except Plan BCP45872

   Civic Address: 8653 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
   Legal Description: Lot 35, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 55248 Except Plan BCP45873

   Civic Address: 8689 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
   Legal Description: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

   Civic Address: 32661 Egglestone Avenue
   Parcel Identifier: 011-452-691
   Legal Description: Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990

   from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone

   to Multiple Family 52 Rowhouse (MR52), Residential Compact 465 (RC465), Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) and Residential Compact 372 (RC372) zones 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 22nd day of January, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2018

__________________________  __________________________
RANDY HAWES                MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR                      CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5703-2018

A bylaw to name two road extensions and one new road
within the District of Mission

WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Charter, may assign the name of any highway;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to name certain streets within the Municipality;

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 Street Naming (Machell and Carter Street Extensions, and Cunningham Avenue) Bylaw 5703-2018."

2. Two road extensions and one new road over portions of property located at:

   Civic Address: 8677 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 003-625-974
   Legal Description: Lot 17, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 24630 Except Plan BCP45872

   Civic Address: 8653 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 005-349-427
   Legal Description: Lot 35, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 55248 Except Plan BCP45873

   Civic Address: 8689 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 015-021-637
   Legal Description: Parcel “One” (Reference Plan 9952) of Lot 5, Section 29, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 665 Except Plans 24630 and BCP46102

   Civic Address: 32661 Egglestone Avenue
   Parcel Identifier: 011-452-691
   Legal Description: Lot “A” Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9990

shall be named as follows:

   a) road extending south off of Machell Street as the logical extension of Machell Street,

   b) road extending east off of Carter Avenue as the logical extension of Carter Avenue, and

   c) road extending east off of Fennell Street and north of Carter Avenue as Cunningham Avenue

as shown on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.
READ A FIRST TIME this 22nd day of January, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2018

_______________________________  _______________________________
RANDY HAWES                     MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR                           CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5691-2017-5050(270)

A 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 5691-2017-5050(270)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 30883 Silverhill Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 024 488 267
      Lot 2 Section 1 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan
      LMP41845
      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 16th day of December, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 18th day of December, 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
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5698-2017-5050(275)

A 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 5698-2017-5050(275)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 32920 Boothby Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 025-741-705
      Lot 51 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster Plan BCP7108
      from Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 22nd day of January, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this 22nd day of January, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES    MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR          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 5697-2017-5050(274)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 8597 Thorpe Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 026-786-401
      Lot 11 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
      BCP25499

      from Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 8th day of January, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this 8th day of January, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this 22nd day of January, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this 22nd day of January, 2018
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Acting Mayor Hamilton called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Late Item 4(f) “Infrastructure Planning Grant Program Applications” be added to the agenda under **Development Services**;

2. That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of January 22, 2018 be adopted, as amended.

CARRIED
3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

4. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Acting Mayor Hamilton assumed the Chair.

Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit Applications for the properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue and 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street

A report from the Senior Planner dated January 22, 2018 regarding the Official Community Plan amendment and zoning amendment for four properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street to allow for the development of up to seventy-nine dwelling units was provided for the Committee's consideration.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule a Public Hearing, subject to Council granting second reading to the related zoning amending and street naming bylaws.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed development and the Committee expressed the following comments and concerns:

- Why staff were proposing an amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP) so close to its adoption and why the proposed new designations had not been considered during the OCP review process;
- Why the developer was able to decrease the size of the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA);
- Whether staff were requiring the developer to register restrictive covenants on the properties not zoned for secondary units in order to further prohibit illegal suites;
- If visitor parking had been considered in the row house complex; and
- Parking and traffic congestion in the area due to the proposed row house complex and homes with secondary dwelling units.

