Regular Meeting of Council
Agenda
March 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) Rezoning Application R17-031 from R558 to R558s for the property located at 7965 Grand Street to facilitate development of a secondary suite

   This report details the rezoning application from R558 to R558s for the property located at 7965 Grand Street to allow for rezoning of the subject property to permit the development of a Secondary Dwelling Unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

   Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5704-2018-5050(277) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

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

   (b) Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 611-1977 and Rezoning of the property located at 33333 - 12th Avenue to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone

   This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 611-1977, and to rezone the property located at 33333 12th Avenue, 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 5711-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5712-2018-5050 (281) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

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

(c) **Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 621-1977 for a property located at 33366 - 2nd Avenue to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone**

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 621-1977, for a property located at 33366 2nd Avenue which will allow the underlying Multiple-Family 52 Apartment (MA52) 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 5713-2018 under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

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

(d) **Development Variance Permit application to facilitate the construction of an accessory building with a roof-pitch less than 4:12, and a height of up to 6 metres – 12948 Sabo Street**

This report details the Development Variance Permit application to facilitate the construction of an accessory building at 12948 Sabo Street.

Staff supports the Development Variance Permit application moving forward and as such has listed it for approval under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda.

5. **CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE**

(a) **2016 - 2018 Strategic Plan Executive Summary – Progress Report as of February 17, 2018**

The purpose of this report is to provide a status update on the objectives contained within Council’s 2016-2018 Strategic Plan. No Council decision or direction is required at this time.

(b) **Council Remuneration – List of Comparator Municipalities**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Council consider and resolve:

That Campbell River, Penticton, Port Moody, Vernon and West Vancouver be used as comparator municipalities to complete the detailed comparative analysis to recommend remuneration for Council and Mayor starting in January 1, 2019 as per C-ADM.06.
6. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

   (a) **7th Avenue Bike Lanes Reconsideration**

   The report from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport, dated February 5, 2018, was brought back for reconsideration by Council, pursuant to Section 131 of the *Community Charter*.

   Mayor Hawes requested that Council reconsider resolution RC18/072; the matter of 7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application, 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.

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

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

8. **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)(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)(f) of the *Community Charter* – law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment;
      - 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.

9. RECONVENE (7:00 P.M.)

10. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

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

11. DELEGATIONS

   (a) Regina and Jerry Maslowski

       Re: secondary suite garbage collection fees

12. PROCLAMATIONS

   (a) Ukrainian Cultural Festival Day

       May 5, 2018

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS

   (a) Public Hearing Notice for March 5, 2018

       For reference

   (b) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5710-2018-5050(280)

       R17-023 (District of Mission) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33100
       Dalke Avenue from Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372) to
       Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC465s)

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

14. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

   (a) Economic Development Select Committee Meeting (Draft) –

       February 14, 2018

15. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

   (a) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5704-2018-5050(277)

       R17-031 (Fodor) – a bylaw to rezone property at 7965 Grand
       Street from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Urban

       First and Second

       Readings

       Page 204
Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling Zone (R558s)

See “Development Services” Section 4(a)

(b) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5711-2018**

A bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 611-1977 for property located at 33333 12th Avenue

See “Development Services” Section 4(b)

(c) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5712-2018-5050(281)**

LUC 18-003 (DOM) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33333 - 12th Avenue from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone (MA52)

See “Development Services” Section 4(b)

(d) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5713-2018**

A bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 621-1977 for property located at 33366 - 2nd Avenue

See “Development Services” Section 4(c)

(e) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5710-2018-5050(280)**

R17-023 (District of Mission) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33100 Dalke Avenue from Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372) to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC465s)

See Public Hearings Section 13(b)

(f) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5562-2016-5050(199)**

R16-003 (Sharp) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32385 McRae Avenue from Multiple Family 52 Townhouse Zone (MT52) to Residential Compact 465 Zone (RC465) and Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465)

Excerpt from public hearing minutes and previous staff report included as background information

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

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

16. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR CONSIDERATION

(a) **Development Variance Permit Application DV17-030 (12948 Sabo Street)**

Development Variance Permit to vary Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009, Section 102 (Definitions) by deleting the portion of the definition of Height (b) that
states: “Highest point of a Building with a flat roof or a pitch less than 4:12; shall be reduced by 3.0m with respect to the maximum permitted height within the applicable height”.

See “Development Services” Section 4(d)

17. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

RECOMMENDATION: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Regular Council Meeting – February 5, 2018 Page 228
(b) Regular Council Meeting – February 19, 2018 Page 247

18. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

19. NOTICES OF MOTION

Moved by Councillor Hamilton:

That staff investigate the feasibility of a municipal name change from the “District of Mission” to the “City of Mission” or “Mission City” and report back to Council.

20. QUESTION PERIOD

21. ADJOURNMENT
DATE: March 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Dickinson, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application R17-031 from R558 to R558s for the property located at 7965 Grand Street to facilitate development of a secondary suite
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Site Plan
Appendix 4 – Suite Floor Plan
CIVIC ADDRESS: 7965 Grand Street
APPLICANT: Rick Fodor
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Attached Multi-Unit Residential OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: August 21, 2017
LOCATION: Mission Urban
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the rezoning application from R558 to R558s for the property located at 7965 Grand Street to allow for rezoning of the subject property to permit the development of a Secondary Dwelling Unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw # 5704-2018-5050(277) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

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

SUMMARY

A development application has been received for the property located at 7965 Grand Street (Appendix 2).

The application includes the proposal to rezone the property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone to allow a secondary dwelling unit in the form of secondary suite within the single family dwelling located at 7965 Grand Street. In this case, the applicant is requesting rezoning approval to construct a secondary suite within his home, in order to co-habitate the dwelling with his son and family.

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the property’s Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Attached Multi-Unit Residential.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Site Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>7965 Grand Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Uses</td>
<td>Single Family Residential dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Area(s)</td>
<td>658 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>658 sq. m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official Community Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Attached Multi-Unit Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management</td>
<td>Located within the Mission Urban community and within the Urban Growth Boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zoning Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Urban Residential 558 Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Construction of a secondary suite within the single family dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>Single family residential development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single family residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Centennial Park (a ‘Community Park’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single family residential development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is approximately 658 sq. m. in size and is located on the west side of Grand Street within the Mission Urban community, immediately across Grand Street from Centennial Park. The existing single-family dwelling will be renovated to permit development of the proposed suite. The property slopes moderately towards the east and south. (Appendix 3).

ZONING and OCP BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009):

The subject property is currently zoned Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone with a minimum lot area of 558 square metres (6,006 sq. ft.). The subject property’s area is 658 sq. m (7,082 sq ft.). The applicant proposes to rezone the property to the R558s Zone which allows lots with a minimum size of 558 square metres 6,006 sq. ft.). The proposed R558s Zone allows for a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a coach house, garden cottage or secondary suite. In addition, one (1) parking space that is separate and unencumbered from the off-street parking of the primary residence will be provided for the proposed secondary suite. This requirement for on-site parking and is addressed whereby the proposed parking space for the secondary suite is planned for the south side of the driveway (Appendix 3).

The single family dwelling located on the subject property and adjacent homes on properties fronting Grand Street in this block are well-maintained and not considered to be candidates for redevelopment to a higher density at this time. While this proposal does not provide for substantial residential densification, it provides an acceptable form of infill redevelopment with an additional housing unit. This form of ‘gentle densification’ will contribute to affordable housing until multiple, adjacent properties between Orchid Drive and 14th Avenue can be assembled for redevelopment to a higher density with townhouses or rowhouses.
PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Character

The proposed rezoning for a secondary suite at 7965 Grand Street will not visually impact the adjacent urban single family neighbourhood as the proposed secondary dwelling unit is to be located within the existing dwelling. Adjacent properties to the west are designated Urban Residential, with similar lot areas. Some properties in the surrounding neighbourhood are zoned for and contain secondary suites. The proposed development is unobtrusive and consistent with the neighbourhood density and character. This proposal will contribute to Mission’s OCP housing affordability objectives with the addition of one secondary suite.

Access and Servicing

The subject property is located very close to a bus stop at the south-west corner of Grand Street and 14th Avenue, providing direct and convenient transit service for local residents.

Tree Retention

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of 2 trees for each of the residential dwelling units created.

Parks and Trails

The subject property is located directly across Grand Street from Centennial Park, which is an 8.6 ha (21.8 acre) community park containing forested areas, a playground, running paths, a lacrosse box and 3 tennis courts. The 2009 Parks, Trails & Bicycle Master Plan recommended upgrading for this park to include washrooms, play structures for young children, and other recreational features.

COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development. Provided a public hearing date is determined by Council, the sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 152 metres (500 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages

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

Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

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

REFERRALS

Mission Fire/Rescue Service

The Mission Fire/Rescue Service has no comments for this proposal.

Building Division

The Building Division comments as follows:

- The furnace room is not common space and needs to be separated out from the lower floor with a rated fire separation;
• The suite takes most of the basement area. The owner should provide calculations to show compliance with the floor area (requirements of the Zoning Bylaw);
• Permit required to upgrade the suite to code minimums.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING

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

1. In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of 2 trees for each of the residential dwelling units created.
2. The servicing requirements, as outlined in Appendix 5 have been addressed to the satisfaction of the District Engineer.
3. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Dickinson, Planner
Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.

Reviewed by:
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 7965 Grand Street

PID: 011-790-695

Legal: Lot 1 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 78716
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 7965 Grand Street
Owner: Trevor & Megan McBride
Applicant: Rick Fodor
Zoning: R558
OCP Designation: Urban Compact - Multiple Family
Appendix 3

Site Plan
Appendix 4
Secondary Suite Floor Plan

[Diagram of Secondary Suite Floor Plan with labels such as Bedroom, Living Room, Entry Door, Path, Dining Room, Kitchen, and Suite Area.]
DATE: March 5, 2018  
TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner  
SUBJECT: Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 611-1977 and Rezoning of the property located at 33333 12th Avenue to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) 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: Attached Multi-unit Residential  
Appendix 5 – Land Use Contract (LUC): 611-1977  
Appendix 6 – Underlying Zone: Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone  
Appendix 7 - Recommended Zone: Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone  
CIVIC ADDRESS: 33333 12th Avenue  
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) 611-1977, and to rezone the property located at 33333 12th Avenue, 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 5711-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5712-2018-5050(281) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for March 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 a termination Bylaw and associated Zoning Amending Bylaw in accordance with the approved process.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

Staff have reviewed the current land uses, Use Contract (LUC) 611-1977, the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw in relation to the subject property.

The review finds:

**Current Land Use**

The subject property is currently occupied by a three storey Apartment and surface Parking Lot.

**Official Community Plan**

The subject property is designated Attached Multi-unit Residential (Appendix 4) in the Official Community Plan. This designation envisions multi-storey buildings near commercial nodes and key destinations, this includes: apartments, townhouses, rowhouses and duplexes.

**Land Use Contract**

LUC 611-1977 (Appendix 5) was approved on October 3, 1977 and permits “the construction of a 59 suite apartment complex comprising the following:

- 39 – two bedroom suites
- 20 – one bedroom suites

with parking facilities and play areas.
Zoning Bylaw

A comparison of the regulations contained within the LUC and Zoning is provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Use Contract: 611-1977</th>
<th>Zoning Bylaw: Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses (Principal Uses)</td>
<td>Apartment Complex</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (Minimum)</td>
<td>1.11 ha (2.75 ac)</td>
<td>0.2 ha (0.5 ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (minimum)</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Depth (minimum)</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>32.6m (107 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>7.62m (25 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>7.62m (25 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>51.8m (170 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (Maximum)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Ratio</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (Principal Building)</td>
<td>3 stories, spread over 5 levels</td>
<td>11.0m (36.1 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Maximum)</td>
<td>59 units on 2.75 acres = 52 units per hectare (21 units per acre)</td>
<td>52 units per hectare (21 units per acre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff are not aware of any known implications associated with the recommended zoning of the subject property to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone (Appendix 6).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5711-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5712-2018-5050 (281) because:

- existing development on the property consists of an Apartment. This type of development is generally in conformance with the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Attached Multi-unit Residential. An OCP Amendment is not required.
- the existing Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone does not provide similar permitted uses and related land use regulations to those found in LUC 611-1977; and
- the recommended Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone provides similar permitted uses and regulations to those found in LUC 611-1977.
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 January 18, 2018 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 611-1977 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. All property owners and occupiers directly affected by LUC 611-1977 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. At the public information meeting, staff did not receive any written comments regarding 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

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

1. The in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5711-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5712-2018-5050 (281) will be one year from the final adoption date of the Bylaw. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address:</th>
<th>33333 12\textsuperscript{th} Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID:</td>
<td>003-413-071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>Lot 546 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 63811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Land Use Contract: 611-1977
Subject Property: 33333 12th Avenue
Owner: NPR GP Inc.
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.

Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
Intergovernmental Relations and Planning
PO Box 9841 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9T2
Phone: (250) 356-1128
Fax: (250) 387-6212
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>Attached Multi-unit Residential</td>
<td>• Multi storey buildings near commercial nodes and key destinations.</td>
<td>• Multi-unit Residential.</td>
<td>• 0.5 to 1.0 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes apartments, townhouses, rowhouses, and duplexes.</td>
<td>• Accessory commercial (associated with a residential care facility).</td>
<td>20-80 units/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heights are limited to 3 storeys (taller and varied building heights, and</td>
<td>• Home occupation, live/work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ground floor commercial, may be possible through a neighbourhood plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Compact</td>
<td>• Small lot residential and infill residential.</td>
<td>• Residential</td>
<td>• 0.5 to 0.75 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heights are limited to 2 storeys (3rd storey is possible within the</td>
<td>• Residential with accessory units with appropriate zoning.</td>
<td>20-36 units/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roofline)</td>
<td>• Home occupation, live/work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>• Traditional single detached residential with provision for accessory units.</td>
<td>• Residential</td>
<td>• 0.5 to 0.75 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Infill residential</td>
<td>• Residential with accessory units with appropriate zoning.</td>
<td>10-22 units/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heights are limited to 2 storeys (3rd storey is possible within the</td>
<td>• Home occupation, live/work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roofline)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.1: Land Use Designations (continued)*
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DISTRICT OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 611 - 1977

A By-law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mr. Richard Francis Schmidt & Mr. John Raymond Schmidt.

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. 20 By-law No. 246 - 1979" declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

The whole of the areas within the boundaries of the Municipality which is divided into zone designations and all of the zones as designated by "The District of Mission Zoning By-law No. 91 - 1971" and amendments thereto, save and except those areas described in the following By-laws:

Development Area No. 3 By-law No. 95 - 1971
Development Area No. 4 By-law No. 108 - 1971
Development Area No. 5 By-law No. 109 - 1971
Development Area No. 7 By-law No. 141 - 1971
Development Area No. 8 By-law No. 142 - 1971
Development Area No. 9 By-law No. 143 - 1971
Development Area No. 10 By-law No. 144 - 1972
Development Area No. 11 By-law No. 145 - 1972
Development Area No. 15 By-law No. 155 - 1972
Development Area No. 16 By-law No. 156 - 1972
Development Area No. 17 By-law No. 159 - 1972
Development Area No. 19 By-law No. 211 - 1972

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the "Municipal Act" for a Land Use Contract to construct a 59 suite apartment complex containing 39 two bedroom units plus 20 one bedroom units.

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 3rd day of August, 1977 with respect to the said application;

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

1. This By-law may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 611 - 1977.

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 Mr. Richard Francis Schmidt & Mr. John Raymond Schmidt to construct a 59 suite apartment complex containing 39 two bedroom units plus 20 one bedroom units.

Lot 413, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 42955, N.W.D.

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 apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 6th day of September, 1977.

READ A SECOND TIME this 19th day of September, 1977.

READ A THIRD TIME this 19th day of September, 1977.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 3rd day of October, 1977.

[Signatures]

MAYOR

CLERK
I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing

to be a true and correct copy

of "District of Mission Land

Use Contract By-law No. 611 -

1977".

CLERK
December 1st 1977

District of Mission
Box 20
Mission, B.C.

Dear Sirs:

Land Use Contract

Schmidt: Richard & John
By-Law #811-1977

We wish to confirm that the above was duly registered in the Land Registry Office, New Westminster, B.C. on November 29th 1977 under application No2401 the Land Registry stamped copy attached hereto.

We confirm having ordered a Certificate of Encumbrances and will forward a copy of the same to you as soon as received by us.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

R.A. MARTINEAU

RAM/sc
Encl.
LAND USE CONTRACT No. 67

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 29th day of November, 1977.

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation, duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, of Box 20, Mission City, British Columbia.

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

OF THE FIRST PART

AND:

Richard Francis Schmidt
Suite "F"
22359 Lougheed Highway
Maple Ridge, B.C.
V2X 2T3

John Raymond Schmidt
Suite "F"
22359 Lougheed Highway
Maple Ridge, B.C.
V2X 2T3

(hereinafter called "THE DEVELOPER")

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the Municipality, pursuant to Section 702A 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 thereupon the use and development of the land shall be in accordance with the land use contract:

AND WHEREAS the "Municipal Act" requires that the Municipal Council consider the criteria set out in Section 702 (2) and 702A (1) in arriving at the terms, conditions and consideration contained in a land use contract:

AND WHEREAS the Developer has presented to the Municipality a scheme for use and development of the within described lands and premises that would be in contravention of a by-law of the Municipality or Sections 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act" or both, and has requested that the Council of the Municipality enter into this contract under the terms, conditions and for the consideration hereinafter set forth:
AND WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, having given
due consideration to the criteria set forth in Section 702 (2) and
702A (1) of the "Municipal Act", have agreed to the terms, conditions
and consideration herein contained.

AND WHEREAS if the land is within a radius of one-half mile
of the intersection of a controlled access highway and another highway,
the approval of the Minister of Highways to the terms hereof must be
obtained.

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both ack-
nowledge 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 these lands and premises situate
lying and being in the ___________________ of
MISSION ___________________, in the Province of British Columbia,
and being more particularly known and described as:

LAND

Lot 413, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 42955, K.W.D.

(Hereinafter 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 prefacing
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, thereafter 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 plans set out in Schedule "C" hereto.

7. All buildings and structures shall be constructed strictly in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

8. All landscaping, surface treatments, fences and screens shall be constructed, located, provided and maintained in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

9. All utilities, including water, sewer, gas, 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 "H" 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 "H" hereto, the entire cost of the development of the land including the provision of all works and services and (including Municipal Inspection fees) and the provision 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, save and except gas and electricity, 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 dedicated or required to be dedicated, or upon rights-of-way granted or required to be granted 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, becomes 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 and 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 hereto.

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
normal building permit fee 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 $18,650.00 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 by 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".

19. Whenever the singular or masculine is used herein, the
same shall be construed as meaning the plural, feminine or body
corporate or politic where the context or the parties so require.

20. All references to a by-law mean a By-law of the Municipality
(whether or not so stated herein). All by-laws referred to, or
applicable in this contract, shall be the most recent by-law enacted,
with the most recent amendments thereto, effective on the date of the
public hearing for this Land Use Contract.
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Should the proposed development not be completed by the stated date, the Municipality may require that new or amended by-laws become effective where applicable.

21. The drawings (if any) referred to on Schedule "A" of this contract (herein referred to as the Drawings) shall form part of this contract as if embodied herein; additional and/or working drawings shall also form part of this contract if approved by the Municipality.

Wherever and whenever works and services are required to be constructed to Municipal requirements or reference is made to engineering drawings they shall be prepared by a Professional Engineer registered to practise in British Columbia; the said drawings shall be submitted by the Developer for approval by the Municipality as if they were being submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Subdivision Control By-law.

22. This agreement shall ensure 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 on 3rd August, A.D. 1977.

This agreement was approved on the 3rd day of October, A.D. 1977 by By-law No. (411-1977).

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:

[Seal]

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

Name
Address
Occupation

[Signature]

[Signature]
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 35th day of August, 1977, at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, whose identity has been proved by the evidence on oath of , who is) personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the Deputy Clerk of the District of Mission, and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Deputy Clerk of the said District 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 35th day of August, one thousand nine hundred and seventy seven.

[Signature]

A-Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia,
A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.

AFFIDAVITY OF WITNESS

Province of British Columbia

To Wit:

I, Beson Nell of Maple Ridge, of the Municipality of Maple Ridge, 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 Francis Schmidt and John Schmidt, the parties thereto, for the purposes named therein.

2. The said instrument was executed at Maple Ridge.

3. I know the said parties, and that they are 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 Maple Ridge, in the Province of British Columbia, this 35th day of August, 1977.

[Signature]

A-Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia,
A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.
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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>
</table>

R. S.
LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 67

CONSENT

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that, 

of 

being the holder of a charge by way of 

registered at the Land Registry Office at 

under number 

against all and singular that certain parcel of tract of land and 

premises being in the 

of 

in the Province of 

British Columbia and known and described as 


in consideration of the sum of ONE DOLLAR ($1.00) hereby agrees and consents to the registration of a Land Use Contract made between the registered owner of the said lands and the 

dated the _____ day of ______________________ A.D. 19___ 

against the aforementioned lands in priority to the said charge in the same manner and to the same effect as if it had been dated and registered prior to the said charge.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED at 

British Columbia, this _____ day of ___________ 19___ 
in the presence of:

Name ____________________________
Address __________________________
Occupation _______________________
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "A"

Schedule of permitted land use.

The construction of a 59 suite apartment complex comprising the following:

39 - two bedroom suites
20 - one bedroom suites

with parking facilities and play areas as set out in subsequent schedules of this contract, all sometimes referred to herein as the development, and in accordance with the drawings numbered and entitled below.

LUC 67-1 Site Plan, Unit Plan.
LUC 67-2 Floor Plans.
LUC 67-3 Elevations, Cross Section.
LUC 67-4 Landscape Site Plan.
LUC 67-5 Landscape Grading Plan and Drainage Site Plan.
LUC 67-6 Landscape Details, as prepared by David C. Gibbon and Associates, Landscape Architects and dated June 15, 1977.
LUC 67-7 General Layout, as prepared by Malenco Engineering Services Ltd., and dated
LUC 67-8 Subdivision Sketch Plan, as prepared by Ron Hoffart, Architect and dated June 24, 1977.

It is acknowledged that the drawings mentioned in schedules A-K are preliminary and that minor changes may be necessary to suit actual site conditions and C.N.H.C. requirements.

Such changes are to be made with the agreement of the Municipality.
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SCHEDULE "B"

Plot Plan and Specifications:

Site Area 2.75 acres

Yards front 107 feet
rear 25 feet
side 25 feet west side
170 feet east side

Site Coverage 21,560 square feet

Height of Building and Structures

Maximum 3 stories, spread over 5 levels

Minimum

Floor Space Ratio Residential floor area not to exceed 0.6 times the lot area.

Minimum Floor Area

Number of Units 59 units

Plan
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**LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 67**

**SCHEDULE "G"**

**Off Street Parking:**

- **Total Area:** 22,680 square feet
- **Number of Spaces:** 84 spaces
- **Size of Spaces:** 9 x 20
- **Surfacing:** Asphalt or Cement
- **Lighting:** To British Columbia Hydro Specifications
- **Signs:** As per Municipal Sign By-law No. 451-1968
- **Access:** From street on south side to be dedicated and constructed.

**Off Street Loading:**

- **Total Area:** Not Applicable
- **Size of Area**
- **Location**
- **Surfacing**
- **Lighting**
- **Signs**
- **Access**
- **Plan**

**Refuse Disposal:** Provisions for refuse disposal shall be made to Municipal requirements.
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SCHEDULE "D"

Signs: To requirements of District of Mission Sign By-law No. 451-1968.

Number

Types

Location

Design

Size

Plan

Buildings & Structures:

Plans As shown on the Drawings and upon working drawings to be submitted prior to the time of application for a building permit.

Specifications

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:

Plans As per submitted plan

Specifications To be maintained in a neat and tidy manner for a period of one year from date of completion. The materials to be used shall be as shown on the landscape plan submitted. On-site grading at property lines abutting on Horne Street and street to be dedicated and constructed shall be graded to conform to District of Mission Subdivision Control By-law No. 337-1974.
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LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 67

SCHEDULE "E"

Utilities:

Water: The water system shall be as schematically shown on Drawing 67-7, it being understood and agreed that the Municipality will, at the cost of the Developer, supply and install the connection from the proposed replacement main referred to in Schedule "I", so that it is clear of curbing and paving as proposed on Horne Street. Connections to the Development shall be provided by the Developer who shall allow space inside the buildings in a location to be approved by the Municipality for a water-meter; the Developer shall make provision for remote read-out as to Municipal requirements.

Sewer: The sewerage system shall be as schematically shown on Drawing 67-7.

