Regular Meeting of Council
Agenda
May 7, 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. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE
   (a) 2017 Audit Results and Communications
       This report is provided to present Council with the results of the audit of the District’s 2017 financial statements, as well as related communications from the District’s auditor. The District’s auditor will be in attendance at the Council meeting to present their audit findings, and answer any related questions. This report is provided for information purposes only and Council action is not required.
   (b) Investment Holdings Quarterly Report – March 31, 2018
       This report will bring Council and the public up-to-date on the District’s cash and portfolio investment holdings. This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.
   (c) Draft 2017 Financial Statements
       RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
       That the District of Mission’s draft 2017 financial statements, attached as Appendix A to the Manager of Accounting Services’ report dated May 7, 2018 entitled Draft 2017 Financial Statements, be approved.
(d) **2018 Annual Tax Rates Bylaw**

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That Council has hereby considered its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies regarding the distribution of property taxes among the tax classes, as set out within its 2018-2022 Financial Plan Bylaw [Bylaw 5687-2017].

(e) **Proposed Framework for Regulation of Cannabis in Mission**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Cannabis Regulation Discussion Paper and Public Information Sheet, attached to the Deputy CAO’s report dated May 7, 2018, be shared with the public and stakeholders on the District’s website;
2. That comments received from the public and stakeholders be brought to a future Council meeting; and
3. That staff be authorized to update the Discussion Paper in (1) to reflect new information that is released by the provincial and federal government as their legislation is finalized over the coming months.

(f) **Council Remuneration Effective in 2019**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Mayor’s salary be established at $XX,XXX starting January 1, 2019;
2. That a Councillor’s salary be established at XX% of the Mayor’s salary or $XX,XXX starting January 1, 2019; and
3. That Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06 be amended as per the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer’s report dated May 7, 2018.

(g) **Municipally Funded Grants – Policy Amendment**

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That Municipally Funded Grants Policy FIN.50 be amended by adding the following items to section 1. **Process**:

a) Applications received after July 15 will not be considered.

b) Delegations to Council by organizations missing the intake deadline will not be permitted, except under specific qualifying or emergency circumstances.
5. **PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH**

   (a) **Equipment Purchase of Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck**

   RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

   1. That the contract for the purchase of one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck be awarded to Hub Fire Engines & Equipment Ltd. at a cost of $686,339 (including PST); and
   2. That any necessary change orders be approved by the Fire Chief, Fleet Supervisor and the Manager of Business Services, provided they are within the $725,000 project budget previously approved by Council.

   (b) **Fire Station 1 Renovations**

   RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

   1. That approval be granted to proceed with the renovations described in this report for Fire Station 1;
   2. That a budget increase of $29,801 required to complete the renovations be funded from the General Fund Accumulated Surplus; and
   3. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

6. **PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE**

   (a) **1st Ave Public Art**

   This report is provided to Council for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report.

7. **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

   (a) **Zoning Bylaw Review Project**

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

   (b) **Rezoning Application to allow a 2-lot subdivision with secondary dwelling units – 32053 Trembath Avenue**

   This report details the development application to rezone 32053 Trembath Avenue to the Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision, and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each property, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

   Staff support the application moving forward and such have listed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5733-2018-5050(289) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

   Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for
May 7, 2018

(c) **Subdivision Proposal in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) at 9537 Manzer Street**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That Agricultural Land Reserve Application ALR18-003 for a subdivision within the ALR be supported; and
2. That the resolution of support be forwarded to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC).

(d) **Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 33234 Whidden Avenue**

This report details the development application to rezone 33234 Whidden Avenue to the Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5728-2018-5050(286) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

(e) **Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite at the property located at 31712 Bench Avenue**

This report details the development application to rezone 31712 Bench Avenue to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5729-2018-5050(287) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also support the Development Variance Permit application which will be listed for Council’s consideration under the “Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amending Bylaw.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

(f) **Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 616-1977 and Rezoning of the property located at 33093 - 7th Avenue to Commercial Local One (CL1) Zone**

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 616-1977 and to rezone the property located at 33093 - 7th 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
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Bylaw.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such has listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5730-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5731-2018-5050(288) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

(g) **Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 168-1972 and Rezoning of the property located at 7365 Alder Street to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone**

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 168-1972 for the property located at 7365 Alder Street 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 support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5732-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5734-2018-5050(290) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

8. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

(a) **Sidewalk Program Update 2018**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the 2018 Updated Sidewalk Priority Map guide the District’s sidewalk program, superseding the Transportation Master Plan Sidewalk priority plan Figure 7.1;

2. That staff proceed with Hatzic sidewalk project Option 2, with funding coming from the annual Walkways and Sidewalk budget; and