The Manager of Planning provided the following information in response:

- The properties had already been redesignated as Attached Multi-Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) under the new Official Community Plan, however the developer was also proposing single-family homes for a portion of the development, which required a proposal to redesignate a portion of the property to Urban Compact. The developer felt the inclusion of single-family homes in the proposed development was appropriate as it complemented the character of the neighbourhoods to the west and northwest of the proposed development.
- The existing ESA designation was a result of past provincial legislation for watercourse protection. Under current regulations, the majority of the property was no longer considered environmentally sensitive, which was why the developer was seeking a redesignation to portions of the property. He stated that staff had
worked with the developer to maintain the spirit of the ESA throughout the property through the use of green space and pedestrian corridors.

- The developer was providing financial compensation for the loss of greenspace in the form of a pedestrian bridge that would connect the proposed new development to Tunbridge Common Park.
- There was no requirement for the developer to provide visitor parking for the row house complex as row homes are individually owned and not treated as common properties.
- Staff were not requiring the developer to register restrictive covenants to prevent illegal secondary suites on the single-family lots without the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling zoning.
- In an effort to ease parking congestion, all properties zoned for secondary dwelling units within the development would be required to provide off-street parking regardless of whether the owner intended to rent out the suite. He noted that the developer had also chosen to space out the homes with proposed secondary units in order to further reduce any potential parking congestion issues.

The Director of Development Services further noted:

- The Official Community Plan Bylaw was intended for broader land use, not specific parcels of property and that a portion of the property had already been redesignated as Attached Multi-Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area under the new Official Community Plan. Going through the amendment process allowed Mayor and Council to hear comments and concerns from residents on individual properties and also provided Council with the opportunity to support or deny specific applications.
- The best method of preventing illegal secondary dwelling units was through the enforcement of the Zoning Bylaw. He noted that staff had already received direction from Council to enforce the Zoning Bylaw with respect to secondary suites in new development projects and that, if approved, resources would be put in place to monitor secondary units within the new development.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, 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 no cash in lieu contribution for parkland applicable to the subdivision of the properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677 and 8689 Cedar Street be taken as per allowances under Section 510 of the Local Government Act and that instead the developers’ volunteered contribution be accepted and applied toward park improvements in Tunbridge Park.

CARRIED

Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 32920 Boothby Avenue

A report from the Planning Technician dated January 22, 2018 regarding a development application to rezone 32920 Boothby Avenue to allow for the construction of a secondary dwelling unit was provided for the Committee’s information.
Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for February 5, 2018, subject to Council granting second reading to the related zoning amending bylaw.

The Committee expressed concern that the addition of the secondary suite may add to parking congestion on Boothby Avenue. The Manager of Planning stated that all properties zoned for secondary dwelling were required to provide off street parking.

**Development Variance Permits for the property located at 12913 Pilgrim Street (DV17-031 & DV 17-032)**

A report from the Planning Technician dated January 22, 2018 regarding development variance permit applications that would allow for an additional storey to be constructed within an accessory building at 12913 Pilgrim Street was provided for the Committee's information.

Staff supports the applications moving forward and as such have listed the Development Variance Permits for approval under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda.

**Renewal of Temporary Use Permit TP14-003 for a Heavy Equipment Operator School to Continue Operating at the Property Located at 11750 Dewdney Trunk Road**

A report from the Planner dated January 22, 2018 regarding the renewal of a Temporary Use Permit to allow the continued operation of a trade school for an additional three years was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support the application for a Temporary Use Permit renewal for a three year term and as such, have listed the Temporary Use Permit TP14-003 for approval under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

**Update to Financial Contributions for Community Amenities Policy LAN. 40 relating to District of Mission Downtown Incentive Program**

A report from the Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated January 22, 2018 regarding proposed amendments to the Financial Contributions for Community Amenities Policy LAN. 40 was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Council expressed concern regarding the small number of business owners that had taken advantage of the Incentive Program to date. Staff were directed to research alternative methods of promotion to encourage more property owners to take advantage of the incentive program.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, and

RECOMMENDED:

That the Financial Contributions for Community Amenities Policy LAN. 40 be updated by:

1. Amending the provision identified on page 2 by changing the date by which a complete Building Permit application is received from December 31, 2016 to December 31, 2019; and