Specifications and Drawings: Engineering drawings shall be submitted. All work shall conform to the requirements of the Subdivision Control By-law, except as particularly otherwise stated herein.
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SCHEDULE "F"

Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways and Drainage:

Road Construction: 12th Avenue shall be fully constructed to the limit shown on Drawing 67-7, including drainage, curbs, paving and boulevard grading. The design of the future of 12th Avenue shall be established to the intersection of 12th Avenue and Dunsmuir Street. The boulevard grading only shall be completed for the westerly portion as shown.

Horne Street: It is understood and agreed that upon request in writing by the Municipality the Developer will contribute $5,000.00 towards the cost of increasing the paved width on Horne Street between 11th and 14th Avenues from 24 feet to 36 feet and the provision of suitable curbing, on the understanding that

(a) the Municipality shall complete the said works on Horne Street within the guarantee period provided for under the terms of this contract for the construction of 12th Avenue.

(b) the Municipality shall make a request in writing for said payment not less than 30 days prior to the end of the said guarantee period.

(c) that the said $5,000.00 shall be a proper charge against any letter of credit held by the Municipality in connection with this contract.

Street Lighting: To Subdivision Control By-law requirements.

Traffic Signs: Road names and traffic signs shall be installed.

Specifications and Drawings: Engineering drawings shall be submitted. All work shall conform to the requirements of the Subdivision Control By-law, except as particularly otherwise stated herein.
A right-of-way shall be granted in favor of the municipality for drainage purposes for the drainage system on these lands.
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SCHEDULE "H"

Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities For Development Use Only:

Construction

Location

Size

Development

Furnishing

Plans

Children's play area, badminton court and barbecue, to be located in the north east corner of the parcel to an area size of 160 feet x 120 feet. Smaller play area to be located in front of the south west corner of the apartment building as schematically shown on Drawing 67-A.
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SCHEDULE "I"

Development and Service to be provided or paid for by the Municipality.

Water
The Municipality shall replace the 6-inch wooden water main with a new 8-inch water main on Home Street between 11th and 14th Avenues, provided that the Developer shall contribute $10,000 towards the cost of the work (including an allowance of 15 percent for engineering).

Sewer
The Municipality shall increase the sewer capacity on Taullirat Street between manholes 282 and 284 and on 7th Avenue between manholes 144 and 206 (an approximate distance between manholes of 700 feet) by installing twin sewers and additional manholes, provided that the Developer shall contribute up to $25,000 towards the cost of the work (including an allowance of 15 percent for engineering).
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SCHEDULE "J"

Works and services to be Maintained by the Developer

For a period of 24 months (the guarantee period) after their acceptance by the Municipality, the Developer shall maintain those works and services that he has constructed either on the Land or upon the existing highways that have become the property of the Municipality; the manner and extent of such maintenance shall be as provided by the Municipal Subdivision By-law.
LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 67

SCHEDULE "K"

Performance Security:

The performance security shall be a letter of credit in a form acceptable to the Municipality in the amount of $5,000 (the Development Security) for the construction of the Development plus the amount approved by the Municipal Engineer for the construction of the works and services referred to in Schedule L, (the Security Deposit)

The Development Security shall be deposited with the Municipality by the Developer not later than 7 calendar days after the adoption of the By-Law authorizing this contract and prior to the time the Mayor and Clerk sign this contract on behalf of the Municipality. The Security Deposit shall be deposited with the Municipality within the time limited in Schedule L; otherwise this contract shall be at an end and the Development Security shall be forfeited, unless the Council of the Municipality by resolution extend the said time.

The letter of credit for the Security Deposit shall be reduced by 80 percent when the said works and services have been accepted by the Municipal Engineer.

One quarter of the balance (5 percent) of the Security Deposit shall be released when as constructed drawings, service record cards and the works have been accepted by the Municipal Engineer. The balance of the unused portion shall be released not later than 50 days after the end of the guarantee period.

It is understood and agreed that upon request by the Developer in writing the Development Security may be considered to be the security deposit required in connection with a building permit on the land; it is further understood and agreed that when an occupancy permit issued by the Building Inspector and the landscaping completed that the Development Security shall be released to the Developer alone unless he instructs the Municipality otherwise in writing.

Each reduction in the amount of the letter of credit shall be requested in writing by the Developer.
LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 67

SCHEDULE "L"

Times of Construction:

The Developer shall commence construction of the works included in Schedules E and F within 120 days of being notified in writing of the signing of this contract by the Municipality in accordance with the following schedule:

(a) Engineering drawings to be submitted to the Municipal Engineer within 60 calendar days,

(b) The Municipal Engineer shall review said drawings and return them to the Developer within a further 30 calendar days,

(c) The Developer shall submit to the Municipal Engineer his Engineer's estimate of the cost of the works within a further 15 days in a form and amount acceptable to the Municipal Engineer,

(d) The Developer shall submit a letter of credit in the amount of 100 percent of the Developer's estimate (or contract price) for the works as approved by the Municipal Engineer within 7 calendar days of being advised that the Developer's estimate of the cost of the work is acceptable to the Municipality.

The said works shall be completed by December 31, 1977 and the Development shall be completed by June 30, 1978 save and except that reasonable extension shall be granted from time to time due to force majeure, including but not limited to strikes, lockouts (other than by the Developer alone), unusual weather and site conditions and other circumstances beyond the control of the Developer (save and except financing) or acts of God. The Developer shall promptly apply for any such extension of time upon the occurrence of any of the foregoing events.

It is understood and agreed that the Developer shall make application for a building permit not later than September 30th, 1977.
A By-law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mr. Richard Francis Schmidt & Mr. John Raymond Schmidt.

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. 20 By-law No. 246 - 1973" declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

The whole of the areas within the boundaries of the Municipality which is divided into zones designations and all of the zones as designated by "The District of Mission Zoning By-law No. 91 - 1971" and amendments thereto, save and except those areas described in the following By-laws:

Development Area No. 3 By-law No. 95 - 1971
Development Area No. 4 By-law No. 108 - 1971
Development Area No. 5 By-law No. 109 - 1971
Development Area No. 7 By-law No. 141 - 1971
Development Area No. 8 By-law No. 142 - 1971
Development Area No. 9 By-law No. 143 - 1971
Development Area No. 10 By-law No. 144 - 1971
Development Area No. 11 By-law No. 145 - 1972
Development Area No. 12 By-law No. 155 - 1972
Development Area No. 13 By-law No. 156 - 1972
Development Area No. 17 By-law No. 159 - 1972
Development Area No. 19 By-law No. 211 - 1972

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the "Municipal Act" for a Land Use Contract to construct a 59 suite apartment complex containing 39 two bedroom units plus 20 one bedroom units.

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 3rd day of August, 1977 with respect to the said application;

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

1. This By-law may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 611 - 1977.

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 Mr. Richard Francis Schmidt & Mr. John Raymond Schmidt to construct a 59 suite apartment complex containing 39 two bedroom units plus 20 one bedroom units.

Lot 413, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 42955, N.W.D.

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 apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 6th day of September, 1977.

READ A SECOND TIME this 19th day of September, 1977.

READ A THIRD TIME this 19th day of September, 1977.

RECONSIDERED AND UNDERTAKEN ADOPTED this 3rd day of October 1977.

[Signatures]

MAYOR

CLERK
I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 611 -

[Signature]

CLBRK
A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of these zones is to provide one Single Family Dwelling in the Urban Residential area and compatible accessory uses. The R930, R669, R558, and R465 zones have different parcel sizes.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the R930, R669, R558, and R465 zones:
   a. Residential limited to:
      i. One Single Family Dwelling.

2. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the R930, R669, R558, and R465 zones:
   a. Agriculture limited to:
      i. Hobby Greenhouse.
   b. Residential limited to:
      One of:
      i. Bed and Breakfast, or
      ii. Boarding Use, or
      iii. Residential Care.
      And,
      iv. Detached Garage,
      v. Home Occupation.
   c. Storage limited to:
      i. Enclosed Storage.
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>R930</td>
<td>930 sq m (10,010 sq ft)</td>
<td>18.0 m (59.05 ft)</td>
<td>30.0 m (98.42 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R669</td>
<td>669 sq m (7,201 sq ft)</td>
<td>18.0 m (59.05 ft)</td>
<td>30.0 m (98.42 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R558</td>
<td>558 sq m (6,006 sq ft)</td>
<td>18.0 m (59.05 ft)</td>
<td>30.0 m (98.42 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type I</td>
<td>558 sq m (6,006 sq ft)</td>
<td>16.0 m (59.05 ft)</td>
<td>30.0 m (98.42 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type II*</td>
<td>465 sq m (5,005 sq ft)</td>
<td>16.0 m (52.49 ft)</td>
<td>25.0 m (82.02 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the R465 zone, a maximum of 40% of the total Lots in any one development may be a Type II Lot.

2. Notwithstanding Section 501, 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 501, 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.

4. Bare Land Strata:
   a. Except as otherwise provided, the determination of all regulations shall mean within the each proposed Bare Land Strata Lot.
   b. Each Bare Land Strata Lot shall conform to the minimum Lot Area provisions of the applicable zone.
D. Setbacks

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

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

2. Notwithstanding Section 501, Part D.1, where a lot existed prior to October 2009, all Buildings and Structures shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum Setbacks:

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

3. Notwithstanding Section 501, 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).

4. The Front Yard Setback of the Principal Building may be reduced to a minimum of 4.0 m (13.2 ft) provided the Front Yard Setback of a garage is a minimum of 6.0 m (19.7 ft).

5. Notwithstanding Section 501 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.

6. Notwithstanding Section 501 Part D.1, the Buildable Area of any Lot shall be a minimum 150 sq m (1,614.6 sq ft).

7. Notwithstanding Section 501 Part D.1, Buildings and Structures on Corner Lots shall be setback a minimum of 1.5 m (4.9 ft) in addition to the minimum Exterior Side Lot Line setback.

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>R930</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R669</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R558</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type I</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type II</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 501, Part E.1, where a Lot in the Urban Residential area existed prior to 1980 and has a Lot Area less than 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.), the Lot Coverage may be increased to 45%.
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 (Garage space, detached or attached, is not used in calculating total floor area):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Floor Space Ratio</th>
<th>Maximum Floor Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R930</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>511 sq m (5,500 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R669</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>362 sq m (3,897 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R558</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>353 sq m (3,800 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type I</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>353 sq m (3,800 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type II</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>334 sq m (3,595 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.

3. Notwithstanding Section 501, Part F.1, where a Lot in the Urban Residential area existed prior to 1980 and has Lot Area less than 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.), the Floor Space Ratio may be increased to 0.70.

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>R930</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R669</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R558</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type I</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R465 – Type II</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.
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).

J. Off Street Parking

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

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

3. Access to the lot, from the Front Lot Line, for Off Street Parking 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 within the R558 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 Residential Care Use, 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.
SECTION 703  MULTIPLE FAMILY APARTMENT ZONES

Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone  MA52
Multiple Family 80 Apartment Zone  MA80
Multiple Family 135 Apartment Zone  MA135

A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of these zones is to provide medium to high density Apartment Buildings in an urban setting with compatible accessory uses. The MA52, MA80, and MA135 zones all have different maximum densities.

   a. The intent of the MA52 zone is to allow 3 storey Apartment Buildings.

   b. The intent of the MA80 zone is to allow up to 4 storey Apartment Buildings.

   c. The intent of the MA135 zone is to allow up to 4 storey Apartment Buildings.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the MA52, MA80, and MA135 zones:

   a. Residential limited to:

      i. Apartments.

2. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the MA52, MA80, and MA135 zones:

   a. Institutional limited to:

      i. Child Care Centre.

   b. Residential Uses limited to:

      i. Home Occupation,
      ii. Indoor Amenity Space, and
      iii. Outdoor Amenity Space.

   c. Storage limited to:

      i. Enclosed Storage.
C. Lot Area

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

2. Notwithstanding Section 703, 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 703, 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 shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Maximum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA52</td>
<td>52 upha (21 upa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>80 upha (32 upa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>135 upha (54 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>Principal Building</td>
<td>7.5 m (19.7 ft)</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building/Structure</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
<td>1.5 m (4.9 ft)</td>
<td>1.5 m (4.9 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 703 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>MA52</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. 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 (Neither indoor amenity space nor parking spaces, are used in calculating total floor area):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA52</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Principal Building</th>
<th>Indoor Amenity Building</th>
<th>Accessory Building/Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA52</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>13.0 m (42.7 ft)</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>15.0 m (49.2 ft)</td>
<td>13.0 m (42.7 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Indoor Amenity Space

1. Developments that contain 25 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 may 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 provided at a rate of at least 50 sq m (549 sq ft) per unit.

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

3. 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. 75% of the required resident parking spaces must be provided as underground parking or as parking within the *Building* envelope.
DATE: March 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 621-1977 for a property located at 33366 2nd Avenue to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) 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: Attached Multi-unit Residential
Appendix 5 – Land Use Contract (LUC): 621-1977
Appendix 6 – Underlying Zone and Recommended Zone: Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33366 2nd Avenue
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) 621-1977, for a property located at 33366 2nd Avenue which will allow the underlying Multiple-Family 52 Apartment (MA52) 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 5713-2018 under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for March 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 a termination Bylaw and associated Zoning Amending Bylaw in accordance with the approved process.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

Staff have reviewed the current land uses, Land Use Contract (LUC) 621-1977, the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw in relation to the subject property.

The review finds:

**Current Land Use**

The subject property is currently occupied by a three storey Apartment and surface Parking Lot.

**Official Community Plan**

The subject property is designated Attached Multi-unit Residential (Appendix 4) in the Official Community Plan. This designation envisions multi-storey buildings near commercial nodes and key destinations, this includes: apartments, townhouses, row-houses and duplexes.

**Land Use Contract**

LUC 621-1977 (Appendix 5) was approved on October 17, 1977 and permits “a 33 suite apartment complex containing the following: 5 – two bedroom units and 28 – one bedroom units”.

**Underlying Zoning Bylaw**

The underlying Zoning of the subject property is Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5713-2018 because:

- existing development on the property consists of an Apartment. This type of development is generally in conformance with the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Attached Multi-unit Residential. An OCP Amendment is not required.
- The underlying Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone provides similar permitted uses and regulations to those found in LUC 621-1977
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 January 18, 2018 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 621-1977 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. All property owners and occupiers directly affected by LUC 621-1977 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. At the public information meeting, staff did not receive any written comments regarding 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

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

1. The in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5713-2018 will be one year from the final adoption date of the Bylaw. 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
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Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 33366 2nd Avenue

PID: 005-379-041

Legal: Lot 529 District Lot 411 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 55798
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Land Use Contract: 621-1977
Subject Property: 33366 2nd Avenue
Owner: Asoke & Hilda Dutt
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).
- 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](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>Attached Multi-unit Residential</td>
<td>• Multi storey buildings near commercial nodes and key destinations&lt;br&gt;• Includes apartments, townhouses, rowhouses, and duplexes&lt;br&gt;• Heights are limited to 3 storeys (taller and varied building heights, and ground floor commercial, may be possible through a neighbourhood plan)&lt;br&gt;• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Multi-unit Residential&lt;br&gt;• Accessory commercial (associated with a residential care facility)&lt;br&gt;• Home occupation, live/work</td>
<td>• 0.5 to 1.0 FSR&lt;br&gt;• 20-80 units/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Compact</td>
<td>• Small lot residential and infill residential&lt;br&gt;• Heights are limited to 2 storeys (3rd storey is possible within the roofline)&lt;br&gt;• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Residential&lt;br&gt;• Residential with with accessory units with appropriate zoning&lt;br&gt;• Home occupation, live/work</td>
<td>• 0.5 to 0.75 FSR&lt;br&gt;• 20-36 units/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>• Traditional single detached residential with provision for accessory units&lt;br&gt;• Infill residential&lt;br&gt;• Heights are limited to 2 storeys (3rd storey is possible within the roofline)&lt;br&gt;• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Residential&lt;br&gt;• Residential with with accessory units with appropriate zoning&lt;br&gt;• Home occupation, live/work</td>
<td>• 0.5 to 0.75 FSR&lt;br&gt;• 10-22 units/ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.1: Land Use Designations (continued)*
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DISTRIBUTION OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 621 - 1977

A By-law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Dr. A. K. Dutt

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. 20 By-law No. 246 - 1973" declared the following described land to be a Development Area:-

The whole of the areas within the boundaries of the Municipality which is divided into zone designations and all of the zones as designated by "The District of Mission Zoning By-law No. 91 - 1971" and amendments thereto, save and except those areas described in the following By-laws:-

- Development Area No. 3 By-law No. 95 - 1971
- Development Area No. 4 By-law No. 108 - 1971
- Development Area No. 5 By-law No. 109 - 1971
- Development Area No. 7 By-law No. 141 - 1971
- Development Area No. 8 By-law No. 142 - 1971
- Development Area No. 9 By-law No. 143 - 1971
- Development Area No. 10 By-law No. 144 - 1972
- Development Area No. 11 By-law No. 145 - 1972
- Development Area No. 15 By-law No. 155 - 1972
- Development Area No. 16 By-law No. 156 - 1972
- Development Area No. 17 By-law No. 159 - 1972
- Development Area No. 19 By-law No. 211 - 1972

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the "Municipal Act" for a Land Use Contract to construct a 33 suite apartment complex containing 5 two bedroom units plus 28 one bedroom units.

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 12th day of September, 1977 with respect to the said application;

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

1. This By-law may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 621 - 1977."

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 Dr. A. K. Dutt to construct a 33 suite apartment complex containing 5 two bedroom units plus 28 one bedroom units, on the following described lands:

Lot 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, Block 74 of District Lot 411, Group 1, Plan 664, 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 apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 19th day of September, 1977

READ A SECOND TIME this 19th day of September, 1977

READ A THIRD TIME this 19th day of September, 1977

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 17th day of October, 1977.

[Signature] [Signature]
MAYOR CLERK
I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 621 - 1977".

CLERK
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LAND USE CONTRACT No. 71

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 7th day of October, 1977.

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation, duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, of Box 20, Mission City, British Columbia,

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

AND:

ASOK KUMAR DUTT
24280 River Road
Maple Ridge, B.C.

AND

NIHLA DUTT
24280 River Road
Maple Ridge, B.C.

(hereinafter called "THE DEVELOPER")

OF THE FIRST PART

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the Municipality, pursuant to Section 702 A of the "Municipal Act", may, notwithstanding any by-law of the Municipality, or Section 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act", enter into a land use contract containing such terms and conditions for the use and development of land as may be agreed upon with a developer, and thereafter the use and development of the land shall be in accordance with the land use contract:

AND WHEREAS the "Municipal Act" requires that the Municipal Council consider the criteria set out in Section 702 (2) and 702 (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 described lands and premises that would be in contravention of a by-law of the Municipality or Sections 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act" or both, and has requested that the Council of the Municipality enter into this contract under the terms, conditions and for the consideration hereinafter set forth:
AND WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, having given
due consideration to the criteria set forth in Section 702 (2) and
702A (1) of the "Municipal Act", have agreed to the terms, conditions
and consideration herein contained.

AND WHEREAS if the land is within a radius of one-half mile
of the intersection of a controlled access highway and another highway,
the approval of the Minister of Highways to the terms hereof must be
obtained.

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both ack-
nowledge 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:

1. The Developer is the owner of these lands and premises situate
lying and being in the ___________________________ of
District ___________________________ in the Province of British Columbia,
and being more particularly known and described as:
 Lots 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, Block 74 of District Lot 411, Group 1,
 Plan 664, New Westminster District

(hereinafter called "THE LAND")

2. The Developer has obtained the consent of all persons having
a registered interest in the land as set out in the schedule preceding
the consents to the use and development set forth herein which consents
are attached hereto.
3. The land, including the surface of water, and any and all buildings and structures erected thereon, theretofore or therein shall be used for the purpose specified in Schedule "A" hereto and for none other.

SYRING

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.

SIGNS

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.

PARKING

6. Off street parking and loading spaces shall be provided, located and constructed in accordance with the plans set out in Schedule "C" hereto.

CONSTRUCTION

7. All buildings and structures shall be constructed strictly in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

8. All landscaping, surface treatments, fences and screens shall be constructed, located, provided and maintained in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

UTILITIES

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 "D" hereto.

HIGHWAYS

10. All highways, bridges, lanes and walkways, including drainages, 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 "D" hereto.
11. All parks, public space, playgrounds, or other facilities, to be dedicated in the location plan or otherwise provided, shall be provided, constructed and developed in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "A" hereto.

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

13. Except as specifically provided in Schedule "D" hereto, the entire cost of the development of the land including the provision of all works and services and (including Municipal Inspection fees) and the provision 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, save and except gas and electricity, 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 dedicated or required to be dedicated, or upon rights-of-way granted or required to be granted 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 "D" hereto, the Municipality shall, from the date of acceptance, becomes 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 and 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, Appendix 9, Municipality with the security set out in Schedule "L" hereto to guarantee performance hereto.

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 normal building permit fee 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 $10,850.00 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 by 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".

19. Whenever the singular or masculine is used herein, the same shall be construed as meaning the plural, feminile or body corporate or politic where the context or the parties so require.

20. All references to a by-law mean a By-law of the Municipality (whether or not so stated herein). All by-laws referred to, or applicable in this contract, shall be the most recent by-law enacted, with the most recent amendments thereto, effective on the date of the public hearing for this Land Use Contract.
Should the proposed development not be completed by the stated date, the Municipality may require that new or amended by-laws become effective where applicable.

21. The drawings (if any) referred to in Schedule "A" of this contract (herein referred to as the Drawings) shall form part of this contract as if embodied herein; additional and/or working drawings shall also form part of this contract if approved by the Municipality.

Moreover and whenever works and services are required to be constructed to Municipal requirements or reference is made to engineering drawings they shall be prepared by a Professional Engineer registered to practise in British Columbia; the said drawings shall be submitted by the Developer for approval by the Municipality as if they were being submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Subdivision Control By-law.

22. This agreement shall ensure 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 on ______________.

Day of ____________________________, A.D. 19____.

This agreement was approved on the ______________ day of ____________________________, A.D. 19____ by By-law No. ______________.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties to this agreement have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

THE CORPORATE SEAL OF ______________
was affixed in the presence of:

__________________________
__________________________

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

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
Occupation: ____________________________

(Witness as to both signatures)
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICE OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the day of , 19 ,
at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia,
whose identity has been proved by the evidence on oath of
who is personally known to me, appeared before me and
acknowledged to me that he is the Deputy Clerk
of the District of Mission, and that he is the person
who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Deputy Clerk
of the said District 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 in the Province of British Columbia, this day of , one thousand nine hundred and seventy .

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, IDA WILLIAMSON, of the Municipality of Maple Ridge
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 ASHOK KUMAR DAVE & NILIMA DAVE
the parties thereto, for the purposes named therein

2. The said instrument was executed at Maple Ridge, B.C.

3. I know the said parties , and that they 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 Maple Ridge,
this 29th day of August , 1977 .

A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia,
A Commissioner for taking Affidavits within British Columbia.
Schedule of Permitted Land Use.

The construction of a 33 suite rental apartment consisting of the following:

28 - one bedroom units
5 - two bedroom units

Mandatory off-street parking spaces in accordance with the Drawings prepared and entitled by Frank Sleigh, Architect and numbered by the Municipality.

Drawing 71-1 - Main floor
71-2 - 2nd & 3rd floor
71-3 - Parking
71-4 - Elevation
71-5 - Stairs and suite plan
71-6 - Basement
71-7 - Roof and landscaping

and drawings prepared and entitled by Barlow & Boom Limited (their drawing number 3D77 sheets 1 to 7) and numbered by the Municipality.

Drawing 71-8 - Footings
71-9 - Structural details
71-10 - Retaining walls
71-11 - Plumbing
71-12 - Electrical
71-13 - Electrical layout and parking level
71-14 - Site grading and drainage

Hereinafter referred to as the Drawings together with working drawings to be submitted.

It is understood and agreed that the building elevations shall be adjusted to suit the soil/silt elevations referred to in Schedule "F".
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LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 71

SCHEDULE "C"

off Street Parking:

Total Area
10,880 square feet

Number of Spaces
33 underground - 9 open spaces

Size of Spaces
9 x 20 feet

Surfacing
Asphalt or concrete

Lighting
To B.C. Hydro and Power Authority specifications

Signs
To By-law 451-1968

Access
From 2nd Avenue. It is understood and agreed that the lane shall be restricted to one way southbound until such time that the lane is widened to permit two way traffic; the developer shall post adequate directional signs within the parking area of the development for traffic control.

Off Street Loading:

Not applicable

Refuse Disposal:

Provision for refuse disposal shall be made to suit municipal requirements. The locations of refuse containers shall be shown on the working drawings to be submitted for approval.
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LAND USE

SCHEDULE "D"

To requirements of District of Mission Sign By-law No. 451-1968.

Buildings and Structures:

Plans: As shown on the drawings and upon working drawings to be submitted prior to the time of application for a building permit.

Building Grade

The parking floor level of the Development shall be adjusted to suit the grading of the sidewalk to be constructed on Second Avenue and the future lane that may be constructed opposite the south property line of the land on the adjoining land lying to the south of the Land.