2. By replacing the following text on page 2:

   In place of the Community Amenity Contribution, a Section 219 of the *Land Title Act* covenant shall be registered on title stating that the zone amending bylaw is in place until December 31, 2018 and that if the residential units have not received a final occupancy permit by December 31, 2018, Council may consider rescinding the zone amending bylaw.
In place of any community amenity contributions volunteered as part of rezoning, a restrictive covenant shall be registered on the title of the subject development lands stipulating that “unless the building receives a final occupancy permit from the District of Mission Building Inspector on or before December 31, 2021, the developer and or property owner shall not construct or continue the construction of, and shall not occupy or use for any purpose, any building or other improvement on the lands unless contributions towards the District’s Community Amenity Contribution fund as agreed to as part of rezoning approval, which permitted the development, have been made.

CARRIED

**LATE ITEM - Infrastructure Planning Grant Program Applications**

A report from the Planner and Engineering Technologist II dated January 22, 2018 requesting Council’s endorsement for two Infrastructure Planning Grant Program (IPGP) applications was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

**RECOMMENDED:**

That the Provincial Infrastructure Planning Grant applications for the *Cedar Valley Local Area Plan – Environmental Protection and Natural Infrastructure Collaboration* and the *Soils Database and Pilot Project for Better Watermain Asset Service Life* projects be endorsed.

CARRIED

**5. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE**

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

**Award of Contract – Norrish Creek Slow Sand Filter Re-Sanding**

A report from the Director of Finance dated January 22, 2018 requesting an increase to the budget on the Norrish Creek Slow Sand Filter Re-Sanding project was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

**RECOMMENDED:**

1. That Mission’s share of the 2017 budget increase in the amount of $90,620 (total regional budget increase is $374,000), for the Norrish Creek Slow Sand Filter Re-Sanding project, be approved to be reallocated from the following available capital budgets: $46,279 from the 2017 water supply contingency budget; $16,961 from the 2017 Dickson Lake Raft Modifications; and $27,380 from the 2017 Eastern Wells Hydrogeological Studies; and

2. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

**6. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE**

Acting Mayor Hamilton assumed the Chair.
License for Use Agreement Renewal – Mission Granite Curling Club

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated January 22, 2018 regarding the License for Use Agreement between the Mission Granite Club and the District of Mission was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the License for Use Agreement between the Mission Granite Club and the District of Mission be approved for a five year period ending March 31, 2023; and
2. That Council direct execution of the License for Use Agreement.

CARRIED

Engaged Community Guide Overview and Request for Funding

A report from the Manager of Social Development dated January 22, 2018 regarding Mission’s Engaged Community Guide (ECG) pilot project was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Council support the Engaged Community Guide pilot project in Mission;
2. That a budget be established in the amount of $5,000 for this project, with funding from the Gaming Reserve Fund; and
3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

7. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Councillor Hinds assumed the Chair.

BC Hydro Beautification Fund Application Result

A report from the Manager of Engineering Planning & Design dated January 22, 2018 regarding the status of the District’s BC Hydro Beautification Fund Application was provided for the Committee’s information.

8. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Acting Mayor Hamilton resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Plecas, 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)(a) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;
   - Section 90(1)(b) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who is being considered for a municipal award or honour, or who has offered to provide a gift to the municipality on condition of anonymity;
   - Section 90(1)(c) of the Community Charter – labour relations or other employee relations;
   - 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)(k) of the Community Charter – negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public;

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 1:59 p.m.

10. RECONVENE

Acting Mayor Hamilton reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Acting Mayor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Pam Alexis
Councillor Jim Hinds
Councillor Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Danny Plecas
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Council Members Absent: Mayor Randy Hawes

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Allyssa Fischer, Administrative Assistant
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
11. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the January 22, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC18/024 to RC18/033 be adopted.

CARRIED

12. PRESENTATIONS

Certificate of Appreciation

Acting Mayor Hamilton presented the Fraser Valley Mountain Bike Association (FVMBA) with a certificate of appreciation in recognition of their hard work and dedication maintaining mountain bike trails throughout Mission and their cleanup efforts following the recent ice storm.

Rocky Blondin, Mission representative for the FVMBA, thanked Mayor and Council for acknowledging the hard work the FVMBA had put into maintaining the trails. He stated that the organization had already put in approximately 350 hours in cleanup time since the ice storm and noted that the efforts of the organization would not have been possible without the help of countless volunteers.

13. DELEGATIONS

Re: Access to 29950 and 29960 Lougheed Highway

Ryan Anderson, Project Manager at OTG Development Concepts appeared before Council to discuss the possibility of secondary access to the properties located at 29950 and 29960 Lougheed Highway. He stated that the properties had gone through a rezoning and redesignation process a few years ago to allow for the development of a gas station and restaurant facility, which had since been constructed and were in operation. He noted that the developer would now like to move forward with the planned second phase of the properties’ development, which included the possibility of creating a secondary access point located off the Lougheed Highway. He stated that the developer was requesting written endorsement from Council regarding the secondary access as the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure had indicated that support from the District would be taken into serious consideration during the decision-making process.

Discussion ensued, and Council expressed concern regarding the speed at which vehicles would be entering and exiting the Lougheed Highway to and from the development. It was noted that the developer had included 30 metre acceleration and deceleration lanes as part of the development plans, which was in excess of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s requirements.

Mr. Anderson noted that without the secondary access, the development would still move forward, but with a significantly modified second phase of development.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

1. That Council strongly support a second access to 29550 and 29960 Lougheed Highway via the Lougheed Highway and that a letter be sent to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure stating Council’s support; and

2. That the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to discharge the existing covenant at 29550 and 29960 Lougheed Highway should the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure support secondary access from the Lougheed Highway.

CARRIED
14. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5695-2017-5050(272)

R17-035 (Murdoch) – a bylaw to rezone property at 12162 Rolley Lake Street from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 12162 Rolley Lake Street from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone to facilitate a three lot subdivision and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each lot. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 008-721-742
Lot 19 Section 23 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan NWP25563

The Acting Mayor opened the public hearing.

The Manager of Planning showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Subject property map.
3. Orthophoto of the subject property.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Acting Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Acting Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5695-2017-5050(272) R17-035 (Murdoch) closed.

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5696-2017-5050(273)

R17-027 (OTG Development Concepts) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33020 Richards Avenue from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 33020 Richards Avenue from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone to facilitate a two-lot subdivision and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each lot. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 018-416-314
Lot 1 Section 4 Township 18 New Westminster District Plan LMP12027

The Acting Mayor opened the public hearing.

The Manager of Planning showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Subject property map.
4. Orthophoto of the subject property.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Acting Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.
Bob Haffner, Mission, questioned whether the property was connected to the municipal sewer system and whether a separate well or septic system was required for secondary dwelling units that were not connected to the municipal sewer system.

The Manager of Planning stated that the subject property was not connected to the municipal sewer system. He noted that the installation of wells and septic systems was under the jurisdiction of the Fraser Health Authority and that it would be up to the Authority to determine whether or not a second septic system or well would be required.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Acting Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5696-2017-5050(273) R17-027 (OTG Development Concepts) closed.

**Zoning Amending Bylaw 5697-2017-5050(274)**

R17-032 (Dhaliwal) – a bylaw to rezone property at 8597 Thorpe Street from Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 8597 Thorpe Street from the Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone to allow a secondary dwelling use in the form of a secondary suite. The subject property is legally described as:

- Parcel Identifier: 026-786-401
- Lot 11 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan BCP25499

The Acting Mayor opened the public hearing.

The Manager of Planning showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
2. Subject property map.
3. Orthophoto of the subject property.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

1. Email from Kim Johnstone dated January 22, 2018 expressing concern that allowing the secondary unit would lead to parking congestion on Egglestone Avenue.