The retaining wall (shown as A on Schedule D-1) to be constructed on the land along the south property line, and the retaining wall forming the west wall of the Development (shown as B on Schedule D-1) shall be constructed sufficiently deep to permit the construction of the future lane without interference to the said retaining walls.

The Developer shall cause the necessary site survey to be made and shall submit his preliminary design to the Municipal Engineer for the walls and the parking floor elevations for approval prior to making application of a building permit for the development. The Developer shall submit engineering drawings for the said retaining walls with his application for building permit.

The Developer shall grant to the Municipality a right-of-way for road widening in its usual form to permit the Municipality or others on its behalf to either (a) extend the retaining wall (shown as C on Schedule D-1) to be constructed by the Developer along the south property line of the Land westwards or (b) to form a sloped bank.

Specifications: Unless otherwise approved by the Municipal Engineer in writing, roof drainage shall be designed to retain rainfall on the roof to reduce peak flow rates to the drainage system.

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:

Plans Specifications

As per drawings submitted

To be maintained in a neat and tidy manner for a period of one year from date of completion. The materials to be used shall be as shown on the Landscape Plan submitted.

On site grading at property line abutting on 2nd Avenue to be graded to conform to the Municipal Subdivision Control By-law No. 337-1974 as amended by the requirements of Schedule F.
Appendix 5

Municipal Utilities:

Water: 8-inch main to be installed on 2nd Avenue from Horne to Catherwood, together in one fire hydrant

Sewer: Twin sewer between Manholes 64 and 64A

Specifications: Municipal Subdivision Control By-law, and/or site specific requirements required by the Municipality

Public Utilities:

Gas: Not applicable

Electric: Not applicable

Telephone: Not applicable

Development Services:

Water: To normal municipal requirements, including 6-inch connection for future unmetered fireline, and for metered domestic purposes; meter to be located in general storage area with access allowed to the Municipality for maintenance and inspection; Meter to be provided by the Municipality at usual municipal conditions; Developer to provide for remote readout to a location approved by the Municipality. Notwithstanding that a 6-inch fireline is provided it is understood and agreed that the building has been designed not to require a sprinkler system for fire protection, and that it is provided only in case of changes to code requirements.

Sewer: To usual municipal requirements.

Drainage: Connection to a manhole referred to in Schedule F by Municipality at cost of Developer.

Gas: If required to requirements of B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.

Electricity: Underground by dip service off a pole approved by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.

Telephone: Underground by dip service off a pole approved by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.
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LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 71

SCHEDULE "F"

Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways and Drainage:

Curbs and Gutters: Construct sidewalk of width not less than 5 feet and curb and gutter across the frontage of the Lands on Second Avenue, complete with let downs and curb returns.

Curb and gutter shall be set to match elevation of sidewalk on north side of the street, modified to eliminate local irregularities.

Paving: Pave and or repave 2nd Avenue across the frontage of the Lands to complete and blend the existing paving to the new curb and gutter. Pave the Lane to be created in Schedule 6.

Roadway Lighting: Not applicable.

Boulevards: Boulevard on the south side of 2nd Avenue opposite the Lands shall be landscaped by grass or other surfacing approved by the Municipality.

Road and Traffic Signs: As required for the Lane to restrict traffic to one-way southebound.

Retaining Wall: The Developer shall slope the adjoining property to the grade of the Lane; he shall obtain the permission of the Owner in writing and furnish a copy to the Municipality; or with the approval of the Municipality he shall construct a retaining wall designed by a professional engineer.

Drainage: The Municipality at cost of the Developer to install manhole on existing drainage system on 2nd Avenue (and not at the location shown on the Drawings) to which the Lands shall be connected.

Snow Removal: The Developer shall install heating cable in the Lane for snow removal and one or more catchbasins in the Lane near the south east corner of the Building. He shall install two catchbasins on the south side of 2nd Avenue near the east and west property lines at locations approved by the Municipal Engineer.

Specifications: Except as otherwise specified above all works shall conform to Subdivision Control By-law requirements in accordance with engineering drawings to be submitted, or if agreed with the Municipality in accordance with engineering drawings prepared by the Municipality.
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Subdivision Plans:

Parcels:

Area

Shape

Dimensions

Highways:

Dimensions

Location

Alignment

Gradient

Rights of Way:

Consolidation of parcels into one lot of approximately 17,390 square feet

135 feet x 132 feet approximately

Dedication of a 15 foot lane on the east side of the parcel, widening to 45.1 feet on a 30 foot right curve at the south end of the lane as shown on Drawing 71-7, herein referred to as the lane.

The Developer shall grant to the Municipality a right of way in a form acceptable to the Municipality for drainage purposes.
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SCHEDULE "H"

Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities:

Not applicable
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LAND USE CONTROL No. 71

SCHEDULE "A"

Development and Service to be provided or paid for by the Municipality.

The Municipality will provide the additional funds over and above the amount specified in Schedule K for the construction of the following municipal services:

(a) Replacement and extension of watermain, 2-inch diameter on 2nd Avenue between Horne and Catherwood Streets, including firehydrants and service connections, and

(b) Twinning of the sanitary sewer on Horne Street south from Second Avenue between Manholes 64 and 64A.

It is also understood and agreed the Municipality will prepare the engineering drawings for the said works.
Works and Services to be Maintained and Operated by the Developer

The Developer shall operate and maintain the heating cable to be installed in the lane for snow removal together with catchbasins draining the lane unless and until the Municipal Council authorizes an alternative arrangement.
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LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 21

SCHEDULE "K"

Security:

The Security to guarantee the performance of this contract shall be one or more letters of credit in a form acceptable to the Municipality in the amount of $1,000 (the Development Security) for the construction of the Development plus the amount estimated by the Municipal Engineer (but not to exceed $20,000) for sewer and water works specified in Schedule E as Municipal Utilities for the construction of off-site works referred to in Schedules E and F (the Security Deposit).

The Development Security shall be deposited with the Municipality by the Developer not later than 7 calendar days after the adoption of the By-law authorizing this contract and prior to the time the Mayor and Clerk sign this contract on behalf of the Municipality.

The Security Deposit shall be deposited with the Municipality within the time set out in Schedule L; otherwise this contract shall be at an end and the Development Security shall be forfeited, unless the Council of the Municipality by resolution extend the said time. It is also understood and agreed that the Architects drawings would then become the property of the Municipality to the same extent that the Municipality had itself authorized their preparation.

The letter of credit for the Security Deposit shall be reduced upon request in writing by the Developer when any phase of construction has been completed to the satisfaction of the Municipal Engineer. The phases of the construction are (1) water system and (2) sewerage system, drainage system, and roadworks including pavement and crushed gravel, placement of curb and gutter, sidewalks, paving, boulevard work and everything else necessary under the terms of this contract.

The amount of the reduction shall be 80 percent of the amount provided for that phase if the work is approved by the Municipal Engineer.

One quarter of the balance (5 percent) of the Security Deposit shall be released when as constructed drawings, service record cards and the works have been accepted by the Municipal Engineer. The balance or the unused portion shall be released not later than 50 days after the end of the guarantee period.

It is understood and agreed that the Development Security shall be considered to be the security deposit required in connection with a building permit on the land; it is further understood and agreed that when an occupancy permit is issued by the Building Inspector and the landscaping completed that the Development Security (or any remaining portion thereof) shall be released to the Developer alone unless he instructs the Municipality otherwise in writing.
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The Developer shall commence construction of the works included in Schedules E and F within 120 days of being notified in writing of the signing of this contract by the Municipality in accordance with the following schedule:

(a) Engineering drawings to be submitted to the Municipal Engineer within 60 calendar days,

(b) The Municipal Engineer shall review said drawings and return them to the Developer within a further 30 calendar days,

(c) The Developer shall submit to the Municipal Engineer his estimate of the cost of the works within a further 15 days in a form and amount acceptable to the Municipal Engineer,

(d) The Developer shall submit a letter of Credit in the amount of 100 percent of the Developer's estimate (or contract price) for the works as approved by the Municipal Engineer within 7 calendar days of being advised that the Developer's estimate of the cost of the work is acceptable to the Municipality, provided that the letter of credit shall not exceed the amount specified in Schedule K, plus $8,000.

The said works shall be completed by June 30th, 1978, save and except that reasonable extension shall be granted from time to time due to force majeure, including but not limited to strikes, lockouts (other than by the Developer alone), unusual weather and site conditions and other circumstances beyond the control of the Developer (save and except financing) or acts of God. The Developer shall promptly apply for any such extension of time upon the occurrence of any of the foregoing events.

The Developer shall make application for a building permit within 15 days of being notified in writing of the signing of the contract and shall allow 7 days for its issuance. It is understood and agreed that no occupancy permit will be issued until the works specified in Schedules E and F have been completed, unless Council authorizes in writing.
A By-law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Dr. A. K. Dutt

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. 20 By-law No. 246 - 1973" declared the following described land to be a Development Area:-

The whole of the areas within the boundaries of the Municipality which is divided into zone designations and all of the zones as designated by "The District of Mission Zoning By-law No. 91 - 1971" and amendments thereto, save and except those areas described in the following By-laws:-

- Development Area No. 3 By-law No. 95 - 1971
- Development Area No. 4 By-law No. 108 - 1971
- Development Area No. 5 By-law No. 109 - 1971
- Development Area No. 7 By-law No. 141 - 1971
- Development Area No. 8 By-law No. 142 - 1971
- Development Area No. 9 By-law No. 143 - 1971
- Development Area No. 10 By-law No. 144 - 1972
- Development Area No. 11 By-law No. 145 - 1972
- Development Area No. 15 By-law No. 155 - 1972
- Development Area No. 16 By-law No. 156 - 1972
- Development Area No. 17 By-law No. 159 - 1972
- Development Area No. 19 By-law No. 211 - 1972

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the "Municipal Act" for a Land Use Contract to construct a 33 suite apartment complex containing 5 two bedroom units plus 28 one bedroom units.

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 12th day of September, 1977 with respect to the said application.

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

1. This By-law may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 621 - 1977."

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 Dr. A. K. Dutt to construct a 33 suite apartment complex containing 5 two bedroom units plus 28 one bedroom units, on the following described lands:

   Lot 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, Block 74 of District Lot 411, Group 1, Plan E6A, 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 apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 19th day of September, 1977

READ A SECOND TIME this 19th day of September, 1977

READ A THIRD TIME this 19th day of September, 1977

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 17th day of October, 1977.
A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of these zones is to provide medium to high density Apartment Buildings in an urban setting with compatible accessory uses. The MA52, MA80, and MA135 zones all have different maximum densities.

   a. The intent of the MA52 zone is to allow 3 storey Apartment Buildings.

   b. The intent of the MA80 zone is to allow up to 4 storey Apartment Buildings.

   c. The intent of the MA135 zone is to allow up to 4 storey Apartment Buildings.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the MA52, MA80, and MA135 zones:

   a. Residential limited to:

      i. Apartments.

2. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the MA52, MA80, and MA135 zones:

   a. Institutional limited to:

      i. Child Care Centre.

   b. Residential Uses limited to:

      i. Home Occupation,
      ii. Indoor Amenity Space, and
      iii. Outdoor Amenity Space.

   c. Storage limited to:

      i. Enclosed Storage.
SECTION 703

C. Lot Area

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

2. Notwithstanding Section 703, 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 703, 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 shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Maximum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA52</td>
<td>52 upha (21 upa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>80 upha (32 upa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>135 upha (54 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>Principal Building</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.7 ft)</td>
<td>(24.6 ft)</td>
<td>(24.6 ft)</td>
<td>(24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building/Structure</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.6 ft)</td>
<td>(14.8 ft)</td>
<td>(4.9 ft)</td>
<td>(4.9 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 703 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>MA52</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. 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 (Neither indoor amenity space nor parking spaces, are used in calculating total floor area):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone:</th>
<th>Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA52</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Principal Building</th>
<th>Indoor Amenity Building</th>
<th>Accessory Building/Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA52</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA80</td>
<td>13.0 m (42.7 ft)</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA135</td>
<td>15.0 m (49.2 ft)</td>
<td>13.0 m (42.7 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Indoor Amenity Space

1. Developments that contain 25 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 may 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 provided at a rate of at least 50 sq m (549 sq ft) per unit.

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

3. 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. 75% of the required resident parking spaces must be provided as underground parking or as parking within the *Building* envelope.
DATE: March 5, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Development Variance Permit application to facilitate the construction of an accessory building with a roof-pitch less than 4:12, and a height of up to 6 metres
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Site Plan
Appendix 4 – Proposed Building Elevations
Appendix 5 – Draft Development Variance Permit
CIVIC ADDRESS: 12948 Sabo Street
APPLICANT: Steve Thomas
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current (current OCP designation) OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 1, 2018
LOCATION: Steelhead
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the Development Variance Permit application to facilitate the construction of an accessory building at 12948 Sabo Street.

Staff supports the Development Variance Permit application moving forward and as such has listed the Development Variance Permit application, for approval under the Development Permits for consideration section of the agenda.

SUMMARY

A development application has been received from Steve Thomas, for the property located at 12948 Sabo Street (Appendix 2). This application for a variance to the District’s Zoning Bylaw is to facilitate the development of an accessory building with a roof pitch less than 4:12 and a height of up to 6 meters.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is approximately 2 hectares (4.95 acres) in size and is located on Sabo Street approximately 270 metres (885 feet) north of its intersection with Smith Avenue. There is an existing single-family dwelling in the south-west quarter of the property. The accessory building is proposed for the south-west quarter of the property. The property slopes gently to the north-west. District mapping identifies a watercourse located on an adjacent property to the south and south-west, approximately 50 metres (165 ft.) from the location of the proposed accessory building (Appendix 3).

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

The applicant proposes to vary one section of the District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009

1. Section 102 (Definitions) by:

   a) deleting the portion of the definition for Height (b) that states:

   highest point of a Building with a flat roof or a pitch less than 4:12, shall be reduced by 3.0m with respect to the maximum permitted height within the applicable height.

The RU16s zoning allows for an overall height of 6.0m (19.7 ft) for an accessory building compared to the proposed height of 5.79m (19 ft); however, the Zoning Bylaw definition of height reduces the overall allowable height by 3.0m (9.8 ft) if the roof pitch is less than 4:12. The applicant has proposed a roof with a pitch of 1:12.

The owner has explained that his intention is to store a recreational vehicle (RV), seadoo and various other recreational vehicles in the proposed building. Staff supports the variance because the proposed building does not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6.0m (19.7 ft) and due to the property owner’s request to store over-sized vehicles inside rather than the current situation which causes the property owner to store his vehicle outside.

COMMUNICATION

A notice of the Development Variance Permit application was mailed or otherwise delivered in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw and the Local Government Act. At the time of preparation of this report, no comments were received in response to the notification.
INFORMATIONAL NOTES

1. Approval of Development Variance Permit DV17-030 can be considered at the March 5, 2018 Regular Council meeting.

SIGN-OFFS:

Ken Bourdeau, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
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Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 12948 Sabo Street
PID: 017-373-417
Legal: Lot 2 Section 28 Township 18 New Westminster District Plan LMP515
Appendix 2

Subject Property: 12948 Sabo Street
Owner: Steve & Trudy Thomas
Applicant: Steve Thomas
Zoning: RU16s
OCP Designation: Rural
THE CONTRACTOR (BUILDER) IS HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR CHECKING AND VERIFYING ALL DIMENSIONS ON THIS DRAWING. ANY DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE REPORTED IMMEDIATELY TO J HALL DRAFTING & DESIGN FOR CORRECTIONS AND / OR INTERPRETATION.

COPYRIGHT. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART IS PROHIBITED. THIS DRAWING AS AN INSTRUMENT OF SERVICE IS THE PROPERTY OF J HALL DRAFTING & DESIGN AND MAY NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THIS OFFICE.

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

STAMP: 28091 58th Ave. Abbotsford, B.C., V4X 2P2, j_hall@telus.net

DRAWN BY:  CHECKED BY:  SCALE:  DATE:  CUSTOMER:  ADDRESS:  PLAN #
DISTRICT OF MISSION  
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV17-030  

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act  

Issued to:  Steven & Trudy Thomas and Charles Thomas & Alisha Ehlers  
12948 Sabo Street, Mission, BC  V4S 1L6  

as the registered owner (hereinafter referred to as the Permittee) and shall only apply to ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the Municipality of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and more particularly known and described as:  

Parcel Identifier: 017-373-417  
Lot 2 Section 28 Township 18 New Westminster District Plan LMP515  

1. The said lands are zoned Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) 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) By deleting the portion of the definition of Height (B) that states:  
      Highest point of a Building with a flat roof or a pitch less than 4:12; shall be reduced by 3.0m with respect to the maximum permitted height within the applicable height  
3. This Permit does not constitute a subdivision approval or a building permit.  

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. [Click here to type resolution number] passed by the Council on the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month], [Click here to type year].  

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Development Variance Permit is hereby issued by the Municipality signed by the Mayor and the Corporate Officer the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month], [Click here to type year].  

__________________________  
Randy Hawes,  
MAYOR  

__________________________  
Michael Younie,  
CORPORATE OFFICER  

Development Variance Permit DV17-030
The purpose of this report is to provide a status update on the objectives contained within Council’s 2016-2018 Strategic Plan. No Council decision or direction is required at this time.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide a status update on the objectives contained within Council’s 2016-2018 Strategic Plan.

BACKGROUND:
Council’s Strategic Plan was adopted at the June 20, 2016 Regular Meeting of Council. It was agreed that staff would report out to Council every 4 months. The status of the various objectives contained within the plan, as of February 17, 2018, is shown in attached Appendix A. Subject to Sections 90 and 92 of the Community Charter, matters that are currently being addressed in Closed Council are not detailed in the 2016 - 2018 Strategic Plan Executive Summary document.

Items previously moved to the objectives completed tracking list can be found in Appendix B for Council’s convenience.

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

COMMUNICATION:
A progress report on the objectives contained within Council’s Strategic Plan will be provided in this format three times each year, in February/March, June and October.

SIGN-OFFS:

Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed by: Kris Boland, Director of Finance
Strategic Plan – Progress Report

Objective 1: Enhanced Lifestyle Opportunities and Community Health

Objective 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop master plan for parks, facilities and trails, including Fraser River Heritage Park and Experience the Fraser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning  ☐ Operations  ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Complete Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Access to facilities, activities, and outdoor spaces for people living with disabilities and for individuals facing economic challenges. Staff have been directed to develop TOR for Council and community review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

Status
The draft report has been provided to Council and was the subject of a Special Council meeting that was held on Wednesday, February 7 and reconvened on February 8th. The report and the recommendations are being edited based on the discussions and direction from Council.

Next Steps
There will be a Community Open House on Saturday, March 10, 2018 from 11 am to 2 pm at the Mission Leisure Centre.

Budget
The original schedule has been extended and this may result in additional costs beyond the $99,000 originally budgeted.
# Objective 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop neighbourhood area plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plans complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Information:**
Area-specific planning must fit into the comprehensive vision for the community and support the OCP. Hatzic, Cedar Valley, Stave Falls are priorities. There are varying degrees of area-specific planning. “Neighbourhood Plans” are comprehensive plans where everything from servicing, road layouts, land uses, densities and design guidelines are planned. “Local Area Plans” are generally, less specific and typically look at roads and servicing.

---

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
A parks planning consultant recently facilitated a ‘Parks, Natural Areas and Schools’ workshop and provided guidance on park planning including new park categories, trail connections for consideration with Cedar Valley. Background research work including mapping of development applications has been mostly completed and will serve as a foundation for the next work stage that will explore road and infrastructure servicing options. Early investigations related to engineering infrastructure planning for this project revealed that the scope of work that will be undertaken with the current staff resources allocated to this project may be strained due to competing priorities, such as the twining of the sanitary river crossing. While further details will be provided after reconciliation between staff resources and this project’s deliverables, it is likely that an extension to the timeline may be needed.

**Next Steps**
Detailed engineering modelling and GIS mapping work will be coordinated to produce optional servicing plans that will illustrate different road and servicing alignments. This next stage of work will be to develop options for block plans to determine appropriate recommendations for road and servicing locations, the trail and cycling network, road classifications and design criteria (taking into account on-street parking, traffic calming, cycling lanes and infrastructure. Associated with this will be the evaluation and awarding of the environmental consultant contract that will report on natural areas and trail/infrastructure design and location criteria. All the findings will inform the design process for infrastructure and roads (the ‘block plans’) which will be incorporated within the draft and final Cedar Valley Local Area Plan.

**Budget**
The budget for this project has been identified at an amount up to $75,000 (funded by the General Fund Accumulated Surplus). Currently, $5,000 has been used for the services of parks planning consultants who assisted staff with the November 22, 2017 Parks, Natural Areas and Schools Workshop and report. Approximately $30,000 will be utilized for engineering servicing infrastructure design for infrastructure and road corridors and transportation planning issues. $15,000 will be allocated for an environmental consultant to prepare a report with recommendations on the composition of environmentally sensitive designated areas and criteria for trail and green infrastructure development in development site buffer areas and in ESA locations. A Provincial Infrastructure Planning Grant has been applied for in order to offset this expense to a maximum of $10,000. The residual budget amount is allocated for staff and consultant work as needed to complete the project.
## Objective 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Expand recreation and activity space and programming for all ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Expanded space and programming in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Committee to engage stakeholders including youth, families, and seniors currently active in existing facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
In addition to the seniors housing project staff are investigating the opportunity to expand specific programs into the Heritage Park Centre facility. During the Master Plan process, opportunities were identified to better use the fitness and home economics areas in the Centre.

**Next Steps**
Develop program opportunities at Heritage Park Centre.

**Budget**
No budget has been identified to-date.
### Objective 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Work with the Mission Seniors Centre Association to review and develop enhanced facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Operations  ☐ Planning  ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Feasibility study complete including draft architectural plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Pending the review of the previous plan this project may refocus on expanding the existing seniors activity centre and could potentially explore multigenerational use in support of strategy 1.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
Council have directed staff to work with MASH to determine the feasibility of constructing a multiuse seniors housing and community centre space. The development of this project will provide additional community space for a variety of leisure and recreational pursuits for seniors as well as the broader community.

**Next Steps**
Meet with MASH representatives to develop a project scope and schedule.

**Budget**
Council have indicated that the District will provide $2.5 million towards this project.
## Objective 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Engage neighbourhoods on needs for parks infrastructure, programming, and community development potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Planning ☐ Operations ☒ Advocacy □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Community-driven model established with ideally one neighbourhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
The Master Plan process is ongoing and the planned Open House will result in additional neighbourhood specific opportunities and recommendations. There are over a hundred recommendations to-date that staff will be reviewing.

**Next Steps**
Create an Implementation Plan based on the recommendations included in the 2017-2018 Parks, Recreation Arts + Culture Master Plan.

**Budget**
A budget has not yet been set for these projects.
### Objective 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategy:</strong></th>
<th>Determine role of District regarding downtown renewal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>☑ Planning  ☒ Operations  ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline:</strong></td>
<td>Immediate – Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Clearly defined relationship between DBA and DOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information:</strong></td>
<td>Clarity is needed on the role of the municipality in facilitating ongoing enhancements in Downtown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE MARCH 6, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.**
Objective 1.6

| Strategy: | Advocate for West Coast Express and transit connections to Maple Ridge as part of a regional service enhancement |
| Category: | ☒ Advocacy, ☐ Planning, ☐ Operations |
| Timeline: | 2016-2017 |
| Outcomes: | Improved regional transportation and connections to Maple Ridge and Vancouver |
| Background Information: | N/A |

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
Discussed with Translink and MOTI (BC Transit) staff at UBCM in September 2017. The Province has not acted on the District’s request.

**Next Steps**
Translink has similar concerns around inequity in cost sharing and will work with Mission to present a common argument to the Province. A draft letter has been produced and is being reviewed and added to by Translink.

**Budget**
While there may be positive budget implications as a result of this initiative, there are no known implications at this time.
### Objective 1.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Attract and promote the development of treatment and housing facilities in Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning  ☐ Operations  ☒ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>New facilities established in Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
Council has provided a letter of support in principle for the project. Staff met with BC Housing to discuss the letter but no formal response has been received to date. BC Housing is working on securing a property.

**Next Steps**
Finalize the location and enter into a MOU with BC Housing on how to proceed. It is hoped construction will start later in 2018.

**Budget**
The District will need to donate or buy the land for this project.
### Objective 1.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategy:</strong></th>
<th>Ensure free parking at the Mission Memorial Hospital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>☑ Planning       ☐ Operations       ☒ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline:</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Free parking agreement extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
The District has made its concerns known to FHA about maintaining free parking at the hospital on several occasions.

**Next Steps**
Some additional parking has been created at the hospital but, to date, free parking is still available. FHA committed to letting the District know in advance should a decision to remove free parking be imminent.

**Budget**
There are no budget implications to the District at this time.
## Objective 2: Improved Public Safety

### Objective 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Staff to prepare a report to address safety concerns related to grow-ops and following Council direction to implement program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning  ☐ Operations  ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Inspection program in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Report to address permits, remediation, inspections, and post-legalization steps to ensure safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
The sale and production of marihuana anywhere within Mission has been prohibited.

**Next Steps**
Staff are working on a report that will summarize existing issues and new regulations for both recreational and medical marihuana. Council will be providing direction on a number of issues including how the provincial regulations will be implemented in Mission once the federal legislation is in place in July 2018.

**Budget**
There will likely be budget implications associated with this work but they are not known at this time.
## Objective 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Implement RCMP initiatives including HUB, growth metrics, and Public Safety Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Programs in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background Information:
- Coordinated crime reduction strategy by creating a community "Hub" committee to address crime, homelessness, drug addiction and disorder.
- Standing growth metrics for Regular Members and Municipal Employees based on population growth and calls for service. Create a Council chaired Public Safety Committee to increase communication and coordination amongst departments and stakeholders.
- To be initiated following adoption of strategic plan.

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

#### Status
As of December 31, 2017 Mission RCMP’s FTE Utilization rate was 50.68 which places us near our full strength of 52 members. Throughout 2017 we were able to maintain staffing levels near our full Utilization rate. A member of our Senior Management Team, Sgt. Jeff Scott has been promoted and transferred to Chilliwack Detachment. Sgt. Scott was in charge our Plain clothes Units and POST Team. We will be welcoming Sgt. Mitch Fox from Ridge Meadows Detachment as his replacement in March.

Mast has been in place for approximately the last seven months. We are now in a position to conduct a review to determine the effectiveness of MAST and what, if any, changes should be made going forward.

Public Safety Committee – Since my last update I have researched how Burnaby’s Public Safety Committee is run as it was indicated that Mission would model their Committee on Burnaby’s. A memo was drafted and provided to the CAO on February 13, 2018 to discuss what I had learned. It is still under review.

#### Next Steps
1. MAST review to be conducted in partnership with Kirsten Hargreaves. Timeline for completion - May 2018.
2. Consult with Council as to the interest of forming a Public Safety Committee in Mission, based on the information that was provided to the CAO.

#### Budget
Now that training for MAST has been completed, no further funding is required at this time.
The Public Safety Committee is not anticipated to have any financial impacts.
**Objective 2.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Advocate for improved ambulance response times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning   ☐ Operations   ☒ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>Immediate - Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Ambulance available within Municipal boundaries at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
### Objective 3: Excellence in Financial Management and Planning

#### Objective 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Update DCC Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016 – early 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>DCC Bylaw updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Must ensure future infrastructure funding is adequate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
First draft of comprehensive DCC Background Report and proposed DCC rates are scheduled to be presented to Council at a Special Meeting on March 12, 2018.

**Next Steps**
Following the presentation of the draft report on March 12, any required revisions will be made, and then next steps include stakeholder consultation, first three readings of the bylaw, Ministry approval of the proposed bylaw, and final bylaw adoption by Council.

**Budget**
The project is expected to complete approximately $15,000 under budget, although that depends on any additional tasks that may arise following Council’s direction at the March 12, 2018 Special Council Meeting.
Objective 3.1

| Strategy: | Review business license fees and relate them to the costs driven by each category of business |
| Category: | ☐ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy |
| Timeline: | 2 years |
| Outcomes: | Fees updated following report to Council and formal resolution |
| Background Information: | N/A |

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

Status
The District retained C. Boehringer and Associates to complete the Business Licence Regulation and Fee Review project. Upcoming project milestones are noted in the table below. Consultation is well under way with all stakeholders identified to date. A communications plan has been drafted and a business survey will be posted on the District’s website. The project is scheduled to be completed in late April.

Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2018</td>
<td>Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>Open house for business community to discuss survey results, new rates, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2018</td>
<td>Business Survey End</td>
<td>Close out survey, collect data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 2018</td>
<td>Business Survey Results</td>
<td>Summarize survey results and incorporate into draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2018</td>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>Update on all findings, summary of business survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2018</td>
<td>Draft Review Report</td>
<td>Internal review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16, 2018</td>
<td>Council Meeting</td>
<td>Discuss findings with recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 2018</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Project compete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget
The project is to be undertaken with both in-house resources as well as consultants. Any costs associated with this project were initially expected to be absorbed within the Development Services budget. However, given the scope and importance of the project, council resolved to add $35,000 to the 2017-2021 Financial Plan for the Business Licence Regulation and Fee Review project which will be funded from General Fund Accumulated Surplus.
Objective 3.2

| Strategy: | Update secondary dwelling unit (suite) program to establish fair and consistent billing |
| Category: | ☐ Planning   ☒ Operations   ☐ Advocacy   |
| Timeline: | 1 year |
| Outcomes: | Update to program complete |
| Background Information: | Phase 1 was a return to enforcing the existing program (complete). Phase 2 is to consider definitions, exemptions, and overall structure to ensure fairness and the ability to support affordable housing for more vulnerable individuals. |

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

Status
A Special Council meeting was held on Oct 23, 2017 and direction provided to staff to take enforcement action on suites going into new developments without approval.

Next Steps
Several issues related to existing suites continue to cause problems for staff and residents. Staff will be bringing some suggested changes back to Council for consideration.

Budget
There will be positive and negative budget implications associated with a new secondary suite policy but they are unknown at this time.
Objective 4: Optimized Planning and Management of Assets and Infrastructure

Objective 4.0

Strategy: Prepare Engineering Master Plans

Category: ☒ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy

Timeline: 2017 (Modelling in 2016 – 2017 pending OCP completion)

Outcomes: Master plans complete and guiding operational plans

Background Information: Connected to strategy 3.0 as DCCs must provide adequate funding. Must identify infrastructure required to support OCP and be tied to financial plan, DCC Bylaw, and OCP.

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

Status
Drainage modeling project is ongoing. Water and sewer modelling projects are already complete. These models are needed to start drainage, water, and sanitary masterplans. The start of this project is pending (1) the universal water metering grant application result, and/or (2) Council’s decision on whether a universal water metering will be implemented in the District within the next 5 years.

Next Steps
Drainage masterplan is pending the completion of the drainage modeling. To start the water and sanitary masterplan projects, staff need a clear direction from Council on the future of the water metering in the District. The effect of water meters on the masterplan analyses is so significant that the work cannot start unless this direction is provided by Council. A wrong assumption with regard to whether or not a universal water metering system will be in place will be in the order of millions of dollars.

Budget
See breakdown 4.0.B – 4.0.F
### Objective 4.0.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Sanitary Modelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016 year-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Modelling complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information:</strong></td>
<td>Following substantial completion of the OCP and Cedar Valley Comprehensive Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update:** February 17, 2018

This item was moved to the completed list at the October 16, 2017 regular council meeting.
Objective 4.0.B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Sanitary Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Master Plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

Status
Sewer modelling project is complete. Sanitary model is needed to start the sanitary master-planning. The start of this project is pending (1) the universal water metering grant application result, and (2) Council’s decision on whether a universal water metering will be implemented in the District within the next 5 years.

Next Steps
To start the masterplan, staff need a clear direction from Council on the future of the water metering in the District. That is because water consumption volume will affect sanitary sewer generation rates. The effect of water meters on the masterplan analyses is so significant that the work cannot start unless this direction is provided by Council. A wrong assumption with regard to whether or not a universal water metering system will be in place is going to be in the order of millions of dollars.

Once the water metering grant application result is out, the Manager of Business Services (Engineering) has been tasked to host a workshop with Council to discuss the future of this water metering and its effect on other projects.

Budget
$90,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objective 4.0.C</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
## Objective 4.0.D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Water Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Master Plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**

Water modelling projects are complete. Water model is needed to start the sanitary master-planning. The start of this project is pending (1) the universal water metering grant application result, and/or (2) Council’s decision on whether a universal water metering will be implemented in the District within the next 5 years.

**Next Steps**

To start the masterplan, staff need a clear direction from Council on the future of the water metering in the District. The effect of water meters on the masterplan analyses is so significant that the work cannot start unless this direction is provided by Council. A wrong assumption with regard to whether or not a universal water metering system will be in place will be in the order of millions of dollars.

Once the water metering grant application result is out, the Manager of Business Services (Engineering) has been tasked to host a workshop with Council to discuss the future of this water metering and its effect on other projects.

**Budget**

$150,000
## Objective 4.0.E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Drainage Modelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016 year-end of 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Modeling complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Following substantial completion of the OCP and Cedar Valley Comprehensive Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
The project started in October 2017 and is still ongoing.

**Next Steps**
Identifying the system deficiencies and listing the storm sewer system upgrade projects for budgeting purposes. The model will also be used for developing Drainage Master Plan. This project would require flow monitoring for calibration and will take longer than the other two utility modeling projects.

**Budget**
$130,000
($95,000 funded in 2016 & 2017; $35,000 funded by the General Fund Accumulated Surplus on June 20, 2016)
### Objective 4.0.F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Drainage Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Master Plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
This project is pending the completion of the District’s drainage model. Staff is working with the consultant to complete drainage model. The drainage model development is expected to be complete in late 2018, as it will require flow monitoring during wet season and, as a result, the drainage master plan is expected to start in early 2019.

**Next Steps**
Preparing an RFP in late 2018/early 2019 to advertise the drainage masterplan project.

**Budget**
$150,000
### Objective 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Revise Subdivision Control Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Bylaw updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Document must provide guidance and transparency in terms of what is expected of development. Assets assumed by the municipality must be built to required standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE JUNE 19, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
### Objective 4.2

| Strategy: Create a strategy and pre-development plan for waterfront |
| Category: ☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy |
| Timeline: 2017 |
| Outcomes: Strategy complete |
| Background Information: N/A |

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**  
On hold.

In May 2017, a report to Council endorsed by the Economic Development Select Committee recommending further technical studies at a cost of $456,000 to explore future land use and re-development potential was supported in principle by Council.

The intent of the technical work was to take a more cost-effective and measured approach to provide valuable technical information to the current land owners and development community while also seeking to identify the risk tolerance or “risk threshold” for investment to occur. With this technical information more clearly understood, land use planning could also begin that more appropriately reflected actual land use potential and associated development costs.

The technical work included:
- Geotechnical: to understand seismic, groundwater and load capacity $174,000
- Flood management: to determine adequate dikeing standards and land elevations $60,000
- Municipal infrastructure: to determine all water, rainwater and waste water requirements $72,000
- Area Planning: Develop a Waterfront Urban Design Plan $150,000

The funding component was withheld pending the outcome of new information that a large waterfront landholding adjacent to the subject properties was for sale. Staff was redirected to this effort to support the investor due diligence process (land use and infrastructure questions) associated with this opportunity.

**Next Steps**  
Staff will be preparing an updated report to Council in March 2018 to revisit the original recommendation to undertake the pre-development technical studies. This is based on completing the investor assistance efforts of the neighbouring properties, as well as the successful outcome of the funding application to the Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund where 100% of the eligible costs ($456,000) of the project were approved for funding.

**Budget**  
The municipal component is currently $0 approved. The Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund will provide $456,000 in funding to undertake this project.
### Objective 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop a plan for facility replacement and expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning □ Operations □ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016 – 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Decisions made regarding future facility needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
A consultant was retained in January 2018 to complete a Facilities Master Plan. The objective of the Master Plan is to identify current deficiencies, future requirements, and potential opportunities related to District facilities, and lead to the development of a strategy to incorporate the findings into the District’s Long Term Financial Plan. In conjunction with the Master Plan, a Working Committee has been created, consisting of representatives from all Departments, to provide a leadership role in the development of the plan and to ensure synergy across departments.

**Next Steps**
The Working Committee and the consultant will continue to meet on a regular basis over the coming months. Tasks will include review of current facilities, interviews with staff to determine current and future deficiencies, discussion of options for the short, medium, and long-term, the calculation of high-level cost estimates, and the preparation of an action plan. It is anticipated that the Master Plan will be complete by July 2018.

**Budget**
There is a budget of $75,000 for the preparation of the Master Plan. Further budget requirements will be identified at later stages of the planning process.
Objective 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Establish clarity on slope-stability risk and exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Inventory completed and program for assessing risk and exposure in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
A number of sites have been identified that have slope stability concerns. It is not clear if stormwater management infrastructure condition or design may be contributing to erosion of slopes. The ongoing erosion in some locations may have the potential to impact buildings, and therefore may represent a risk to residents and to the District. Engineering staff have confirmed with Finance and Public Works that the 2018 drainage system inspection program budget is available to fund contracting an engineering consultant to assess the sites and provide cost estimates for mitigation. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued in December 2017 to hire an engineering consultant to assess the sites and rank which sites represent the greatest liability to the District and infrastructure. The RFP closed on January 31, 2018. Five proposals were received and are currently being evaluated by staff from Engineering, Public Works and Purchasing.

**Next Steps**
1) Staff will evaluate the proposals received in response to the RFP and will award the contract to the proponent whose proposal provides the best value to the District. The contract is expected to be issued to the winning proponent by February 28, 2018.
2) The engineering consultant report will complete the work and submit a report by May 15, 2018.
3) Staff will prepare a report for Council for July 16, 2018 with recommended mitigation actions and associated costs based on the engineering consultant report.
4) As directed by Council at the July 16, 2018 meeting, staff will proceed with addressing sites according to the risk represented at each site.

**Budget**
The 2018 drainage system inspection program budget is $100,000. Staff estimates the cost of the engineering consultant assessment and report to be approximately $35,000. The July 16, 2018 Council report is expected to include costs for the mitigation actions proposed by the engineering consultant.
## Objective 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop customer satisfaction metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Measures and goals established and program underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE JUNE 19, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
### Objective 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Identify new regional water source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning ☐ Operations ☒ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Water source identified and agreement reached on development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>A new water source is imperative for growth under current OCP projections. Large industrial water users or large developments could quickly use up the existing a finite capacity. Existing partnership with Abbotsford on water supply could be either a challenge or opportunity as opinions differ on the urgency for developing an additional source. Ongoing advocacy required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
At their January 11, 2018 meeting, the Joint Shared Services Committee (JSSC) approved recommendations to move the project forward based on the recommended Solution Set #1, which includes conservation, optimization, and a new source expansion in the form of a collector well.

**Next Steps**
Public engagement on Solution Set #1, incorporation of Solution Set #1 into the Joint Water Master Plan, and refining Solution Set #1 to a project definition report/concept. Staff will report back to the JSSC in March with further details.

**Budget**
The planning phase of this project remains within budget, and a tentative budget for the development of the new water source is included in the 2018 JSSC Financial Plan. Further refinements to the project budget will likely be required as the planning and investigation progresses.
Objective 5: Effective Economic Development

### Objective 5.1

| Strategy: | Develop an industrial and commercial land expansion strategy |
| Category: | ☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy |
| Timeline: | 2016 – 2017 |
| Outcomes: | Increased available commercial and industrial land |
| Background Information: | N/A |

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
Subsequent to ongoing land owner meetings and a preliminary meeting with senior management at the ALC, a follow-up meeting and community tour was held with ALC field staff in October, 2017.

Key outcomes and feedback from that engagement included a suggestion to:
- Review neighbouring jurisdictions industrial growth strategies to better understand the scope and depth of work required for a comprehensive land exclusion submission.
- Focus on our key market differentiators when compared to these jurisdictions.
- Technical studies will be important to support any submission. These studies include agrology reports, agricultural capability studies, infrastructure master plans, industrial land demand study (local and regional), etc.
- Recommended a more modest and more specific land area as opposed to the 600 acres identified, and also recommended that the OCP include as much information related to the land expansion perspective as possible.
- It was strongly recommended that agricultural industry be a component of land use for the identified lands.
- It was made apparent that even with the aforementioned work undertaken, any exclusion application would be difficult for the ALC to support given their mandate to preserve agricultural land.

**Next Steps**
Staff has determined that it would be prudent to wait and see what the outcome is for Abbotsford’s 260 acre ALR exclusion application to the ALC, with an expected decision mid-February, 2018. Additionally, staff and the Mayor have arranged to meet directly with the ALC’s independent advisory committee on February 21st, who are tasked with providing strategic advice and policy guidance on revitalizing the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC). A decision on the undertaking of technical studies required to support a submission will be made following these efforts.

**Budget**
$20,000 from the General Fund Accumulated Surplus was agreed by Council to retain the agricultural land exclusion consultant. This budget has now been exhausted.
## Objective 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop TOR and task-list for Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Planning  ☐  Operations  ☒  Advocacy  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>TOR and operations plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE MARCH 6, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.**
### Objective 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop District tourism strategy report cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning  ✒ Operations  ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Reporting underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**

Council has determined that delivering tourism services through an in-house model will be more efficient (financially and operationally) than a previously explored stand-alone Destination Marketing Organization (DMO). The in-house model consolidates and aligns the efforts of multiple municipal departments (Economic Development; Forestry; Parks, Recreation and Culture) and presents the opportunity to coordinate and/or add capacity to the Visitor Information Centre, Stave West, Fraser River Heritage Park and other major outdoor recreational assets currently under the direct control of the municipality. It would also provide continuity in developing and managing important stakeholder relationships (local operators; Provincial ministries; First Nations partnerships; Destination BC; Scenic 7, etc.), managing private investment interests, establishing related educational opportunities and generating a unified brand and marketing strategy.

**Next Steps**

A tourism strategic framework is now in place for 2018. The strategy focuses on transition efforts as well as building on three strategic pillars: a) product development; b) partnership development and; c) marketing and brand development. It is anticipated that staff capacity will be added in 2018 and there will be a significant focus on building a more detailed operational plan around the transition steps and identified strategy. The operational plan will be complete in July, 2018.

**Budget**

An additional $39,150 for staffing capacity and capital projects was approved by Council for 2018, with 2019 still under review. An additional amount of $50,000 was allocated from within the Forestry Department to work collaboratively on priority initiatives and capital projects.
## Objective 5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop a service-focused strategy to enhance reputation and attract investment and improve business retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Strategy complete for Council review, quarterly reviews established with continuous improvement program in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
The Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC) met on February 14th and undertook a visioning exercise to revisit the top priorities for economic development in Mission. This was a one month delay against the anticipated timeline.

**Next Steps**
A number of items were identified and the EDSC and Staff is undertaking additional due diligence to better understand the opportunities and challenges associated with each. A recommendation to Council on these priorities will be presented to Council following the March 14th EDSC meeting, where the identified priorities will be finalized.

**Budget**
TBD once priorities are identified.
Objective 5.5

**Strategy:** Expand film industry in Mission

**Category:** ☐ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy

**Timeline:** 1 year

**Outcomes:** Establish industry-leader as film liaison for Mission

**Background Information:** Council resolved to move film liaison services to external body to drive expansion.

### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018

**Status**
No change. Pending Council direction, the Economic Development department continues to act as the lead on film production inquiries, coordinating permit and site location requirements with multiple departments, such as Engineering, Forestry, and Parks, Recreation and Culture.

2017 film production statistics are demonstrating stable levels of total film projects, with a significant increase in total filming days, meaning film productions are spending more time in the community on each filming project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Productions</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Film Days</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Enquiries</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permit Revenue DOM</strong></td>
<td>$10,939.00</td>
<td>$9,817.00</td>
<td>$9,617.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestry Revenue DOM</strong></td>
<td>$10,725.00</td>
<td>$4,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guaranteed Community $ (Wrap Sheet)</strong></td>
<td>$161,377.00</td>
<td>$120,127.00</td>
<td>$288,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Community $</strong></td>
<td>$259,177.00</td>
<td>$288,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notable film productions filmed in Mission include: X-Files; Supernatural; Beyond – Season 2; Riverdale; and Hallmark movies.

**Next Steps**
Awaiting Council direction.

In the interim, staff is attending the Creative BC Community Affairs bi-monthly meetings to ensure we are aware of the latest policies and productions coming to the area and to network with other municipality’s film divisions. Staff also attended the Municipal Appreciation Evening hosted by Creative BC and the Annual Fraser Valley Regional Film Partners meeting.

Policy development work has also proceeded and includes a review of: Use of Drones; Filming on ALR lands; Filming on First Nations land.

**Budget**
No budget allocation.
### Objective 5.6

| Strategy: | Develop strategic land acquisition plan and land/development site inventory including commercial, industrial, and housing |
| Category: | □ Planning ☒ Operations □ Advocacy |
| Timeline: | 6 months |
| Outcomes: | Report to Council on list of sites and strategy in place |
| Background Information: | N/A |

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 17, 2018**

**Status**
Geotechnical assessment for 32702 Best Avenue is being arranged. Several other properties are being assessed for the best way to dispose of them. Several properties that were on the potential sale list are being worked on in the hopes some of those can be considered for sale.

**Next Steps**
Continue assessments and list those properties that are already approved for sale. Bring a new list of potential sale properties to Council for consideration.

**Budget**
Revenue implications will not be known until the properties are listed for sale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status and Budget: June 20, 2016**

**Initial Budget:** Unbudgeted

**Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016**

**Current Status**
Council has committed funding toward the streetscape renewal project. Other initiatives include a tax revitalization program, Act Team, Façade grant program etc.

**Next Steps**
A press release or factsheet will be developed that lets the community know what steps are being taken to revitalize downtown.

**Goals / Measures**
A revitalized downtown

**Budget**
$3.5 million approved for streetscapes

**Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 9, 2017**

**Status**
During the March 2016 Strategic Planning session, Council was unsure of its position regarding investment in the downtown. A number of committee and budget discussions took place over the next 6 months regarding this issue. At the freestanding committee of the whole meeting on September 7, 2016, Council recommended to approve $3.5 million for the 1st Avenue Streetscape Improvements Project. The funding for the project was broken down as:

- 2017 - $500,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus
- 2018 - $300,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus, $808,869 from the District of Mission Development Corporation Accumulated Surplus, and the balance of $1,891,131 to come from the General Capital Reserve Fund.
At the October 3, 2016 Council meeting, these recommendations were adopted.

**Next Steps**
Now that Council has moved to financially support Downtown Renewal, their role has been determined. The project is now proceeding and being steered by the Engineering department. It is staff’s recommendation that this item be moved to the completed list.

**Budget**
Total budget $3.5 million
- 2017 - $500,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus
- 2018 - $300,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus, $808,869 from the District of Mission Development Corporation Accumulated Surplus, and the balance of $1,891,131 to come from the General Capital Reserve Fund.

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE MARCH 6, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
### Objective 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Advocate for improved ambulance response times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning ☐ Operations ☒ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>Immediate - Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Ambulance available within Municipal boundaries at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status and Budget: June 20, 2016

8 new ambulances were approved for the region with 2 in Abbotsford.

Ongoing discussions with BCAS. Fire Chief engaged as is Council and CAO.

**Initial Budget:**

Unbudgeted

#### Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016

**Current Status**

Ongoing

**Next Steps**

Fire Chief to assess changes made by BC Ambulance Service and to re-engage BC Ambulance Service with results.

**Budget**

No budget implications
## Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 9, 2017

**Status**
The Fire Chief reviewed BC Ambulance Service (BCAS) response to medical calls with Mission Fire Rescue Service (MFRS) crews who feel that, with the addition of another two ambulances in Abbotsford, Mission has experienced a minor improvement in response times. Most incidents where BCAS is coded to respond emergency have BCAS crews arriving quicker resulting in shorter wait times for MFRS crews. The majority of long wait times for an ambulance in Mission now appear to be connected to the way BCAS dispatch has coded the ambulance response for a particular medical response. BCAS responses where the incident is coded as a non-emergency response is causing the majority of long wait times. MFRS crews try to have the ambulance upgraded with BCAS dispatch when warranted but sometimes, depending on the call type, BCAS will not upgrade to an emergency response.

**Next Steps**
Fire Chief to work with local BCAS unit chief to discuss whether there is a better way to get ambulance crews upgraded when needed.

**Budget**
N/A

## Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: June 6, 2017

**Status**
BCEHS conducted a trial of adding an additional full time ambulance for the District of Mission in Nov/Dec 2016. With the success of that trial, as of January 2017 Mission has one additional full time Ambulance. The new ambulance has helped with shorter response times and Mission Fire Rescue crews being tied up for less time at medical aid incidents.

On May 26, 2017 Chief Unrau met with the BCEHS Director of Fraser District Patient Care and BCAS District Manager of Patient Care Delivery, along with Abbotsford, Langley City, and Langley Township Fire Chiefs and each community’s Police OIC, to discuss our regions’ BCAS changes/issues. This was the first of what will be quarterly meetings to discuss upcoming changes within BCAS, response trends/issues, and allow for input from each community/service provider prior to changes occurring. These meetings should substantially improve communications for each community prior to changes occurring within BCAS and allow each community input into those changes before they occur.

**Next Steps**
Chief Unrau to meet quarterly with BCEHS, BCAS, Abbotsford, and Langley Fire and Police officials to discuss regional BCAS changes and response issues. Chief Unrau to provide Council and MFRS members with updates on any changes/issues.