Council briefly discussed parking congestion on Egglestone Avenue. Engineering staff were directed to look into potential parking issues on Egglestone Avenue and Fairbanks Street and determine if No Parking signs were necessary.

The Acting Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Aaron Galozo, Mission, stated that he was not opposed to the rezoning proposal, but expressed concern that more than one suite would be operating out of the property as had been the case in the past. He stated that at one point, the property had a total of 3 suites, but noted one had recently been removed due to several complaints to the Bylaw Enforcement Division.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Acting Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5697-2017-5050(274) R17-032 (Dhaliwal) closed.

**15. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES**

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and
RESOLVED: That the following minutes be received as information:
(a) Economic Development Select Committee Meeting – September 12, 2017
(b) Joint Shared Services Committee Meeting – November 9, 2017
(c) Mission Community Heritage Commission (draft) – November 15, 2017
(d) Cultural Resources Commission Meeting – November 29, 2017
(e) Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Meeting (draft) – December 7, 2017
CARRIED

16. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1) (OCP17-005 Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering), a bylaw to redesignate portions of property located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street from Attached Multi Unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area to Urban Compact and Environmentally Sensitive Area, be read a first time.

2. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5702-2018-5050(276) (R17-020 Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering), a bylaw to rezone properties located at 32661 Egglestone Avenue, 8653, 8677, and 8689 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Multiple Family 52 Rowhouse (MR52), Residential Compact 465 (RC465), Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) and Residential Compact 372 (RC372) zones, be read a first time.

3. That Street Naming (Machell and Carter Street Extensions, and Cunningham Avenue) Bylaw 5703-2018, a bylaw to name two road extensions and one new road, be read a first time.


5. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5695-2017-5050(272) (R17-035 Murdoch), a bylaw to rezone property at 12162 Rolley Lake Street from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be read a third time.

6. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5696-2017-5050(273) (R17-027 OTG Development Concepts), a bylaw to rezone property at 33020 Richards Avenue from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be read a third time.

7. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5697-2017-5050(274) (R17-032 Dhaliwal), a bylaw to rezone property at 8597 Thorpe Street from Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone, be read a third time.

8. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5387-2013-5050(124) (R13-018 Hodgson a bylaw to rezone property at 32645 Richards Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be adopted.

9. That Street Naming (Lindsay Terrace) Bylaw 5389-2013, a bylaw to name a new cul-de-sac over a portion of the property located at 32645 Richards Avenue, be adopted.

CARRIED
17. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR CONSIDERATION

Development Variance Permit DV17-031 (12913 Pilgrim Street)

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That Development Variance Permit DV17-031 (12913 Pilgrim Street) to vary Section 201 Rural Zone; Part I. Height of Buildings, Subsection 2 to increase the maximum allowable building height of an Accessory Building from a maximum of 6.0 m (19.7 ft.) to a maximum of 7.46 m (24.48 ft.) be approved.

CARRIED

Development Variance Permit DV17-032 (12913 Pilgrim Street)

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That Development Variance Permit DV17-032 (12913 Pilgrim Street) to vary Section 201 Rural Zone; Part I. Height of Buildings, Subsection 2 to allow for an additional floor within an Accessory Building be approved.

CARRIED

Temporary Use Permit TP14-003 (11750 Dewdney Trunk Road)

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds

RESOLVED: That Temporary Use Permit TP14-003 (11750 Dewdney Trunk Road) to allow for the operation of a trade school at 11750 Dewdney Trunk Road be approved.

CARRIED

18. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

Regular Council Meeting – January 8, 2018

CARRIED

19. RESOLUTIONS RELEASED FROM CLOSED

Cultural Resources Commission Appointments & Termination of Replaceable Logging Agreement

The following information was released from the Closed Council meeting held on January 8, 2018:

Cultural Resources Commission Appointments

Ms. Valerie Billesberger was reappointed to a two year term on the Cultural Resources Commission, commencing January 2018 and ending January 2020;

Ms. Deborah Handley was reappointed to a two year term on the Cultural Resources Commission, commencing January 2018 and ending January 2020;

Ms. Tara Gibson was appointed to a two year term on the Cultural Resources Commission, commencing January 2018 and ending January 2020; and

Ms. Marilyn Davidson was appointed to a two year term on the Cultural Resources Commission, commencing January 2018 and ending January 2020.
Termination of Replaceable Logging Agreement

The District of Mission has entered into a Termination of Replaceable Logging Agreement with H&C Logging Ltd.

20. NEW/ORPER BUSINESS

There was no new/other business.

21. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no notices of motion.

22. QUESTION PERIOD

Rod Tulett, Mission, expressed his appreciation for Mission’s emergency first responders. He stated that his house had recently been damaged in a fire and commended Mission Fire Rescue Service for their prompt response. He noted that the majority of the home and irreplaceable contents had been saved due to their immediate assistance. He also praised the work of Mission RCMP’s Victim Services unit, whose staff had provided him and his wife with invaluable assistance during their time of need.

Joel Kealey, Mission, appeared before Council to convey his disappointment in the recent awarding of the District of Mission Towing and Storage Contract to Jack’s Towing (2010) Ltd. He expressed concern that the contract had not been awarded to a local company and that the contract could potentially take away jobs from local Mission residents. He questioned the fairness of the District’s Request for Proposals (RFP) process.

In response to Mr. Kealey’s concerns, Acting Mayor Hamilton stated that the District had issued a public Request for Proposals for towing and storage and had received responses from three organizations. She noted that a team of professionals, including representatives from the Mission RCMP, Mission Fire/Rescue Service, Parks, Recreation and Culture, and Public Works had reviewed the submissions and determined that Jack’s Towing (2010) Ltd. was the most qualified candidate. She clarified that Mayor and Council were not involved in the RFP process, but trusted District staff to thoroughly evaluate each proposal that had been received.

The Chief Administrative Officer noted that the unsuccessful proponents had been contacted and invited to Municipal Hall for a debriefing meeting. He stated that the District had posted a statement on their website in an effort to clarify the RFP process and that the storage and towing contract had been vetted through the District’s legal team.

Mr. Kealey expressed concern that the proponent who had offered the highest bid was the one that had been awarded the contract and that the contract should have been awarded to a local towing company.

Acting Mayor Hamilton clarified that price was just one of the many criteria considered during the RFP review process. She stated that when staff had taken the full list of criteria into consideration, Jack’s Towing (2010) Ltd. had been the highest scoring proponent and was accordingly awarded the contract.

The Chief Administrative Officer stated that it was not possible for the District to close the RFP to entities from other municipalities, since in order to remain competitive, the RFP must be open to everyone.
Samantha Greenwood, Mission, stated that she worked for Mission Towing. She questioned whether the property Jack’s Towing (2010) Ltd. would be using as their vehicle storage yard in Mission was properly zoned for its intended use. She noted that the property was currently zoned as Core Commercial Waterfront, which limited automotive uses to parking lot or car rental facility. She also expressed concern that leaking oil from vehicles could contaminate the waterfront property.

The Chief Administrative Officer stated that the District would be closely monitoring the property to ensure no contamination was occurring. He also noted that storage was an acceptable use within the Core Commercial Waterfront zone.

23. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

_________________________              _________________________________
CAROL HAMILTON   MIKE YOUNIE
ACTING MAYOR      CORPORATE OFFICER
DATE: February 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Christine Brough, Executive Assistant
SUBJECT: Resolutions Released from Closed Council – January 22, 2018 Closed Meeting

This report is being provided for information purposes. Council action is not required.

At the January 22, 2018 Closed Council meeting, the following information was released from Closed Council:

- Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Appointments
  - Ed Hodson and Manpreet Brar were reappointed to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee for a further three year term (to December 30, 2020)

SIGN-OFFS:

Christine Brough, Executive Assistant

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.