**Budget**
N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
<th>No updates at this time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>Chief Unrau to meet quarterly with BCEHS, BCAS, Abbotsford, and Langley Fire and Police officials to discuss regional BCAS changes and response issues. Chief Unrau to provide Council and MFRS members with updates on any changes/issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.**
### Objective 4.0.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Sanitary Modelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>2016 year-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Modelling complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>Following substantial completion of the OCP and Cedar Valley Comprehensive Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status and Budget: June 20, 2016

**Initial Budget:**
$60,000 (funded in 2016)

#### Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016

**Current Status**
The sanitary model update project has recently been awarded to a consulting engineering firm and is expected to be complete in December 2016.

**Next Steps**
Identifying the system deficiencies and listing the sanitary system upgrade projects for budgeting purposes. The model will also be used for developing Sanitary Master Plan.

**Goals / Measures**
Sanitary models are used to identify the infrastructures needed to accommodate services to the residents under the existing and OCP scenarios. Sanitary modeling is an essential tool to investigate the adequacy of the existing/future infrastructures to provide safe conveyance of waste to wastewater treatment plant and accommodate growth under the OCP.

**Budget**
$60,000
Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 9, 2017

**Status**
The District began updating its District-wide sanitary sewer model in the second half of 2016. The updated model is to assess system deficiencies under the existing and the future/OCP scenarios and propose upgrades to the sanitary collection system to meet current and future sanitary sewer network needs in the District. As the part of this project, the existing and OCP population per parcel with sanitary sewer services have been estimated. The model network has been updated for the existing and OCP scenarios. Flow monitors were installed in November 2016 at different locations within the District’s sanitary sewer network.

**Next Steps**
Flow monitoring data is currently being used to calibrate the model parameters. Flow monitoring allows the model to estimate flows in different parts of the network with more accuracy. Once the model is calibrated, the system performance under the existing and OCP scenarios will be assessed and the required upgrades to address capacity issues will be recommended. The study will provide a list of sanitary sewer infrastructure projects with their associated Class D cost estimates. Depending on the nature of the proposed upgrades, they will be included in the next several years’ Capital and/or DCC project lists.

The sanitary sewer modeling project is expected to be completed in spring 2017.

**Budget**
$60,000. Staff expect the project will be completed with the allocated budget.

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: June 6, 2017

**Status**
Sanitary Modeling project is at its final stage. The modeling works are complete, but the draft report still needs revisions. Staff have reviewed the model and the report, and sent comments to the consultant for revising the report.

**Next Steps**
Preparing a list of Capital Projects for sanitary system upgrades for the next 5 years before the budget deliberation time in September 2017.

**Budget**
$60,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Sanitary Modeling is complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>Use the model in the upcoming sanitary sewer master plan to analyze system capacities at different phases of growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
**Objective 4.0.C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Water Modelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning  ☐ Operations  ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016 year-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Modelling complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Following substantial completion of the OCP and Cedar Valley Comprehensive Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status and Budget: June 20, 2016**

Initial Budget:
$50,000 (funded in 2016)

**Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016**

**Current Status**
The water model update project has recently been awarded to a consulting engineering firm and is expected to be complete in December 2016.

**Next Steps**
Identifying the system deficiencies and listing the water distribution system upgrade projects for budgeting purposes. The model will also be used for developing Water Master Plan.

**Goals / Measures**
Water models are used to identify the infrastructures needed to accommodate services to the residents under the existing and OCP scenarios. Water modeling is an essential tool to investigate the adequacy of the existing/future water infrastructures to provide safe conveyance of water from the sources at Canel and Norrish to the residents of Mission.

**Budget**
$50,000
Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 9, 2017

Status
The District began updating its District-wide water model in the second half of 2016. The updated model is to assess system deficiencies under the existing and the future/OCP scenarios and propose upgrades to the water distribution system (i.e., watermains, Pressure Reduced Valves (PRVs), etc.) to meet current and future water distribution network needs in the District. As the part of this project, the existing and OCP population per parcel with water services have been estimated. The model network has been updated for the existing and OCP scenarios and system analyses have started.

Next Steps
The water distribution system performance under the existing and OCP scenarios will be assessed and the required upgrades to address water flows/pressure to deal with daily demand and during fire scenarios will be identified. The study will provide a list of required upgrades with their associated Class D cost estimates. Depending on the nature of the proposed upgrades, they will be included in the next several years’ Capital and/or DCC project lists. The water modeling project is expected to be completed in spring 2017.

Budget
$50,000. Staff expect the project will be completed with the allocated budget.

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: June 6, 2017

Status
Water Modeling project is at its final stage. The modeling works are complete, but the draft report still needs revisions. Staff have reviewed the model and the report, and sent comments to the consultant for revising the report.

Next Steps
Preparing a list of Capital Projects for Watermain upgrades for the next 5 years before the budget deliberation time in September 2017.

Budget
$50,000
### Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: October 3, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
<th>The water model project is complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>Use the model in the upcoming Water Master Plan to analyze system capacities at different phases of growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.**
### Objective 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Revise Subdivision Control Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☒ Planning ☐ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>Bylaw updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>Document must provide guidance and transparency in terms of what is expected of development. Assets assumed by the municipality must be built to required standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status and Budget: June 20, 2016

Update started however project must be re-initiated.

**Initial Budget:**
Unbudgeted

Director of Engineering & Public Works to provide estimate.

#### Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016

**Current Status**
The draft is complete and was distributed to Councillors for their review. The draft was also sent to the District’s attorney for legal review.

**Next Steps**
Once the legal aspects of the requirements in the proposed Development Bylaw are reviewed, staff will take the Bylaw to Council for three readings, possibly having an Open House with Developers/engineers to discuss it, and (after reflecting the comments received) it will go to Council for fourth reading and approval.

**Goals / Measures**
To update the design standards from 1985 to today’s standards.

**Budget**
No budget was assigned for this project, as it was done in-house. The cost associated with the legal review of the document will be paid from Corporate Administration account. (Engineering staff does not know how much the legal fee for this is.)
Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 9, 2017

Status
This project is to update the District’s design standards from 1985 to today’s standards. The new bylaw will be called the Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw and will set the standards required for Subdivisions, Developments, and Re-development applications in the District. The draft is complete and was distributed in the fall of 2016 to Councillors for their review. The draft was also reviewed by the District’s attorney and their comments were reflected in the draft.

Currently, staff are engaging directly with builders, contractors, developers, and consulting engineering firms that are involved in local development related projects. Invitation emails/letters were sent to this interest group in mid-December 2016 with a link to the District’s website for reviewing the draft Bylaw. Reviewers are being asked to forward their comments in the editable/electronic format to the District by February 10, 2017.

Next Steps
Staff will review the received comments by March 2017 and update the draft Bylaw as appropriate. A report will then be prepared for Council’s first, second, third, and final readings in spring 2017.

Budget
The cost associated with the legal review of the draft Bylaw was $7,200 (funded from the existing legal budget). There have been no other costs associated with this project, as the work is underway by the District staff.

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: June 6, 2017

Status
The Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw was completed earlier this year and has been adopted by Council in May 2017.

Next Steps
Completed

Budget
N/A (all works were done in house by staff)

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE JUNE 19, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
### Objective 4.5

**Strategy:** Develop customer satisfaction metrics

**Category:**
- [x] Planning  
- [ ] Operations  
- [ ] Advocacy

**Timeline:** 1 year

**Outcomes:** Measures and goals established and program underway

**Background Information:** N/A

#### Status and Budget: June 20, 2016

- Not started.

**Initial Budget:**
$2,500 to license required software and for data analysis (funded by the General Fund Accumulated Surplus on June 20, 2016)

#### Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016

**Current Status**
The Citizen Satisfaction & 2017 Budget Survey was produced based on best practices for establishing satisfaction metrics as a component of overall performance management programs within the context of municipal government. With over 830 submissions it provides a good baseline for initial metrics, to be reviewed annual through a similar survey that will provide the ability to report year-over-year comparisons by operational category. The results were presented to Council at the September 14, 2016 FSCOW budget meeting.

**Next Steps**
As overall performance management progresses the results will be reviewed and subsequent survey instruments will be developed to support the overall program while providing year-over-year comparisons. Additionally, spot-surveys of specific areas will be used (corporate administration, communication initially) to examine the reliability of the data compared to the original survey instrument and to gauge the impact of specific projects on overall citizen satisfaction. In late 2016, the final budget consultation will complete this initial project and transition the measurement of citizen satisfaction to an ongoing program led through the Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives function starting in 2017.

**Budget**
This project has been funded from the existing operating budget for 2016. Replacement survey software is required in 2017, which will be absorbed by the 2017 operating budget. This project does not require additional funding to complete, and will have no ongoing financial impact as it transitions to a program.
Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: February 9, 2017

Status
Customer satisfaction metrics used in 2017 budget survey confirmed to align with best practices. Will be used as baseline going forward.

Next Steps
2018 preliminary budget feedback survey will include matching questions to measure progress over time. Once this survey is complete staff will be able to work with Council to establish goals and then strategies for achieving goals.

Budget
$2,500 was funded in 2016 based on a continuation of service with an existing software provider. In the fall of 2016 the software provider discontinued their Canadian services, requiring a replacement be found. During the final quarter of 2016 staff trialled multiple engagement and survey platforms and found none within the original estimated budget performed as required.

In December of 2016 staff identified an excellent platform that met technical and legislated requirements, and working with IT identified funding sources to accommodate the additional cost for the first year of service.

Provided the experience with the new platform remains consistently positive staff will bring forward a request for additional funding to accommodate the software as an ongoing expense. Annual software licence of approximately $6,500 required for survey platform. This was absorbed in 2017 fiscal through a carry forward and with support of IT Services; however, an increase to the core budget for Civic Engagement & Corporate Initiatives will be required to continue delivering online engagement.

Status, Next Steps and Budget Update: June 6, 2017

Status
Complete – now transitioned to ongoing operations as “Citizen Satisfaction Measures.” This project is now part of the annual financial planning process.

Next Steps
The 2017 citizen satisfaction survey launches June, 2017 and will provide the first opportunity for year-over-year comparison of satisfaction metrics. Moving forward the Manager of Civic Engagement & Corporate Initiatives will assess the delivery and use of the metrics to optimize.

Budget
One-time funding was used to license the survey platform for 2017. Funding moving forward will come as part of the 2018 budgeting process.

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE JUNE 19, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.
### Objective 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Develop TOR and task-list for Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>☐ Planning ☒ Operations ☐ Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline:</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>TOR and operations plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status and Budget: June 20, 2016**

Underway.

**Initial Budget:** Unbudgeted

**Status, Budget Update, and Next Steps: October 17, 2016**

**Current Status**

Terms of Reference completed and approved by Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC). Minor amendments anticipated pending the joint planning session with Council on October 24, 2016.

Task list under development. A DRAFT task list has been completed by the EDSC and will be finalized by October 18th. This task list will provide advice to Council on the suggested areas of focus for the Economic Development department.

**Next Steps**

The task list and recommendations will be presented to Council on October 24, 2016 at the joint meeting between Council and the EDSC.

**Goals / Measures**

Following the joint meeting with Council where direction will be requested on the task list, specific goals and measures will be developed for each priority.

**Budget**

No material changes to the Economic Development budget are anticipated for this objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>All items for Objective 5.2 completed in 2016.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE COMPLETED LIST AT THE MARCH 6, 2017 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING**
DATE: March 5, 2018

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

SUBJECT: Council Remuneration – List of Comparator Municipalities

ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06
Appendix 2 – List of BC Municipalities and their Population
Appendix 3 – List of Potential Comparator Municipalities

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That Campbell River, Penticton, Port Moody, Vernon and West Vancouver be used as comparator municipalities to complete the detailed comparative analysis to recommend remuneration for Council and Mayor starting in January 1, 2019 as per C-ADM.06.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a background on the process of remunerating Mayor and Councillors and to provide a list of comparator municipalities as per the Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06 (Policy). A subsequent report will be presented to Council that makes recommendations to Council of any changes to remuneration and the Policy (Appendix 1).

BACKGROUND:

The Policy sets the salaries and benefits to be paid to Mayor and Councillors and requires that a detailed comparative analysis be undertaken every three (proposed to be amended to four) years and considered by the incumbents prior to being implemented January 1 of the year after the municipal election. The first step in the analysis is to decide on the list of comparator local governments that will be used to complete the detailed comparative analysis.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The District uses a variety of comparator municipalities depending on the task. For CUPE wage decisions, the following comparators are typically used:

- Kamloops
- Abbotsford
- Maple Ridge
- Township of Langley

For the exempt staff salary review, the median salaries of the following comparator municipalities were used:
A comprehensive review of the Policy was completed in 2014 and the following comparators were evaluated with the short listed ones shown in bold. Langford and City of North Vancouver were removed from the final list of comparators due to their populations being too low and too high, respectively. Notwithstanding that Langford’s population has grown significantly to where it now is a good comparator with Mission, Langford pays their Mayor based on it being a part time position and the Councillors’ salary is adjusted downwards, resulting in what staff feel is an unreasonable comparator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campbell River</th>
<th>Vernon</th>
<th>City of North Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penticton</td>
<td>West Kelowna</td>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody</td>
<td>FVRD</td>
<td>New Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2 provides a list of BC municipalities and regional districts and their 2016 populations. There are not many other municipalities that have a very similar population to Mission’s 39,000. There are several regional districts with similar populations but staff recommends that regional districts not be used as comparators given the very different remuneration models in regional districts.

Appendix 3 provides population and taxation information for various potential comparator municipalities as of 2016 and is an update to the information developed in 2014 to support the Policy review. Staff is recommending that the same list of comparators as were used in the 2014 analysis be included in the 2017 detailed comparative analysis – namely Campbell River, Vernon, Penticton, Port Moody and West Vancouver.

As per the Policy, Council approval of the comparators to be used is required prior to completing the detailed remuneration analysis.

The federal government is changing the way it taxes elected officials’ remuneration starting January 1, 2019. Currently, one third (1/3) of the total remuneration is an allowance for expenses and is tax free, as set out in the Income Tax Act. The Policy states that this tax free portion is to be used to cover mileage and miscellaneous expenses to and from local events in the Mission area. In light of the federal government’s changes, staff will be bringing forward some options for Council to consider in light of this change to compensate for the loss of this taxable benefit.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this report at this time.

COMMUNICATION:

No further communication is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06 sets out a comparative process for establishing remuneration for Council members, which includes the types of benefits to which Council members will be entitled. The system will be based on comparisons with other like municipalities, in terms of
population, total operating expenditures, total assessed property value and the assessment / property tax mix. The process requires that Council approve the comparator local government organizations prior to completing the detailed analysis. This report recommends that Council approve using Campbell River, Penticton, Port Moody, Vernon and West Vancouver as the comparators.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed by:
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer

**Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:**
Reviewed.
# COUNCIL REMUNERATION AND EXPENSES

**Category:** Administrative Services  
**Number:** ADM.06(C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Policy</td>
<td>☒ Council</td>
<td>☒ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Procedure</td>
<td>☐ Administrative</td>
<td>☐ Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Department Head</td>
<td>☐ Department Head</td>
</tr>
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</table>

**Office of Primary Responsibility:** Corporate Administration

**Date Adopted:** 2014-04-22  
**Council Resolution No:** RC14/297  
**Date to be Reviewed:** June 2017

**Manner Issued:** District Website, email, Pipeline, Council Orientation Package

## BACKGROUND:

The District of Mission is governed by its elected officials, a Mayor and six (6) Council members (Council), who serve at the will of the community. This public service role requires a tremendous time commitment as well as personal sacrifice and dedication, which often comes at the expense of other personal interests and priorities. As such, the District aims to provide a fair and equitable level of Remuneration for Council members and to reimburse Council members for all reasonable Expenses incurred while undertaking municipal business.

## PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Policy is to establish an objective and fair system for determining Remuneration levels and Expense reimbursements for elected officials at the District of Mission.

## POLICY:

1. **Definitions:**
   
   “**Chief Administrative Officer**” means the individual appointed by Council to the position of Chief Administrative Officer (or his/her designate) as the head of Administration.
   
   “**Council**” means the duly elected officials of the District, those being the Mayor and Councillors.
   
   “**District**” means the District of Mission.
   
   “**Expense(s)**” means expenses incurred by Council members while undertaking municipal business including but not limited to course fees, conventions costs, meal expenses and travel costs.
   
   “**Remuneration**” means any form of salary/indemnity and benefits paid to or on behalf of Council members.

2. **Remuneration**
   
   a) The District will undertake a comparative process for establishing Remuneration for Council members, which includes the types of benefits that Council members will be
entitled to. This system will be based on comparisons with other like communities, in terms of population, total operating expenditure budgets, total assessed property values, and the assessment/property tax mix, e.g. the degree of residential versus non-residential assessments and property taxes. Population shall be the first and primary filter in choosing the initial comparators, with the other factors being used to reaffirm the final selected comparators.

b) The detailed comparative analysis shall be undertaken every three (3) years before the general election and the results will be presented to the incumbent Council. The comparative analysis will take into account total Remuneration [both salaries and benefits (e.g. medical, life insurance, extended health benefits, vehicle allowances, etc.)], within the chosen comparators.

c) The Chief Administrative Officer will identify proposed comparator local government organizations well before the general election, as per the criteria noted in 2 a), and bring these organizations forward for Council's approval prior to undertaking the actual comparative analysis.

d) The proposed Remuneration shall be recommended by the outgoing Council in advance of the general election, with the view of applying these new Remuneration levels to the newly elected officials once in office and once re-affirmed by the new Council.

e) Any recommendations on Remuneration are intended to apply to the new incoming Council in year one (1) of their mandate, i.e. effective January 1 in the calendar year following the general municipal election. Accordingly as at January 1, 2015 the Mayor's per annum salary level is established at $70,178.00 and the Councillors per annum salary level is established at $28,071.00.

f) In interim years two (2) and three (3) the Vancouver consumer price index (VCPI) will be used to adjust Council salary/indemnity levels [including the one-third (1/3) non-taxable portion] at the beginning of each calendar year. The VCPI for the 12 month period ending November 30th of the previous year will be used so that any adjustments can go into effect at the beginning of the calendar year.

g) The level of Remuneration recommended for the Mayor and each Councillor will be the average of the Remuneration (exclusive of any benefits) results from the chosen comparator local government organizations. In the event that the average is less than the current level of Remuneration (exclusive of any benefits), no increases or decreases will be recommended.

h) The District will also offer Medical Services Plan, Extended Health and Dental Benefit coverage to the Mayor and Council members. The Mayor's premiums will be paid 100% by the District; however, any premiums for Councillors or any dependents will have to be paid by the individual.

3. Expenses

a) One-third (1/3) of the annual salary paid to each member of Council is exempt from taxation in accordance with the Income Tax Act, as this portion is considered as to be an allowance for expenses incidental to the discharge of the duties of office. The District considers that this non-taxable portion will be used for all municipal business travel that is 100 kilometers or less per round trip [see related 3. b) below] and for non-District sponsored meetings or events [see related 3. c) below] that Council members choose to attend, and as such these Expenses will not be reimbursable.
b) Members of Council shall be reimbursed for mileage while attending District business outside of Mission if the round trip from and to Mission is greater than 100 kilometers. This reimbursement shall be on a per kilometer basis for all kilometres over the 100 kilometer base which applies on a per trip basis. The per kilometer reimbursement rate will be as per the District-wide mileage reimbursement policy which applies to all employees.

c) The District will also pay for tax fares for any Mayor or Councillor who has restricted mobility in order to attend District meetings. This reimbursement will not be considered part of a Council member’s non-taxable allowance for expenses incidental to the discharge of their duties of office.

d) The District will pay for meal costs, event fees, conventions, courses, etc., for Council members attending District-sponsored events or meetings, as long as there are sufficient budget funds available. Expense reimbursement allowance levels that apply to all District employees will be applied. The Chief Administrative Officer shall determine which events or meeting are deemed to be District-sponsored.

e) The Chief Administrative Officer shall approve all Expense claims of Council members before reimbursement.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AGREEMENTS AND/OR BYLAWS:

COU.14A – Council and Staff Expenses
Council Procedure Bylaw 5345-2013

*** END OF POLICY ***
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APPENDIX 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2016 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>60439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Flats</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>20047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkford</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernie</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invermere</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>7425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radium Hot Springs</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparwood</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>6036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>59517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegar</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaslo</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakusp</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>10572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Denver</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmo</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay I</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay J</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay K</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>31447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>4049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossland</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfield</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary B / Lower Columbia-Old-Glory</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary C / Christina Lake</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary D / Rural Grand Forks</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary E / West Boundary</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keremeos</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoyoos</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penticton</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerland</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan-Similkameen H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Hot Springs</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anmore</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belcarra</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen Island</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>3680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>232755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>139284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>102238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>117285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>25888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Bay</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>82256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>70996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>85935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>52898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt Meadows</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>18573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>58612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>33551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>198309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>517887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>631486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>42473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Rock</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>19952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>16133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>383360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Saanich</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>16814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colwood</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>16859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquimalt</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>17655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langford</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>35342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metchosin</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Saanich</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>11249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Bay</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>18094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>114148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sooke</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>13001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>85792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Royal</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>10408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Fuca (Part 1)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Fuca (Part 2)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltspring Island</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>10557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Gulf Islands</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>83739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>4944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladysmith</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Cowichan</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Cowichan</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>29676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>8558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>5019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley I</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>155698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantzville</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>90504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parksville</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualicum Beach</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>7058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>6125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>7724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>7465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>30981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Alberni</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>17678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tofino</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ucluelet</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni-Clayoquot F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>44671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell River</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>32588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold River</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayward</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahsis</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeballos</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona D (Oyster Bay - Buttle Lake)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comox Valley  
Comox  
Courtenay  
Cumberland  
Comox Valley A  
Comox Valley B (Lazo North)  
Comox Valley C (Puntledge - Black Creek)  
Powell River  
Powell River A  
Powell River B  
Powell River C  
Powell River D  
Powell River E  
Sunshine Coast  
Gibsons  
Sechelt  
Sunshine Coast A  
Sunshine Coast B  
Sunshine Coast D  
Sunshine Coast E  
Sunshine Coast F  
Squamish-Lillooet  
Lillooet  
Pemberton  
Squamish  
Whistler  
Squamish-Lillooet A  
Squamish-Lillooet B  
Squamish-Lillooet C  
Squamish-Lillooet D  
Thompson-Nicola  
Ashcroft  
Barriere  
Cache Creek  
Chase  
Clearwater  
Clinton  
Kamloops  
Logan Lake  
Lytton  
Merritt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comox Valley</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>66527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>14028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>25599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>3753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox Valley A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>7213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox Valley B (Lazo North)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>7095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox Valley C (Puntledge - Black Creek)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>8617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>20070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>29970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsons</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechelt</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>10216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish-Lillooet</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>42665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillooet</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>2574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>19512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistler</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>11854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish-Lillooet A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish-Lillooet B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish-Lillooet C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish-Lillooet D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>132663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashcroft</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriere</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Creek</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>90280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Lake</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lytton</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>7139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Peaks Mountain</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola A (Wells Gray Country)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola B (Thompson Headwaters)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola E (Bonaparte Plateau)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola I (Blue Sky Country)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola J (Copper Desert Country)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola L (Grasslands)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola M (Beautiful Nicola Valley - North)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola N (Beautiful Nicola Valley - South)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola O (Lower North Thompson)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson-Nicola P (Rivers and the Peaks)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Okanagan</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Country</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachland</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kelowna</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Okanagan</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Okanagan J</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enderby</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumby</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spallumcheen</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelstoke</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Arm</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicamous</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Shuswap F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Hundred Mile House</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quesnel</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>9879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Lake</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>10753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>6265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>5156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo I</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo J</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo K</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo L</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>11035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert Bay</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Alice</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hardy</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>4132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port McNeill</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena-Queen Charlotte</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>18133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masset</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Clements</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Edward</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Rupert</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Charlotte</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena-Queen Charlotte A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena-Queen Charlotte C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena-Queen Charlotte D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena-Queen Charlotte E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>37367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelton</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>8131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hazelton</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisga'a</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>11643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine C (Part 1)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine C (Part 2)</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat-Stikine F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>37896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns Lake</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. James</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Lake</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granisle</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithers</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telkwa</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderhoof</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>4439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>5256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley-Nechako G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>94506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>3714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>74003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valemount</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George A</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>3527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>4278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George F</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George G</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser-Fort George H</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>62942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetwynd</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Creek</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. John</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>20155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson's Hope</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouce Coupe</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbler Ridge</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River B</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>5628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River C</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>6772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River D</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>5920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River E</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>2949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine Region</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rockies</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>5393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rockies</td>
<td>RGM</td>
<td>4831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSD Types:**

- **CY** = City
- **DM** = District Municipality
- **T** = Town
- **VL** = Village
- **IM** = Island Municipality
- **IRI** = Indian Reserve
- **RDA** = Regional District Electoral Area
- **IGD** = Indian Governmental District
- **S-E** = Indian Settlement
- **NL** = Nisga’a Land
- **NVL** = Nisga’a Village
## Appendix 3 – Potential Comparator Municipalities (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>Total Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>Tax Roll General Taxable Values**</th>
<th>% Total Taxes Residential**</th>
<th>% Total Assessment Residential**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>38,833</td>
<td>61,379,161</td>
<td>$5,464,550,171</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>141,397</td>
<td>225,014,000</td>
<td>$19,548,571,205</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>83,788</td>
<td>112,203,597</td>
<td>$11,408,153,366</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>82,256</td>
<td>116,301,382</td>
<td>$14,162,376,266</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>70,996</td>
<td>184,714,000</td>
<td>$14,591,311,861</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>58,612</td>
<td>87,816,298</td>
<td>$12,165,019,548</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>74,003</td>
<td>150,792,000</td>
<td>$8,511,641,196</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td>52,898</td>
<td>103,788,000</td>
<td>$16,043,317,107</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langford</td>
<td>35,342</td>
<td>46,967,948</td>
<td>$6,378,148,938</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell River</td>
<td>32,588</td>
<td>54,775,157</td>
<td>$4,251,642,932</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penticton</td>
<td>33,761</td>
<td>98,072,162</td>
<td>$5,786,748,681</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody</td>
<td>33,551</td>
<td>59,754,639</td>
<td>$8,406,339,513</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>40,116</td>
<td>68,999,000</td>
<td>$7,142,714,936</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>42,473</td>
<td>145,237,442</td>
<td>$38,965,600,212</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kelowna</td>
<td>32,655</td>
<td>54,302,364</td>
<td>$6,843,185,187</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2016 BC Stats: [http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/StatisticsBySubject/Census/2016Census/PopulationHousing/MunicipalitiesByRegionalDistrict.aspx](http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/StatisticsBySubject/Census/2016Census/PopulationHousing/MunicipalitiesByRegionalDistrict.aspx)


Shaded rows are recommended for inclusion in 2017 detailed comparative analysis – average population is 36,498.
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 traffic, 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 north 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](image-url)

**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 outweigh 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>- Five year maintenance costs</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></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 the 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.
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: February 20, 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)

Requesting a reduction in our secondary suite garbage collection fees.

Preferred meeting date for delegation: March 5, 2018

Alternative meeting date for delegation:

Please refer to the Council Meeting Schedule on the District’s website for dates of Council Meetings.

REGINA JERZY MASOWSKI
Name(s) of presenter(s)

Name of group/organization (if applicable)

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

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

A reduction in garbage collection fees.

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

If yes, what was the result? Booked for March 5, 2018 7:00 p.m.

Regular Council Meeting

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

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

Information provided on this form will be published and made available for public viewing. Please submit a separate document with your contact information.
District of Mission Council Resolution - March 5, 2018

WHEREAS British Columbia has a large and diverse multicultural society in which the Ukrainian community plays a leading and vibrant role; and

WHEREAS The District of Mission will host dancers from across British Columbia, and Washington State who will attend an adjudicated dance competition; and

WHEREAS Canadians of all nationalities will have an opportunity to discover and explore Ukrainian culture, heritage and history; and

WHEREAS Ukrainian arts and crafts will be displayed and demonstrated; and

WHEREAS Ukrainian music played will be performed throughout the day on traditional folk instruments and the singing of folk songs; and

WHEREAS Traditional Ukrainian cuisine will be served for the nourishment and enjoyment of all; and

WHEREAS The Ukrainian Cultural Festival has been an annual event in the Lower Mainland since 1996, attracting performers and audiences from within and outside the Province of British Columbia,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the District of Mission hereby proclaims May 5, 2018 as

“Ukrainian Cultural Festival Day”

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this 5th Day of March, 2018

_______________________________________________  __________________________________________________
MAYOR RANDY HAWES                                  CORPORATE OFFICER
February 13, 2018

The Honourable Randy Hawes
Mayor of the District of Mission
8645 Stave Lake Street
Box 20
Mission, BC V2V 4L9

Re: 23rd Annual BC Ukrainian Cultural Festival May 5, 2018

The BC Ukrainian Cultural Festival Society, a non-profit organization, is sponsoring its 23rd Annual BC Ukrainian Cultural Festival. This year’s festival will take place on Saturday May 5th 2018, 9:00am – 5:00pm at the Clarke Foundation Theatre located at Heritage Park Secondary School, 33700 Prentis Avenue, Mission BC.

We feature dance competitions, arts and crafts for display and sale, food, entertainment and much more.

We would be greatly honoured if you and your members of City Council would be our guests at the daytime activities (confirmation required).

We will have the Official Opening at 9:50 a.m. at which time we invite you to the stage for opening remarks.

Also, I have enclosed a copy of the previous years “District of Mission Proclamation” to proclaim “Ukrainian Festival Day”. We humbly ask that you present this request at your next meeting on our behalf. We would appreciate a new copy of the Proclamation for our festival program. Please e-mail a digital copy of the proclamation to info@bcucf.ca and the original to above address.

I’d like to thank you and your council for assisting our organization in the promotion of our event.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Darka Morin
President
BC Ukrainian Cultural Festival Society
info@bcucf.ca
www.bcucf.ca
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, March 5, 2018 to consider the following proposed bylaw:


   The purpose of the Bylaw is to facilitate the subdivision of the property in conjunction with development application P2016-015 (lands to the south).

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

   - Parcel Identifier: 026-863-693
   - Lot 31 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan BCP26897

   from the **Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone** to **Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone**.

   The location of the subject property is 33100 Dalke Avenue and is shown on the following maps:

   Copies of the proposed bylaw and report relevant to this bylaw 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, February 23, 2018 to Monday, March 5, 2018. The information is also available on our website at [www.mission.ca](http://www.mission.ca) by searching “Public Meeting Information”. For further information regarding this bylaw, 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 this proposed bylaw 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, March 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 20th day of February, 2018.
February 20, 2018

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Public Hearing Notification

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on Monday, March 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:

DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5710-2018-5050(280) (R17-023 – District of Mission)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to facilitate the subdivision of the property in conjunction with development application P2016-015 (lands to the south).

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

Parcel Identifier: 026-863-693
Lot 31 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan BCP26897

from the Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone.

The location of the subject property is 33100 Dalke 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, February 23, 2018 to Monday, March 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 Marcy Bond, Senior 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,

Marcy Bond

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: February 19, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Marcy Bond, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application R17-023 for the property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue to facilitate the subdivision of the property in conjunction with development application P2016-015 (lands to the south).
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 - Conceptual Layout for all parcels under Development Applications
Appendix 4 – Proposed D3 Detention Pond

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33100 Dalke Avenue
APPLICANT: District of Mission
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Residential Compact OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: June 27, 2017
LOCATION: Cedar Valley
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the rezoning application for the property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw that would allow a subsequent subdivision.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for March 5, 2018

SUMMARY

The District of Mission has submitted a Rezoning application (R17-023) for the District owned property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue (Dalke detention pond) (Appendix 3). The proposal is to rezone the property to the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone and then sell the lot, to the developer of the properties to the south, at fair market value. The developer will then reclaim 33100 Dalke Avenue by removing the temporary detention pond. The lot will then be consolidated with the properties to the south to allow for the development of single family lots as shown on Appendix 4.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is approximately 699 square metres (7523 sq. ft.) and is located at the corner of Dalke Avenue and the Egglestone Street/Nottman Avenue intersection. The lot is currently encumbered with a temporary detention pond.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009):

The subject property is currently zoned Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone. Considering the property’s OCP designation of Urban Compact, the District is proposing to rezone the property to the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Character

The surrounding neighbourhood consists of a mix of urban compact lots and suburban acreages; However, under the District of Mission OCP Bylaw 5670-2017 the area is designated to allow for more compact residential development with the installation of full municipal services.

Municipal Services

This existing detention pond at 33100 Dalke Avenue was constructed as a temporary storm water detention facility and was slated to be decommissioned, once the community storm water detention facility (identified as the D3 site on Appendix 5) was brought on line.

The decommissioning of this pond is a component of a larger plan, undertaken by the developer of application R16-010 and R17-015, to develop a community storm water facility to service the entire area.

Tree Retention

The requirements for tree planting as per Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting will be addressed by the developer of R16-010 and R17-015.
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Residential developments proposing compact lots require approval of an Intensive Residential Development Permit. The Intensive Residential Development Permit Area Guidelines are designed to facilitate a higher standard of building design, housing and alternative site compatibility.

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

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

The development variance permit for lot depth for this proposed lot was considered by Council as part of R16-010.

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

No community amenity contribution is being requested for this application. In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the developer of rezoning applications R16-010 and R17-015 has volunteered to contribute $2815 (per new residential lot created) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs on the District to fund new or expanded facilities and/or amenities within the community.

COMMUNICATION

One (1) development notification sign has been posted 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.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING

The Final Reading of the amending bylaws will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.
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>33100 Dalke Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID:</td>
<td>026-863-693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>Lot 31, Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCP26897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Property: 33100 Dalke Avenue
Owner: District of Mission
Applicant: District of Mission
Zoning: RC372
OCP Designation: Urban Residential - Compact
DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF:
1) LOT 1 PLAN LMP3590
   CIVIC ADDRESS: 9040 NOTTMAN STREET, MISSION
   PARCEL IDENTIFIER: 20-292-139
2) LOT 2 EXCEPT: PART SUBDIVIDED BY PLAN 35446; PLAN 23197
   CIVIC ADDRESS: 9040 NOTTMAN STREET, MISSION
   PARCEL IDENTIFIER: 20-292-139
3) LOT A PLAN EPP57128
   CIVIC ADDRESS: NOTTMAN STREET, MISSION
   PARCEL IDENTIFIER: 200-869-167
4) LOT 31 PLAN BCP26897
   CIVIC ADDRESS: 9040 NOTTMAN STREET, MISSION
   PARCEL IDENTIFIER: 202-275-966
5) LOT 18 PLAN 35446
   CIVIC ADDRESS: 9042 NOTTMAN STREET, MISSION
   PARCEL IDENTIFIER: 202-275-966
all of SECTION 28 TOWNSHIP 17 NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT

SCALE: 1:800

LOT DIMENSIONS DERIVED FROM
FIELD SURVEY

DRAFTED: OCTOBER/NOVEMBER, 2013
DRAWING DATE: MAY 3, 2017
PREPARED FOR: FELDBERG & ASSOCIATES LTD
NOTICE TO COUNCIL (POSTING PLAN LMP3590)
Legend:
- Catchment Area in Cedar Valley
- Existing Wetland
- Proposed Location for Rainwater Management Facility
- Existing Dwellings & New Development (11.55ha) - rainwater directed to the rainwater management facility
- Multi-family Area - rainwater detained on-site

Catchment Area in Cedar Valley
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, February 14, 2018 commencing at 8:00 a.m.

Members Present: Rocky Blondin, Blondin Enterprises Inc., EDSC Chair
Lesa Lacey, Lacey Developments Ltd.
Wade Peary, Riverside College
Pia Ritch, Mission Community Skills Centre Society
Edgar Sarfeld, Vinegar Hill Consulting Co. Ltd
Dan Schubert, Schubert Plumbing & Heating Ltd
Beverly Toews, Fraser Pacific Enterprises Inc.
Craig Toews, University of the Fraser Valley (UFV)
Ann Harper, Representative for the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (MRCC)

Members Absent: Raymond Szabada, Sumas Regional Consortium for High Tech. (SRCTec)
Ron Poole, Chief Administration Officer
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Staff Present: Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer
Clare Seeley, Executive Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Chair called the meeting to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
Moved by C. Toews and seconded by A. Harper
That the agenda of the February 14, 2018 meeting of the Economic Development Select Committee be approved
CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL
Moved by P. Ritch and seconded by W. Peary
That the minutes of the January 10, 2018 meeting of the Economic Development Select Committee be approved.
CARRIED
The committee were reminded to consider potential conflict of interest issues with the agenda prior to New Business.
4. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Planning – Introduction to Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

S. Crawford advised that D. Sommer, the Director of Development Services will begin attending the meetings in place of G. MacKay and has been requested to provide a quarterly planning update.

(b) Residential Fire Sprinklers

Several follow-up meetings have occurred since the discussion that took place with the Mission Fire Chief at the EDSC meeting on January 10, 2018, where concerns were raised regarding the lack of process, costs and communication from the District of Mission to all relevant parties including developers, Fraser Valley Home Builders Association (FVHBA) and the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (MRCC) regarding the adoption of the Residential Fire Sprinkler Bylaw.

A communication has since been issued (included in the February 14, 2018 Agenda Package) and a strategy is now being developed to ensure that external communication is considered with new or amended Bylaw’s.

L. Lacey recommended that the District considers cost implications for the municipality and residents when reviewing Bylaws.

(c) Terms of Reference

The amendments to the Economic Development Select Committee Terms of Reference were adopted by Council. A copy was included in the February 14, 2018 Agenda Package.

(d) Request for Input: Changing from “District of Mission” to “City of Mission”

R. Blondin was approached by Councillor Hamilton to ask for the EDSC’s input for the consideration of a name change for the municipality to the “City of Mission”.

Discussion ensued regarding the benefits and cost associations involved in changing to a city classification.

The committee was in support of the change, with a preference for “Mission City”, highlighting the community’s heritage. It was noted that this may not be attainable due to the province’s standards in name designation to “City of”.

The committee also discussed how the tourism rebranding could be impacted by this process and it was decided that the over-arching municipal brand identity, rather than the name, could be as effective as a reclassification to “City of”, while also helping to build visitor attraction.

(e) Economic Development Update

   i. EDSC Nomination Process

The process will begin in March, 2018 where a nominations committee will be formed, with a minimum of two participants composing of the EDSC Chair and at least one EDSC member.

The process will include reviewing the self-assessments undertaken by the EDSC in 2017, advertising and reviewing applications for the vacant EDSC position, determining which current members are interested in running for another term and clarifying interest in the Chair and Vice-Chair positions. The election will take place in May, 2018 after which the recommendations for the composition of the committee will be passed to Council for approval.
The last meeting of the current EDSC will take place in June, 2018.
C. Toews left the meeting at 8:52 a.m.

ii. Visioning Exercise
S. Crawford recognized the work the EDSC has accomplished in the last year, with their advice validating many District initiatives.

The EDSC requested a more visionary approach regarding potential areas of focus at the January, 2018 meeting. With this in mind the following areas were discussed as possible items for the committee’s consideration:

- District Brand Identity – brand, typography, logo & tag line.
- Bypass – Transportation movements east to west.
- Film – business support, attraction strategy.
- Policy Development – business license fees, bylaws etc.
- Red Tape Reduction – improving time, cost, process.
- Waterfront Redevelopment
- Industrial Land Expansion – lands currently recognized in the Official Community Plan (Agricultural Land Reserve)
- Innovation Zone – knowledge based economy, identifying potential zone locations, Smart City designation.
- Workforce & Education Development – soft and technical skills, align education with business requirements.
- Tourism Development – development of the business plan
- Other EDSC Suggestions – events centre (similar to the Tradex in Abbotsford), establish alternate locations for industrial land away from the ALR - upland, Downtown redevelopment (existing brownfield sites) & improvements, ease development process (red tape) and Innovation Zone Development with the City taking the lead.

W. Peary left the meeting at 9:25 a.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

EDSC Regular Meeting – Wednesday, March 14, 2018 at 8:00 a.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED COMMITTEE MEETING

Moved by D. Schubert and seconded by B. Toews
That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting adjourned at 9:35 a.m.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5704-2018-5050(277)

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 5704-2018-5050(277)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 7965 Grand Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 011-790-695
      Lot 1 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 78716
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) 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
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5711-2018

A Bylaw to terminate “District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw 611-1977”

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 3rd day of October, 1977 enact a bylaw cited as “District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 611-1977”;

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 5711-2018”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and Richard Francis Schmidt and John Raymond Schmidt, for the property legally described as:

   Parcel Identifier: 003-413-071
   Legal Description: Lot 546 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 63811

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
ADOPTED THIS __ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES
MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE
CORPORATE OFFICER
WHEREAS, under the provisions of the *Local Government Act*, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5712-2018-5050(281)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 33333 12th Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier:  003-413-071
      Lot 546 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 63811
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5713-2018

A Bylaw to terminate “District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw 621-1977”

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 17th day of October, 1977 enact a bylaw cited as “District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 621-1977”;

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 5713-2018”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and Asoke Kumar Dutt and Hilda Dutt, for the property legally described as:
   Parcel Identifier: 005-379-041
   Legal Description: Lot 529 District Lot 411 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 55798

   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
ADOPTED THIS ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5710-2018-5050(280)

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 5710-2018-5050(280)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 026-863-693
      Lot 31, Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan
      BCP26897
      from Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 19th day of February, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this 19th day of February, 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
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 5562-2016-5050(199)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 32385 McRae Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier:  006-589-154
      Lot 294 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
      42842
      from Multiple Family 52 Townhouse (MT52) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone for the northern portion of the property and from Multiple Family 52 Townhouse (MT52) Zone to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone for the southern portion of the property, as shown on Schedule A attached to and forming part of this Bylaw; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 16th day of May, 2016
READ A SECOND TIME this 16th day of May, 2016
PUBLIC HEARING held this 6th day of June, 2016
READ A THIRD TIME this 6th day of June, 2016
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2016

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE A

Legend

- Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Multi Family 52 (MT52) Townhouse Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone
- Shaded area to be rezoned from Multi Family 52 (MT52) Townhouse Zone to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone
DATE: May 16, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Robert Publow, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning to facilitate subdivision of property located at 32385 McRae Avenue into four (4) lots to accommodate three (3) single-family lots and one (1) duplex lot.
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Draft Plan of Subdivision
Appendix 4 – Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan
Appendix 5 – Engineering Department Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32385 McRae Avenue
APPLICANT: Brian Sharp
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Urban Residential.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: January 14, 2016
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the rezoning application to rezone the northern half portion of 32385 McRae Avenue from Multi Family 52 (MT52) Townhouse Zone to Compact Residential 465 (RC465) Zone and the southern half portion from MT52 to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to accommodate a 4-lot subdivision; and identifies the necessary bylaw amendment to the Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009.

Staff support proposed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5562-2016-5050(199) and as such have listed the Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for June 6, 2016.

SUMMARY

An application has been received from Brian Sharp, part owner and agent for the property owners (Goodland Holdings Ltd. and B. Sharp Developments Ltd.) of 32385 McRae Avenue, to rezone the subject property to facilitate a subdivision into four (4) lots, as shown in draft plan of subdivision attached as Appendix 3. The two target Zones would allow the northern half of the property to be subdivided into 3 compact residential lots and the southern portion to accommodate a duplex.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood and Site Characteristics

The proposed development is located in the Mission Core area and is in compliance with the property’s Urban Residential OCP designation.

The subject property is situated within the Urban Infill Area of Mission and is surrounded predominantly by single-family residential properties with a multi-family development directly west. The neighbouring properties along the Hurd Street, Cedar Street and 7th Avenue corridors transition to designations that envision higher residential density development in the form of compact and multi-family housing. While the application is to downzone the property to a lower density land use, the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding land uses and fits well within the neighbourhood density and the area’s OCP designation. To allow a more efficient use of the land and to maintain the single-family residential character of the area, one of the four lots proposed will accommodate a duplex.

ZONING (Bylaw 5050-2009)

The site is currently zoned Multi Family 52 (MT52) Townhouse Zone. In accordance with the Urban Residential designation, the applicant proposes to rezone the northern portion of the property to Compact Residential 465 (RC465) Zone, which allows 3 lots with a minimum size of 465 m² (5,005 ft²), and the southern portion to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone, which allows a duplex on a lot with a minimum size of 558 m² (6,006 ft²). The configuration of the target zones are shown in the Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan, attached as Appendix 4.

Access

Paved access is available to the site from McRae Avenue at the north and Widgeon Avenue at the south. Upgrades to Widgeon Avenue shall be required as a component of the subdivision as detailed by the Engineering Department comments in Appendix 5.
Servicing
Municipal sanitary service is available on Widgeon Avenue, municipal storm services and municipal water are available on both McRae Avenue and Widgeon Avenue. The developer is required to provide engineered designs for the above services to all proposed lots as a component of the subdivision process as detailed in Appendix 5. Engineered designs of the proposed servicing and road design will be required at time of subdivision, at which time a separate Development Variance Permit application may be required.

Environmental Protection
There are no watercourses or environmentally sensitive areas on the subject property. The property is relatively flat and therefore no geotechnical issues are expected to arise.

Tree Retention
In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of eight (8) trees; 2 trees for each of the four (4) 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 tree (trees having a caliper of 0.2 metres or greater) that will be removed except within the proposed municipal infrastructure necessary to complete the development.

Parks and Trails
As no parkland has been identified within this site and in accordance with section 510 of the Local Government Act, the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department is recommending cash-in-lieu for parkland for this development proposal up to 5% of the market value of the land.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT - INTENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA
A Development Permit for building form and character is required for all residential developments within the urban area. The OCP establishes guidelines for the form and character of intensive residential development by facilitating a higher standard of building design, housing alternative, site compatibility and site aesthetics that promote a vibrant residential neighbourhood. The applicant is required to register a restrictive covenant stipulating design guidelines as outlined in the OCP that the proposed residential buildings would need to meet.

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

COMMUNITY AMENITY CONTRIBUTION (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities)
In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $11,260 (two (2) new lots x $2,815 plus two (2) units X $2,815 per duplex) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

COMMUNICATION
The developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development. Provided a public hearing date is determined by Council, the sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 152 metres (500 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.
Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages
A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.

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

REFERRALS

Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of servicing works requirements as outlined in Appendix 5.

Parks, Recreation and Culture
The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objection to the project and recommends that parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash in lieu at time of subdivision.

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 $11,260 ($2,815 per new unit or lot) is received;
2. Completion of servicing works as required by the Engineering Department;
3. Registration of a restrictive covenant for building form and character; and
4. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
In accordance with Section 510 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash in lieu to subdivision file S16-003.

SIGN-OFFS

Robert Publow, Planner
Reviewed by: Chris Laing, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32385 McRae Avenue

PID: 006-589-154

Legal: Parcel Identifier: 006-589-154
Lot 294 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 42842
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 32385 McRae Avenue
Owner: Goodland Holdings Ltd. & B Sharp Developments Ltd.
Applicant: Brian Sharp
Zoning: MT52
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Multi Family 52 (MT52) Townhouse Zone to Compact Residential 465 (RC465) Zone

Shaded area to be rezoned from Multi Family 52 (MT52) Townhouse Zone to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone
CIVIC ADDRESS: 32385 McRae Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: MT52  PROPOSED ZONES: RT465 and RC465

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on McRae Avenue. No upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Widgeon Avenue.

Municipal sanitary sewer is available on McRae Avenue. The Developer shall extend the sanitary sewer to the west property line of the site. Engineered design is required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on McRae Avenue. No upgrades are required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
McRae Avenue provides paved access to the southern portion of the site. No upgrades are required.

Widgeon Avenue provides paved access to the site. The developer is to construct Widgeon Avenue to a remaining ½ local residential cul-de-sac. Engineered design is required.

A variance permit may be required to vary Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985. Suitability - Works on Adjacent Highways, as Widgeon Avenue is an unconstructed road dedication that exceeds the cul-de-sac fronting the site.

OTHER COMMENTS:
As there are multiple scenarios for servicing, variances may be required to vary the Subdivision Control Bylaw after the Developer explores the feasibility of each option in more detail.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the rezoning application may proceed to final adoption once the roadwork requirements have been met.

Prepared by: Blake Tabian, Engineering Technologist
Reviewed by: Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

January 25, 2016
Zoning Amending Bylaw 5562-2016-5050(199)

R16-003 (Sharp) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32385 McRae Avenue from Multiple Family 52 Townhouse Zone (MT52) to Compact Residential 465 Zone (RC465) and Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465)

The purpose of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into three single family lots of a minimum 465 square metres and one duplex lot of a minimum 558 square metres. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 006-589-154
Lot 294 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 42842

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Chris Laing, Manager of Planning, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Purpose and outline of the proposal.
3. Subject property map.

The Acting Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

In response to a question from a Councillor, the Director of Development Services noted that the cul de sac shown on the proposed lot layout is intended to be built out to allow for a turnaround for fire trucks.

Tom Haldane expressed concern with increased noise and the potential for conflict with rental tenants from the proposed duplex.

Brian Sharp, the applicant, noted that the intention is to have the duplex be stratified.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5562-2016-5050(199) R16-003 (Sharp) closed.
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 5th day of February, 2018

READ A SECOND TIME this 5th day of February, 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this 5th 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
#### 2017 to 2021 Financial Plan

### General Operating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>General Capital</th>
<th>Drainage Capital</th>
<th>Water Capital</th>
<th>Sewer Capital</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property taxation</td>
<td>-29,972,934</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,596,389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-121,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers</td>
<td>-2,848,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-667,183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-321,819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>-1,619,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8,012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>-42,885,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,781,489</td>
<td>-6,531,837</td>
<td>-4,892,317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>General Capital</th>
<th>Drainage Capital</th>
<th>Water Capital</th>
<th>Sewer Capital</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and finance</td>
<td>4,922,943</td>
<td>-4,737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective services</td>
<td>16,599,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit services</td>
<td>2,920,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-321,819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development services</td>
<td>2,658,114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1,443,353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>267,088</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-905,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,367,490</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry enterprise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-130,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal recoveries</td>
<td>-3,003,202</td>
<td>3,064,202</td>
<td>-61,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>41,822,135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,543,973</td>
<td>4,499,735</td>
<td>4,367,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual (surplus) deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual (surplus) deficit</th>
<th>General Capital</th>
<th>Drainage Capital</th>
<th>Water Capital</th>
<th>Sewer Capital</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Reserves, capital and debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserves, capital and debt</th>
<th>General Capital</th>
<th>Drainage Capital</th>
<th>Water Capital</th>
<th>Sewer Capital</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets purchased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets contributed by developers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New debt/temporary borrowing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of debt</td>
<td>594,859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to reserves</td>
<td>6,678,442</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226,691</td>
<td>3,255,272</td>
<td>1,590,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>-4,890,666</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-989,176</td>
<td>-1,223,170</td>
<td>-1,120,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves/surplus used for capital funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves/surplus used to fund operations</td>
<td>-1,519,269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reserves, capital and debt</td>
<td>1,063,366</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>762,484</td>
<td>2,032,102</td>
<td>470,407</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)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Details</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property taxation</td>
<td>-31,569,324</td>
<td>-32,710,422</td>
<td>-33,609,914</td>
<td>-34,507,370</td>
<td>-35,444,143</td>
<td>-167,841,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Improvements</td>
<td>-166,681</td>
<td>-166,681</td>
<td>-166,681</td>
<td>-166,681</td>
<td>-166,681</td>
<td>-833,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers</td>
<td>-9,812,849</td>
<td>-2,833,242</td>
<td>-2,834,603</td>
<td>-2,835,978</td>
<td>-2,837,366</td>
<td>-21,154,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>-3,272,036</td>
<td>-5,183,536</td>
<td>-2,275,256</td>
<td>-8,564,847</td>
<td>-3,391,385</td>
<td>-22,686,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-1,227,281</td>
<td>-1,224,560</td>
<td>-1,282,331</td>
<td>-1,294,984</td>
<td>-1,308,088</td>
<td>-6,337,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>-1,627,046</td>
<td>-1,669,296</td>
<td>-1,639,636</td>
<td>-1,689,802</td>
<td>-1,741,329</td>
<td>-8,367,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer in-kind contribution for capital</td>
<td>-4,478,328</td>
<td>-4,334,077</td>
<td>-4,409,428</td>
<td>-4,486,286</td>
<td>-4,564,681</td>
<td>-22,272,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses Details</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and finance</td>
<td>4,962,575</td>
<td>5,213,206</td>
<td>5,142,163</td>
<td>5,250,724</td>
<td>5,330,175</td>
<td>25,898,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government and fiscal services</td>
<td>8,123,097</td>
<td>7,675,888</td>
<td>7,801,695</td>
<td>8,455,456</td>
<td>8,109,021</td>
<td>40,165,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective services</td>
<td>16,872,292</td>
<td>16,943,386</td>
<td>17,464,309</td>
<td>18,031,043</td>
<td>18,589,494</td>
<td>87,900,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and public works</td>
<td>2,920,942</td>
<td>2,979,274</td>
<td>3,038,859</td>
<td>3,099,397</td>
<td>3,161,629</td>
<td>15,200,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>5,311,716</td>
<td>4,476,137</td>
<td>4,525,974</td>
<td>4,643,866</td>
<td>4,736,742</td>
<td>23,694,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development services</td>
<td>2,741,968</td>
<td>2,357,064</td>
<td>2,404,090</td>
<td>2,452,085</td>
<td>2,501,040</td>
<td>12,456,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, recreation and cultural services</td>
<td>7,947,231</td>
<td>7,390,652</td>
<td>7,724,881</td>
<td>9,381,356</td>
<td>8,151,676</td>
<td>40,595,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1,457,594</td>
<td>1,475,082</td>
<td>1,509,590</td>
<td>1,553,978</td>
<td>1,571,508</td>
<td>7,567,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>277,089</td>
<td>231,216</td>
<td>235,806</td>
<td>240,487</td>
<td>245,261</td>
<td>1,229,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage utility</td>
<td>2,331,317</td>
<td>2,041,119</td>
<td>2,083,157</td>
<td>2,083,617</td>
<td>2,215,504</td>
<td>10,754,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utility</td>
<td>3,948,432</td>
<td>3,650,221</td>
<td>3,718,537</td>
<td>3,903,646</td>
<td>4,088,386</td>
<td>19,309,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility</td>
<td>5,355,603</td>
<td>4,550,624</td>
<td>4,371,245</td>
<td>4,565,233</td>
<td>5,185,055</td>
<td>24,027,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry enterprise</td>
<td>4,282,404</td>
<td>3,844,279</td>
<td>3,915,842</td>
<td>3,988,327</td>
<td>4,062,764</td>
<td>20,096,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>68,784,352</td>
<td>64,740,164</td>
<td>65,871,216</td>
<td>69,602,434</td>
<td>69,933,950</td>
<td>338,932,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Annual (surplus) deficit | -11,866,697 | -11,661,602 | -9,287,770 | -13,558,881 | -9,831,073 | -56,206,023 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserves, capital and debt Details</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets purchased</td>
<td>26,338,527</td>
<td>15,299,672</td>
<td>8,900,861</td>
<td>15,388,261</td>
<td>10,230,942</td>
<td>76,158,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets contributed by developers</td>
<td>4,478,328</td>
<td>4,334,077</td>
<td>4,409,428</td>
<td>4,486,286</td>
<td>4,564,681</td>
<td>22,272,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New debt/temporary borrowing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of debt - principal <em>(see note below)</em></td>
<td>594,860</td>
<td>619,102</td>
<td>507,934</td>
<td>527,406</td>
<td>547,626</td>
<td>2,796,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to reserves</td>
<td>12,324,714</td>
<td>13,030,459</td>
<td>13,549,547</td>
<td>13,952,270</td>
<td>14,163,524</td>
<td>66,920,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>-8,308,146</td>
<td>-8,381,336</td>
<td>-8,452,590</td>
<td>-8,529,978</td>
<td>-8,605,362</td>
<td>-42,279,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves/surplus used for capital funding</td>
<td>-21,844,317</td>
<td>-12,511,755</td>
<td>-9,756,202</td>
<td>-11,500,724</td>
<td>-10,410,862</td>
<td>-65,244,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves/surplus used to fund operations</td>
<td>-1,717,269</td>
<td>-728,617</td>
<td>-647,984</td>
<td>-664,699</td>
<td>-659,512</td>
<td>-4,418,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,866,697</td>
<td>11,661,602</td>
<td>9,287,770</td>
<td>13,558,881</td>
<td>9,831,073</td>
<td>56,206,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>594,860</td>
<td>619,102</td>
<td>507,934</td>
<td>527,406</td>
<td>547,626</td>
<td>2,796,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest associated with debt</td>
<td>243,300</td>
<td>182,551</td>
<td>164,250</td>
<td>164,250</td>
<td>164,250</td>
<td>918,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total payments</strong></td>
<td>838,160</td>
<td>801,653</td>
<td>672,184</td>
<td>691,656</td>
<td>711,876</td>
<td>3,715,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>6,500</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>199,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Public Works</td>
<td>2,567,007</td>
<td>1,504,782</td>
<td>1,926,886</td>
<td>974,207</td>
<td>2,371,066</td>
<td>7,891,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Purchasing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>3,000</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>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government - Major Projects</td>
<td>864,793</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,664,789</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>1,079,796</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>11,144</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>16,364</td>
<td>11,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government - Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>267,610</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,054,014</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>3,333,310</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>7,798</td>
<td>34,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal General Capital Plan</td>
<td>5,412,743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,528,881</td>
<td>1,306,806</td>
<td>2,522,295</td>
<td>5,502,088</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 Acquisition</td>
<td>89,432</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>345,376</td>
<td>208,970</td>
<td>231,955</td>
<td>999,593</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>1,448,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - All Areas</td>
<td>563,728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,009,000</td>
<td>502,260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,074,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Creek Parkway Parkland</td>
<td>258,403</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>731,707</td>
<td>780,341</td>
<td>1,533,800</td>
<td>3,304,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</td>
<td>920,682</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,318,376</td>
<td>1,442,937</td>
<td>1,487,296</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</td>
<td>981,263</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>475,220</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>981,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford/Mission Recycling Depot</td>
<td>55,625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,080</td>
<td>18,984</td>
<td>19,888</td>
<td>166,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Waste Management Capital Plan</td>
<td>1,036,888</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>509,300</td>
<td>198,848</td>
<td>198,888</td>
<td>1,148,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Replacement Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>2,986,141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>953,498</td>
<td>339,417</td>
<td>1,822,384</td>
<td>850,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestry Capital Plan</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>222,942</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>21,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>766,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCCs (Restricted Revenue)</td>
<td>264,586</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>892,400</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,257,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Drainage Utility Capital Plan</td>
<td>576,270</td>
<td>305,422</td>
<td>1,007,400</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>1,017,000</td>
<td>2,023,670</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>74,250</td>
<td>561,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>873,250</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>2,168,590</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>581,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital - Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Supply DCC</td>
<td>86,973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>456,085</td>
<td>42,427</td>
<td>1,392,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Water Utility Capital Plan</td>
<td>4,031,834</td>
<td>390,653</td>
<td>1,940,111</td>
<td>82,458</td>
<td>2,078,187</td>
<td>3,706,440</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>1,137,800</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>663,199</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>4,798,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital Plan</td>
<td>11,273,969</td>
<td>1,383,976</td>
<td>1,532,422</td>
<td>1,034,266</td>
<td>2,252,786</td>
<td>5,683,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26,338,527</td>
<td>403,220</td>
<td>6,233,563</td>
<td>15,299,672</td>
<td>2,495,620</td>
<td>24,777,110</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**

- $32,975,310
- $17,795,291
- $11,352,015
- $20,165,370
- $13,902,247
- $96,190,232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Plan</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>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>29,089,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan</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>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>9,826,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Capital Plan</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>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>2,348,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle and Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Reserve Fund</td>
<td>2,986,141</td>
<td>953,498</td>
<td>339,417</td>
<td>1,822,384</td>
<td>850,932</td>
<td>6,952,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Vehicle and Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td>2,986,141</td>
<td>953,498</td>
<td>339,417</td>
<td>1,822,384</td>
<td>850,932</td>
<td>6,952,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Utility Capital Plan</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>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>2,461,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Utility Capital Plan</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>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>15,556,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Utility Capital Plan</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>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>29,623,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING</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>
### Budget 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</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></td>
<td>(10,443,034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase)/Decrease in inventories of property</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase)/Decrease in prepaid expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase)/Decrease in inventories of supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net financial assets/net debt</td>
<td>(10,443,034)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV17-030

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: Steven & Trudy Thomas and Charles Thomas & Alisha Ehlers
12948 Sabo Street, Mission, BC V4S 1L6

as the registered owner (hereinafter referred to as the Permittee) and shall only apply to ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the Municipality of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and more particularly known and described as:

Parcel Identifier: 017-373-417
Lot 2 Section 28 Township 18 New Westminster District Plan LMP515

1. The said lands are zoned Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) 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) By deleting the portion of the definition of Height (B) that states:
       Highest point of a Building with a flat roof or a pitch less than 4:12; shall be reduced by 3.0m with respect to the maximum permitted height within the applicable height

3. This Permit does not constitute a subdivision approval or a building permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. [Click here to type resolution number] passed by the Council on the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month] , [Click here to type year] .

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Development Variance Permit is hereby issued by the Municipality signed by the Mayor and the Corporate Officer the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month] , [Click here to type year] .

___________________________
Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

___________________________
Michael Younie,
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV17-030
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on February 5, 2018 commenced at 1:00 p.m. for COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, and was immediately followed by a CLOSED MEETING of Council, and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. for REGULAR COUNCIL proceedings.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes  
Councillor Pam Alexis  
Councillor Carol Hamilton  
Councillor Jim Hinds  
Councillor Rhett Nicholson  
Councillor Danny Plecas  
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services  
Rogine Battel, Manager of RCMP Administration  
Kris Boland, Director of Finance  
Michael Boronowski  
*Caroline Dalgleish, Maintenance Supervisor  
Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer  
Mike Dickinson, Planner  
*Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III  
Allyssa Fischer, Administrative Assistant  
Brenda Formosa, Administrative Clerk  
*Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Design and Planning  
*Jason Horton, Manager of Parks & Facilities  
*Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering and Projects  
*Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture  
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works  
*Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector  
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning  
Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services  
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer  
*Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services  
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture  
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services  
Dale Unrau, Fire Chief  
*Present for a portion of the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Hawes called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of February 5, 2018 be adopted.

CARRIED
3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and

RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

4. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Councillor Nicholson assumed the Chair.

Cedar Valley Local Area Plan Project Update

A report from the Planner dated February 5, 2018 regarding an update on the Cedar Valley Local Area Plan was provided for the Committee’s information.

Rezoning Application from RU16 to RR7S to allow a secondary dwelling unit and Variances at the properties located at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue

A report from the Planner dated February 5, 2018 regarding rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a three lot subdivision on the properties located at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for February 19, 2018, subject to Council granting second reading to the related zoning amending bylaw.

Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 34884 Moffat Avenue

A report from the Planner dated February 5, 2018 regarding the development application to rezone 34884 Moffat Avenue to R930s to facilitate 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 19, 2018, subject to Council granting second reading to the related zoning amending bylaw.

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

A report from the Planner dated February 5, 2018 regarding an application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 416-1975 for an unaddressed property located on Cedar Valley Connector was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for February 19, 2018, subject to Council granting second reading to the related repeal bylaw.

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

A report from the Planner dated February 5, 2018 regarding an 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 was provided for the Committee’s information.
Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for February 19, 2018, subject to Council granting second reading to the related zoning amending bylaw.

**Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018**

A report from the Manager of Inspection Services dated February 5, 2018 regarding a new Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw for the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System was provided for the Committee’s information.

### 5. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

**2017 Investment Performance Report**

A report from the Manager of Accounting Services dated February 5, 2018 regarding the District’s investment holdings as of December 31, 2017 was provided for the Committee’s information.

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

A report from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector dated February 5, 2018 regarding the budget amendments that Council has approved since the 2017 - 2021 Financial Plan Bylaw was adopted in December of 2016 was provided for the Committee’s information.

**2017 Budget Carry Forward Requests**

A report from the Manager of Accounting Services dated February 5, 2018 regarding the various 2017 budget carry forward requests from departments for specific projects was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

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).

CARRIED

**Economic Development Select Committee – Terms of Reference**

A report from the Economic Development Officer dated February 5, 2018 regarding proposed changes to the Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC) Terms of Reference was provided for the Committee’s consideration.
Moved by Councillor Hinds, and

RECOMMENDED:

That the proposed changes to the Economic Development Select Committee (EDSC) Terms of Reference as set out in the report from the Economic Development Officer dated February 5, 2018, be adopted.

CARRIED

**Status of Community Emergency Preparedness Grant Funding for a Mobile Reception Centre**

A report from the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer dated February 5, 2018 regarding a request to establish a budget for the purchase of provisions for a mobile reception centre and related to training was provided for the Committee's consideration.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

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.

CARRIED

**Council Attendance at Conferences – Councillor Alexis’ Request**

A report from the Executive Assistant dated February 5, 2018 regarding Councillor Alexis’ request to attend the 2018 Business Improvement Areas of BC (BIABC) Annual Conference on behalf of Council was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

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).

CARRIED

**6. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE**

Councillor Hamilton assumed the Chair.

**Parks, Recreation and Culture Department 2017 Grant Update**

A report from the Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated February 5, 2018 providing Council with an update on the grants the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department received in 2017 was provided for the Committee’s information.

**Tennis Court Development**

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated February 5, 2018 regarding the costs to add an additional tennis court at Centennial Park as requested by the Mission Tennis Club was provided for the Committee’s information.
Discussion ensued, and the following questions and concerns were noted by the Committee:

- The desire to create a strong working relationship with Mission’s tennis community and come up with a long-term strategy to build up the sport;
- Whether the court at Heritage Middle School should be dedicated to tennis or available for other sports in the community;
- The cost disparity between repairing existing courts versus building one new court.

Council noted that tennis courts would be discussed in more detail on February 7, 2018 at the Special Counting Meeting on the Parks, Recreation, Arts and Culture Master Plan.

South Arena Generator – Operating Budget

A report from the Manager of Parks and Facilities dated February 5, 2018 regarding proposed amendments to the Parks, Recreation and Culture operating budget to include operating and fleet charges was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

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.

CARRIED

January Ice Storm- Tree Clean-Up Efforts to Date

A report from the Manager of Parks and Facilities dated February 5, 2018 regarding the costs resulting from the clean-up activities associated with the December 31st ice storm event was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

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.

CARRIED

7. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Councillor Hinds assumed the Chair.
Engineering & Public Works Capital Project Updates

A report from the Manager of Development Engineering & Projects dated February 5, 2018 regarding a year-end update on the 2017 Engineering and Public Works capital projects was provided for the Committee’s information.

Prentis Avenue Roadworks Funding Request and Contract Award

A report from the Manager of Development Engineering & Projects dated February 5, 2018 regarding the approval to award a contract to Tiegen Excavating Ltd. for road improvements along Prentis Avenue was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

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.

CARRIED

Update on Free Residential Yard Waste Drop-off at Mission Landfill

A report from the Manager of Environmental Services dated February 5, 2018 regarding a proposed extension of the free residential yard waste drop-off period at the Landfill as a result of the ice storm was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

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.

CARRIED

7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application

A report from the Engineering Technologist III dated February 5, 2018 regarding the submission of a grant application to BikeBC to help fund the 7th Avenue Bike Lane project was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Discussion ensued, and several questions and concerns were raised by the Committee, including:

- Loss of parking on the north side of the street negatively impacting homeowners’ accessibility to their homes;
- Concerns about cyclist safety as the street is marked as a dedicated commercial truck route and an emergency access route for fire engines;
- How other communities had implemented dedicated cycling lanes;
- How loss of parking for businesses located between Taulbut and Grand Streets would be mitigated;
- Whether any consideration had been given to widening the sidewalks on 7th Avenue to create a shared walking/cycling path as opposed to creating dedicated bike lanes;
- Whether there was opportunity to widen the travel lanes in Option 1 past the proposed 3.3 metres; and
- How often the cycling lanes would be used.

In response, the Engineering Technologist stated that:
- The south side of 7th Avenue provided 3 times as many parking spots as the north side and would be able to accommodate the additional cars traditionally parked on the north side of the road.
- Transportation Association of Canada studies have indicated that 3.3 metres was wide enough for a truck lane and that the addition of the bike lanes would visually narrow the roadway, encouraging motorists to drive at lower speeds;
- The Engineering Department was recommending a parking lane between the travel lane and bike lane and the use of delineators as a physical separator in order to increase safety and security for cyclists;
- Both delineators and brightly coloured paint would be used in locations considered to be conflict points, such as intersections and clustered driveways;
- Marked parking stalls was not recommended because they hinder parking availability by limiting the number of cars that can be parked;
- Many communities placed their bike lanes adjacent to vehicle traveling lanes;
- Increasing the width of the sidewalk on 7th Avenue to accommodate a shared pedestrian/cycling route would be very costly;
- The proposed travel lane widths in Option 1 met the Transportation Association of Canada’s recommended minimum width for a vehicle traveling lane. She noted that 7th Avenue was different widths throughout the District and that the design in Option 1 was completed with the narrowest width of the street in mind.

The Manager of Engineering and Planning Design noted that the average width of a vehicle was 1.8 metres and that Option 1 allowed for a 2.4 metre width parking lane.

The Engineering Technologist further noted that by providing cycling lanes, more residents would be encouraged to use their bicycles. The Engineering Department would be working with ICBC on an education campaign to encourage cycling in Mission and to educate both cyclists and motorists on safe cycling practices.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:
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.

OPPOSED: Mayor Hawes
Councillor Hinds

CARRIED

8. PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH

Councillor Plecas assumed the Chair.

Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy

A report from the Fire Chief dated February 5, 2018 regarding the proposed Fire Rescue Service – Service Level Establishment & Limitations Policy was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, and

RECOMMENDED:

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


CARRIED

9. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mayor Hawes resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That Council rise from Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

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

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, 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)(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.

CARRIED

The meeting recessed at 3:37 p.m.

11. RECONVENE

Mayor Hawes reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes
Councillor Pam Alexis
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Jim Hinds
Councillor Danny Plecas

Council Members Absent: Councillor Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services
Marcy Bond, Senior Planner
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Allyssa Fischer, Administrative Assistant
Brenda Formosa, Administrative Clerk
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

12. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the February 5, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC18/053 to RC18/074, except item RC18/073 (7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application) be adopted.

CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the February 5, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in item RC18/073 (7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application) be adopted.

OPPOSED: Mayor Hawes
Councillor Hinds

CARRIED

13. DELEGATIONS

Cassy Crawford and Donna Duvall, Mission Arts Council

Cassy Crawford and Donna Duvall of the Mission Arts Council appeared before Council to request funding assistance for the Fraser Valley Children’s Festival and the IGNITE Youth Mentorship Program. They briefly discussed the activities of both the Festival and the Program and the benefits provided to the community. It was noted that the Mission Arts Council had received $22,500 in funding from the District for the 2018 year, a decrease from the $31,500 in funding received in 2018. It was stated that without additional funding, it would be difficult for Mission Arts Council to maintain the same level of services.

The Mission Arts Council requested $5,000 to support the Fraser Valley Children’s Festival and an additional $5,000 for the IGNITE Youth Mentorship Program for 2018.

It was noted that although the District had increased the Municipally Funded Grants budget for 2018, an increase in the number of requests had led to a decrease in the amount of funding that was available to individual applicants.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED:
That staff investigate funding options for the Mission Arts Council request and report back to Council.

CARRIED

14. PROCLAMATIONS

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That February 19 to 25, 2018 be proclaimed “Heritage Week” within the District of Mission.

CARRIED

15. PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 30883 Silverhill Avenue from the Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to the Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone to facilitate a two lot subdivision and to allow for a secondary dwelling on each lot. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 024-488-267
Lot 2 Section 1 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan LMP41845
The 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.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

1. Email from Laurie Eide dated February 1, 2018 stating opposition to the proposed development and expressing concerns regarding an increase in traffic, capacity of the well water supply, and the steepness of the road.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Council expressed concern regarding the steep slope of the driveway, and the Manager of Planning noted that the driveway would have to meet the requirements of the Development Bylaw.

R. Ahrend, Mission, questioned if the property was able to be subdivided since it was not hooked up to the municipality’s sewer or water services.

Mayor Hawes stated that the property was able to be subdivided provided if the septic system design met Fraser Health Authority’s standard.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5691-2017-5050(270) R17-029 (Wonnacott) closed.

**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**

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 32920 Boothby Avenue from the Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 025-741-705
Lot 51 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster Plan BCP7108

The 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.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.
The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5698-2017-5050(275) R17-034 (Clarkson) closed.

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

-AND-

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

The purpose of the proposed Official Community Plan and Zoning Amending Bylaws is to allow for the development of up to seventy-nine (79) units consisting of fifty-one (51) urban compact lots and twenty-eight (28) fee simple row houses. The subject properties are legally described as:

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

The 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. Rezoning Planning Analysis.
4. Development Permit Applications.
The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

1. Email from Sean B. dated January 31, 2018 expressing concern regarding the impact the proposed development would have on sensitive wildlife located within the area.

2. Email from Kale Hungerson dated February 1, 2018 expressing concern regarding the increase in parking and traffic congestion the proposed development might create on Machell Street. He also questioned the removal of the Environmentally Sensitive Area located behind his property on Machell Street and the connection of the laneways to the new development, noting these changes would directly impact the value of his property.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Chris Barthel, Mission, expressed the following summarized concerns:

- Removal of land from the Environmentally Sensitive Area designation;
- The rowhome driveways would not be long enough to accommodate larger vehicles and travel trailers;
- The increase in traffic and congested parking;
- Safety of children playing in the streets; and
- Concern that the roads and laneways in the proposed development would not be wide enough with cars parked on either side to provide garbage trucks and emergency vehicles with easy access.

In response, the Mayor noted that Council had discussed parking issues throughout the District at length. He noted that in this particular subdivision, the roads would be 10.8 metres in width, an increase from the standard 8.5 metres, which would allow space for vehicles to be parked on both sides of the street and adequate room for two vehicles to pass each other.

The Manager of Planning stated that under the current Attached Multi Unit Residential designation, the developer would have been able to build as many as 150 units, but had instead requested a redesignation to Urban Compact, which reduces the number of allowable units by two-thirds.

The Mayor further noted that the developer had consulted with an environmental professional on the removal of land from the environmentally sensitive area.

Andy McLaychy, Mission, expressed concern regarding the proposed fee simple row homes and stated that the home development needed to have a strata to ensure residents are obeying regulations. He expressed concerns regarding parking, lack of snow clearing on sidewalks in winter, and child safety due to the amount of traffic on the road.

Mayor Hawes noted that sidewalk snow clearing was the responsibility of the homeowner, and that District Council and Staff were actively working to address issues with unauthorized suites and the parking issues created by these units.

Darren Hall, agent for the applicant, confirmed that they had been working with staff to meet or exceed the requirements set out by the District. He stated that:
The developer had taken parking issues into serious consideration and had designed the parking pads to be larger than required, and there was room to park two regular sized vehicles at the rear lane;

How residents chose to use their garage (storage instead of parking) was beyond the control of the developer;

An environmental expert had been retained in order to ensure all standards were met with regards to the environmentally sensitive area;

The land proposed for the middle walkway was never designated as an environmentally sensitive area and that the developer had consulted with the planners and opted to design this as an unpaved walkway to maintain the character of the greenspace;

The proposed multi-family units were fee simple rowhomes, not townhouses. He noted that the inclusion of this building type offered buyers with an affordable alternative;

The row houses would not have access to the basement from the outside making it very difficult for owners to construct illegal secondary suites;

Council expressed concern that some of the proposed lots with secondary suites bordered Machell Street. Mr. Hall clarified that the developer had chosen corner lots as they are wider and would provide additional off street parking spaces.

Councillor Plecas asked the applicant if any endangered wildlife had been found within the ESA. Mr. Hall stated that no endangered species had been discovered at this point.

Michelle Bedford, Mission, expressed the following summarized concerns and comments:

- Row homes on Burton Street without adequate parking would lead to an increase in vehicles parked on Machell Street;
- Garages on Machell had been built too small to park vehicles in, leading to additional cars parked on the street;
- Cars parked illegally on Machell (e.g. in front of stop signs or fire hydrants) and the lack of response from the Bylaw Enforcement Division;
- No consideration taken by builders regarding how it would be to actually live in the neighbourhoods they designed;
- Recommended the District enforce “resident only” parking on Machell Street and the surrounding area.

Mayor Hawes acknowledged that parking on Machell Street was a problem that Council was aware of and that staff would be investigating possible solutions.

John Paul Lowes, Mission, expressed his concern about vehicle speed on Machell Street and the safety of children playing on the street. He also expressed concern that Tunbridge Park was too far away from the proposed development and that not enough greenspace was provided for children and animals. He further noted that many vehicles parked illegally (e.g. in front of fire hydrants or hanging out of driveways) around Machell Street and that the Bylaw Division was not actively enforcing the area.

Janice McCullough, Mission, expressed the following summarized comments and concerns:

- The removal of land from the environmentally sensitive area and destruction of wildlife habitat;
• The lack of greenspace will increase the risk of conflicts between people and wildlife;

• The new development would filter additional traffic onto Fennel Street. She recommended that Council consider placing speed bumps or other traffic calming measures on Fennel Street; and

• Questioned whether the District had plans to create an animal corridor throughout the length of the municipality;

In response to Ms. McCullough’s concerns, Mayor Hawes stated that what was proposed to be ‘removed’ from the ESA had actually been mislabeled and was never classified as an ESA.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated the Cedar Valley Area Plan would address the trail network.

Helen Stewart, Mission, expressed concern regarding the state of the greenspace to the north of the development, noting that it was full of construction debris that had been left behind after a recent development. She also expressed concern regarding vehicle speeds on Machell Street and recommended the District consider implementing speed bumps, raised crosswalks, and additional traffic calming measures in the area.

Ed Kobes, Mission, stated his concurrence with the other speakers’ concerns. He further stated that he believed alternate access onto Burton Avenue could alleviate traffic congestion on Machell. He recommended the District consider adding access from Cedar Street heading north onto Burton Avenue. He questioned whether bioswales would be constructed on the roadsides and asked that the developer consider increasing the size of garages within the new development.

Debbie Kobes, Mission, stated that kids in the area needed somewhere to play that was close enough for them to safely walk to. She noted the small park that is there has enough room for a couple of children, however the equipment is geared towards toddlers and the older kids need space too. It was her understanding with the rowhouses there was supposed to be a neighbourhood park.

Mayor Hawes agreed that play areas should be within a couple of blocks from homes. He stated he would like to see the walkway designed so kids can play in it.

Helen Stewart expressed concern that Mission would always be a bedroom community if developers did not take into consideration the needs of families and children.

Lee Walker, Mission, stated his opposition to the proposal. He noted that his property backed onto an environmentally sensitive area, and his fence had been moved three feet back from his property line. He expressed frustration that the buffer distance from the ESA was not consistent, and that he was paying property taxes for land he was not able to use.

In response to Mr. Walker’s comments, the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the fence had most likely been moved due to environmental setback regulations which have changed over time.

Chris Barthel, Mission, asked for clarification about the misidentification of the environmentally sensitive area. He also expressed concern about driveway lengths and dumping of construction materials in the environmentally sensitive areas.

Shirley Mogridge, Mission, expressed concern regarding the potential increase in traffic on Egglestone Avenue. She recommended that the District consider installing a 4-way stop at the intersection of Fennell Street and Egglestone Avenue.
Ed Kobes, Mission, expressed concern regarding the additional construction vehicle traffic, noting that previous projects have seen large construction vehicles solely using Machell and blocking access for hours.

Greg Skrzyniarz, the applicant, stated:
- He was taking parking issues and secondary suite issues very seriously, and that the overall design provided for an average of 4.3 parking spaces per row home and an average of 5.2 parking spaces per single-family residence meaning there would be 39 street parking spaces in addition to the designated on-site parking;
- The garages would be 18 feet deep and 20 feet wide, which would be large enough to accommodate two vehicles, with the exception of long-bed trucks. He noted that the driveways had also been designed to be 18 feet long and 20 feet wide, but there was some flexibility and they could accommodate an additional 6 to 8 inches in the design if necessary;
- They would work with the District’s Planning and Engineering Departments to determine any necessary traffic calming solutions.
- The proposal was for far fewer units than what was allowable under the Official Community Plan because they wanted to preserve the character of the neighbourhood.
- The 33 foot wide north-south greenspace pathway could serve as a place for children in the neighbourhood to play.
- They were working closely with environmental experts and with the District’s Planning Department to keep the spirit of the environmentally sensitive area and turn the area into a usable greenspace;

Wayne Curtis, Mission, asked the developer whether or not a spotted owl had been located within the property’s environmentally sensitive area.

In response, Mr. Skrzyniarz stated that the biologist had been to the site many times and had not located an owl nest to date.

Janice McCullough, Mission, asked for clarification in regards to the walkway and the greenspace.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the north-south greenspace was not considered an environmentally sensitive area and would be a 33-foot walkway. The trail running east-west was adjacent to an environmentally sensitive area and was designed to be the required 10 meters back in order to protect the creek.

Sean Baron, Mission, expressed concern that environmentally sensitive areas within the development were not going to be protected. He noted the presence of a natural creek and stated that he had seen owls and other wildlife in the area. He recommended that the developer consider leaving proposed lots 4, 5, 6, and 7 as dedicated greenspace.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1) and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5702-2018-5050(276) (OCP17-005/R17-020 – Skrzyniarz & Omega Engineering) closed.

16. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be received as information:

(a) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Meeting – November 14, 2017
17. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED:

1. That 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, be read a first and second time.

2. That 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, be read a first and second time.

3. That 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, be read a first and second time.

4. That 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, be read a first and second time.

5. That 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, be read a first and second time.

6. That Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018, a bylaw to support the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System, be read a first, second, and third time.


8. That 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, be read a third time.


10. 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 adopted.

CARRIED

Discussion ensued regarding the multi-unit development application for the Egglestone Avenue and Cedar Street properties, in which Council noted: concerns regarding parking and traffic issues on the surrounding streets; bylaw enforcement; clarification, preservation and clean-up of environmentally sensitive areas; and the need for detail as
to how the 30-foot wide walkway bisecting the development would be used as play space.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED:
That the meeting be extended until all items of business have been concluded.
CARRIED

Staff provided the following information in response to the various questions and concerns:

- The environmentally sensitive area to the north of the subject property is a protected greenspace under the provincial Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR). The area misidentified as greenspace/environmentally sensitive is the 30-foot wide walkway that would bisect the development. It was not identified in the RAR report as an area requiring protection, rather it was negotiated between the District and the developer to retain as a neighbourhood amenity over and above what is required.

- This development proposal does not contain a designated park, but will connect to Tunbridge Park by a bridge and trail. The developer has met all requirements for parkland through the contribution of 5% cash in lieu, which can be used for building adequate play space within the wide walkway.

- Enforcement of existing bylaw regulations, particularly in regard to parking and secondary suites is an ongoing, priority project. The issues on Machell Street identified during tonight’s Public Hearing can be addressed by staff separately from the subject development application.

- The District is working closely with the Mission Public School District as part of the Cedar Valley Local Area Plan to address the school needs of a growing population.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED:

1. That, in accordance with Section 477 of the Local Government Act, Council has considered District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 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.

2. That 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, be read a second and third time.

3. 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 second and third time.

4. 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 second and third time.
5. That consideration of adoption of Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1) and Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5701-2018-5670(1) be held pending receipt of a staff report containing the following information:

   a) a staff assessment of traffic issues on the surrounding streets and solutions to address those issues;

   b) specific design details for incorporating play space in the 30-foot wide walkway within the proposed development; and

   c) how and when the construction debris in the vacant lot in the northern section of the subject property near the creek will be cleaned up.

CARRIED

18. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of January 22, 2018 be adopted.

CARRIED

19. RESOLUTIONS RELEASED FROM CLOSED

Resolutions Released from Closed Council – January 22, 2018 Closed Meeting

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).

20. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no new/other business.

21. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no notices of motion.

22. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the public.

23. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on February 19, 2018 commenced at 1:00 p.m. for COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, and was immediately followed by a CLOSED MEETING of Council, and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. for REGULAR COUNCIL proceedings.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes
Councillor Pam Alexis
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Jim Hinds
Councillor Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Danny Plecas
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: *Rogine Battel, Manager of RCMP Administration
Kris Boland, Director of Finance
Marcy Bond, Senior Planner
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
*Steve Crawford, Staff Sergeant, Operations (NCO)
Jason Kinch, Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management
Brenda Formosa, Administrative Assistant
*Heather Gherman, Manager of Human Resources
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Rob Racine, Engineering Technologist I – Development
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services
Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
*Present for a portion of the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER
Mayor Hawes called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED:
1. That Late Item 15(h) “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018” be added to the agenda under Bylaws for Consideration; and

2. That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of February 19, 2018 be adopted, as amended.

CARRIED

3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED
4. **PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH**

Councillor Plecas assumed the Chair.

**Mission Detachment Quarterly Report**

A report from the Inspector of the Mission RCMP Detachment dated February 19, 2018 was provided for the Committee’s information. Staff Sergeant Crawford, Operations (NCO), provided an overview of the report, which covered:

- policing statistics for the fourth quarter of 2017;
- the detachment’s annual performance priorities;
- Crime Prevention Office statistics; and
- major investigations and initiatives.

It was noted that the Mission Detachment will be hosting the Annual Mission Community Policing Forum on February 28, 2018.

5. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

Councillor Hinds assumed the Chair.

**2018 Paving, Watermain, Sewer, Drainage, and Sidewalk Project Locations**

A report from the Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management dated February 19, 2018 detailing the capital projects planned for 2018 in the areas of paving, water/sewer/drainage utilities and sidewalks, was provided for the Committee’s information.

The Committee discussed the need for sidewalk improvements in several areas including 14th Avenue and Taulbut Street and expressed concerns regarding the increased capacity required for the penitentiary’s sanitary pump station. It was noted that a report regarding sidewalk upgrades would be brought forward in the spring as part of the capital plan review. Staff were directed to provide additional information about the reasons for the penitentiary pump station upgrade.

6. **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Councillor Nicholson assumed the Chair.

**Mission Community Heritage Commission (2018 Work Plan)**

A report from the Senior Planner dated February 19, 2018 regarding the Mission Community Heritage Commission’s 2018 Work Plan, was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Discussion ensued and Council asked that the Mission Community Heritage Commission research and assess the heritage value of the old Japanese school on Dewdney Trunk Road, with the goal of preserving the building.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

That the Mission Community Heritage Commission’s 2018 Work Plan, as appended to the Senior Planner’s report dated February 19, 2018, be approved.

CARRIED
Development Permit DP17-041 to allow for a Comprehensive Renovation to the Exterior of the Existing McDonald’s Restaurant

A report from the Senior Planner dated February 19, 2018 detailing an application to allow for a comprehensive renovation to the exterior of the existing McDonald’s Restaurant, was provided for the Committee’s information.

Rezoning Application R17-023 for the property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue to facilitate the subdivision of the property in conjunction with development application P2016-015 (lands to the south)

A report from the Senior Planner dated February 19, 2018 regarding a rezoning application for the property located at 33100 Dalke Avenue to facilitate the subdivision of the property in conjunction with lands to the south, was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for March 5, 2018, subject to Council granting second reading to the related zoning amending bylaw.

Discussion ensued regarding ways to mitigate potential parking issues, including construction of wider streets; and strategic placement of lots with suites in the adjoining development to the south.

7. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

Appointment of Officers for 2018 Municipal Election

A report from the Chief Administrative Officer dated February 19, 2018 regarding the appointment of officers for the 2018 municipal election, was provided for the Committee's consideration.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

That Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, be appointed as Chief Election Officer and that Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer, be appointed Deputy Chief Election Officer to administer and conduct the 2018 general local election.

CARRIED

Revised Policy: HUM.03 - Respectful Workplace

A report from the Chief Administrative Officer dated February 19, 2018 regarding the revised Respectful Workplace Policy HUM.03, was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Human Resources advised that new workers receive a copy of the policy during orientation, and another round of internal training will be implemented for all District employees.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

That District policy HUM.03 Respectful Workplace, as attached to the report from the Manager of Human Resources dated February 19, 2018, be approved as revised.

CARRIED
8. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mayor Hawes resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Stevens, 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 Plecas, 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)(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 2:00 p.m.

10. RECONVENE

Mayor Hawes reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes
Councillor Pam Alexis
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Jim Hinds
Councillor Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Danny Plecas
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Kris Boland, Director of Finance
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
11. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the February 19, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC18/093 to RC18/099 be adopted.

CARRIED

12. PRESENTATIONS

Mission’s 125th Anniversary

Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture gave a presentation on the District of Mission’s 125th anniversary celebration activities which took place in 2017. The District’s Parks, Recreation & Culture department awarded 27 grants to small community groups to assist them with their Mission 125th anniversary celebrations. Activities included: the Heritage Park Picnic, Cycling-4-Diversity, the Diwali Festival and Culture Days. A public art piece of a large steel sculpture depicting an “M” for Mission to celebrate Mission’s 125th milestone is scheduled to be installed downtown at the corner of Welton Street and 2nd Avenue this spring.

13. DELEGATIONS

Rick Rake, Mission Community Services Society

Rick Rake, coordinator for the Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs), appeared before Council to provide information about Mission Community Services’ ‘New to Canada’ department. Mr. Rake provided an overview of Mission’s immigration history and current statistics and described the purpose and goals of the LIPs organization.

He invited Council and the public to attend the LIPs immigration forum titled “We’re Your Neighbours” on March 17, 2018 from 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Copper Hall on 1st Avenue. He asked Council to provide a short statement welcoming newcomers to the community, that could be shared at the forum on March 17th.

Don David, Chang’s Tae Kwon Do

Don David of Chang’s Tae Kwon Do appeared before Council to discuss the homeless situation in and around Logan Avenue and Mission Square Centre. Mr. David advised that he has been speaking with several other the business owners in the area, who are also dealing with the resulting problems such as discarded garbage and syringes. He requested that Council assist him in finding a solution to the problem. The Mayor directed Mr. David to the District’s Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives who will provide several contacts and resources for local community organizations who are assisting with the local homeless issues.

14. PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the properties at 34461 and 34489 Ferndale Avenue from Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the
subject properties into 3 lots of a minimum 0.7 hectare (1.73 acre) lot size and to allow for a secondary dwelling unit on each lot. The subject properties are legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 018-137-938
Lot A Section 35 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP9028; and

Parcel Identifier: 018-137-946
Lot B Section 35 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP9028.

The 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. Map of proposed variances.
4. Location map.

The Deputy Corporate Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5699-2018-5050(276) R17-025 (Minderhoud) closed.

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

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 34884 Moffat Avenue from the Urban Residential 930 (R930) Zone to the Urban Residential 930 Secondary Dwelling (R930s) Zone to allow a secondary dwelling use in the form of a secondary suite within an addition to be constructed to the existing home. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 008-629-943
Lot 71 District Lot 6 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan 39517

The 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.

The Deputy Corporate Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5705-2018-5050(278) R17-036 (Proska) closed.
Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018

LUC 18-001 (DOM) - a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract for District-owned property located at an unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector

The purpose of the proposed land use contract repeal bylaw is to discharge Land Use Contract No. 416-1975 registered to the District owned property located at an unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector as shown on the maps in the 2018-02-19 Report to Council. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 011-325-321
Lot 10 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8517

The 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.

The Deputy Corporate Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Ian MacKenzie, Mission, queried if the District was going to terminate the land use contract and then rezone the property as environmentally sensitive, which would prevent any future development on the property.

Staff advised Mr. MacKenzie that this particular parcel of land has not been previously developed and, as the area is protected due to the watercourse, it will remain an Environmentally Sensitive Area.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 LUC 18-001 (DOM) closed.

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

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

The purpose of the proposed land use contract repeal bylaw is to discharge Land Use Contract No. 170-1972 registered to the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street.

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street from the Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to the Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone. The subject properties are legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 011-941-669
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
Parcel Identifier: 011-941-626
Lot 23 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 951

The 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.

The Deputy Corporate Officer stated that no written submissions pertaining to the subject application had been received.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Hearing no questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018 LUC 18-002 (DOM) and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5708-2018-5050(279) closed.

15. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5710-2018-5050(280) (R17-023 District of Mission), a bylaw to rezone property at 33100 Dalke Avenue from Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372) to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC465s), be read a first and second time.

2. That 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, be read a third time.

3. That 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, be read a third time.

4. That Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5706-2018 (LUC 18-002 DOM), a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract for District-owned property located at an unaddressed lot on Cedar Valley Connector, be read a third time.

5. That Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5707-2018, a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract for the properties located at 32793 Lougheed Highway and an unaddressed property on Wardrop Street, be read a third time.

6. That 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, be read a third time.

8. That Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 5700-2018, a bylaw to support the commencement of bylaw enforcement through the Upper Fraser Valley Bylaw Adjudication System, be **adopted**.

CARRIED

16. **DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**Development Permit Application DP17-041 (7230 Park Street)**

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That Development Permit DP17-041 (7230 Park Street) to allow for a comprehensive renovation of the exterior of the existing McDonald’s Restaurant be **approved**.

CARRIED

17. **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Special Council Meeting – February 7, 2018 and February 8, 2018

(b) Special Council Meeting – February 8, 2018

CARRIED

18. **RESOLUTIONS RELEASED FROM CLOSED**

**2017-2018 Community Service Awards / 2018 Freeman of the City Medals**

The following resolution was released from the Closed Council meeting held on December 18, 2017:

**2017 - 2018 Community Service Awards**

1. That Tracy Martin be awarded an Against the Odds Achievement Award for her efforts on behalf of people with disabilities and her volunteerism with Mission Community Services Society;

2. That Cory Cassel be awarded an Arts and Culture Service Award for his many efforts to promote arts and culture in Mission;

3. That John Keresman be awarded a Crime Prevention and Community Safety Award in recognition of his extensive volunteerism and efforts on behalf of the Mission RCMP Crime Prevention Office;

4. That Jordyn Mooney be awarded a Community Service Award (under age 25) for her efforts on behalf of the youth of Mission and her work to promote a greater understanding of anxiety issues among young people;

5. That Douglas Hughes be awarded a Community Service Award (under age 25) for his efforts on behalf of youth, LGBTQ and SOGI in our community and his willingness to encourage and mentor others;

6. That Reg and Lily Sayers be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of their hard work on behalf of the Mission Community Services Society’s Community Volunteer Income Tax program and their continued efforts on behalf of Mission’s seniors;
7. That Mervin Hildebrandt be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of his many hours of tireless service on behalf of the Mission Community Food Centre, and those in need in our community;

8. That Wally Warkentin be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of his many years of volunteerism on behalf of the Canadian Cadets program, including 8 years as a leader and mentor with 521 Aurora Royal Canadian Air Cadets Squadron in Mission;

9. That Loa Duncan be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her volunteerism on behalf of Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Fraser Valley and the remarkable way in which she has touched the lives of youth in Mission;

10. That Beverly James be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her volunteerism on behalf of a variety of organizations and community groups, including Mission Community Services Society, the Reel on the River Film Series, the Mission Folk Music Festival, the Gorilla Gardeners, Mission Adopt-A-Block, and the Friends of the Library;

11. That Janis Foerster be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her efforts on behalf of Mission Youth House (MY House), the Mission Folk Music Festival, Mission Hospice, and the Twilight Concert Series;

12. That Ernestine O’Rourke be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her enthusiastic support of the Mission Friendship Centre, Mission Connect Events, Stone Soup, and Mission Youth House (MY House) and her advocacy work on behalf of at risk youth in Mission;

13. That Natasha Cox be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her tireless efforts as a community and environmental champion, and her work to promote partnerships and education related to watershed restoration;

14. That Julie Hartland and Moneca Harder be awarded a Community Service Award for their many years of volunteerism on behalf of the Fraser Valley Humane Society (Feline Adoption Centre in Mission), SAINTS, and Elizabeth’s Wildlife Centre;

15. That Dan Williams be awarded the Sports Volunteer of the Year Award in recognition of his leadership on the Mission Sports Council and his tireless efforts on behalf of Mission Minor Baseball and sports in Mission;

16. That Daphne Sleigh be awarded a Special Accomplishment Award in recognition of her volunteerism on behalf of the District of Mission Historical Society and for her work adapting and updating a book on Mission’s history, Mission As it Was, in honour of the District’s 125th anniversary;

17. That Dan Rempel be awarded a Special Accomplishment Award in recognition of his leadership in coordinating efforts to welcome and support refugees from the Congo who joined our community in 2016;

18. That the 125th Anniversary Committee be awarded a Special Recognition Award in recognition of their hard work and dedication in making the District of Mission’s 125th Anniversary celebrations a resounding success;

19. That Bonnie Harber be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of her efforts on behalf of the Steelhead Community Association, her willingness to help out wherever it is needed, and her love for and dedication to the community;

20. That Ron Cockroft be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award posthumously for the kindness and compassion that he showed to others and for his many years of dedicated service to the community;
21. That Sophie Zehner be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of her advocacy behalf of Mission seniors and her many years of dedicated service and hard work on behalf of the community;

22. That Dick Brodie be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of his many years of volunteerism on behalf of the Mission Optimist Club and the community; and

23. That Barry McLeod be awarded the Citizen of the Year award in recognition of his efforts, which go far above and beyond the parameters of his job, to reach out to, support and champion at risk youths in Mission.

2018 Freeman of the City Medals

1. That Betty Robertson be awarded the 2018 Freeman of the City Medal in recognition of her outstanding dedication and lifelong service to the community;

2. That Cal Crawford be awarded the 2018 Freeman of the City Medal in recognition of his outstanding dedication and lifelong service to the community;

3. That Terry Gidda be awarded the 2018 Freeman of the City Medal in recognition of his outstanding dedication and lifelong service to the community; and

4. That, notwithstanding the residency requirement in the District of Mission policy AWA.02 Freeman Award, Mel Zajac be awarded the 2018 Freeman of the City Medal in recognition of his outstanding dedication and lifelong service to the community.

19. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no new/other business.

20. NOTICES OF MOTION

Pursuant to Section 131 of the Community Charter, Mayor Hawes requested that Council reconsider resolution RC18/072; the matter of 7th Avenue Bike Lanes and BikeBC Grant Application, 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, that was brought before Council at the regular meeting of February 5, 2018.

21. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the public.

22. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.