3. That 14th Avenue road widening DCC project be included for consideration with the 2019 budget discussions.

(b) **Results of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project**

This report is being provided as information to update Council on the results of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project.
(c) Water Metering Update

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That funding in the amount of $40,000 be approved for additional water and sewer modeling related to the assessment of the potential impact of water metering and conservation on future infrastructure requirements, with $20,000 funded from the Water Capital Reserve Fund and $20,000 funded from the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund; and

2. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

9. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That pursuant to Section 90 of the Community Charter, the public be excluded from this portion of the meeting as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:

   - Section 90(1)(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)(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(2)(b) of the Community Charter – the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party;

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

3. That Council immediately resolve into the closed portion of their meeting.
11. RECONVENE (7:00 P.M.)

12. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
   (a) Committee of the Whole report dated May 7, 2018
       Report of recommendations to be circulated at the 7:00 p.m. reconvened public meeting

13. PRESENTATIONS
   (a) Freeman of the City Medal Presentation
       Freeman of the City medal presentation for Cal Crawford.

14. DELEGATIONS
   (a) Barry McLeod, Youth Unlimited
       Suggesting the development of a “stand alone” Youth Centre.
   (b) Frank Muermann
       Requesting a repeal of the section of District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 which forbids the keeping of chickens on residential properties.

15. PROCLAMATIONS
   (a) Cycling4Diversity Week
       May 20th to 26th, 2018
   (b) Child Find’s Green Ribbon of Hope Month and National Missing Children’s Day
       May, 2018 and May 25, 2018

16. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   (a) Public Hearing Notice for May 7, 2018
       For reference
   (b) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5722-2018-5050(284)
       R17-041 (Central Valley Engineering) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372) and Residential Compact 465 Zone (RC465)
       Copy of Notice to Owner/Occupant and previous staff report included as background information
17. **COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES**

(a) Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Meeting (Draft) – April 5, 2018  
   Page 355

(b) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Meeting – March 13, 2018  
   Page 362

18. **BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION**

(a) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5728-2018-5050(286)**  
   First and Second Readings  
   R17-040 (Gherman) – a bylaw to rezone property at  
   33234 Whidden Avenue from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558)  
   to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling Zone (R558s)  
   See “Development Services” Section 7(d)  
   Page 365

(b) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5729-2018-5050(287)**  
   First and Second Readings  
   R18-001 (Sale) – a bylaw to rezone property at  
   31712 Bench Avenue from Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to  
   Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s)  
   See “Development Services” Section 7(e)  
   Page 366

(c) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5730-2018**  
   First and Second Readings  
   LUC18-007 (DOM) – a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract  
   616-1977 for the property at 33093 – 7th Avenue  
   See “Development Services” Section 7(f)  
   Page 367

(d) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5731-2018-5050(288)**  
   First and Second Readings  
   LUC18-007 (DOM) – a bylaw to rezone property at  
   33093 – 7th Avenue from Institutional Parks Recreation and  
   Civic Zone (IPRC) to Commercial Local One Zone (CL1)  
   See “Development Services” Section 7(f)  
   Page 368

(e) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5732-2018**  
   First and Second Readings  
   LUC18-008 (DOM) – a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract  
   168-1972 for the property at 7365 Alder Street  
   See “Development Services” Section 7(g)  
   Page 369

(f) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5733-2018-5050(289)**  
   First and Second Readings  
   R17-044 (D&D Design) – a bylaw to rezone property at  
   32053 Trembath Avenue from Urban Residential 558 Zone  
   (R558) to Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465)  
   See “Development Services” Section 7(b)  
   Page 370
(g) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5734-2018-5050(290)  
LUC18-008 (DOM) – a bylaw to rezone property at 7365 Alder Street from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone (MA52)  
See “Development Services” Section 7(g)

(h) Street Naming (Sylvia Avenue, Trenholm Avenue and Brett Lane) Bylaw 5723-2018  
A bylaw to name extensions for three existing roads.  
See “Public Hearings” Section 16(b)

(i) Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5727-2018  
A bylaw to impose property tax rates for the year 2018  
See “Corporate Administration and Finance” Section 4(d)

(j) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5722-2018-5050(284)  
R17-041 (Central Valley Engineering) – a bylaw to rezone properties at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372) and Residential Compact 465 Zone (RC465)  
See “Public Hearings” Section 16(b)

(k) Zoning Amending Bylaw 5689-2017-5050(269)  
R15-022 (Oberoi) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 32270 Lougheed Highway from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone  
Excerpt from Public Hearing minutes and previous staff report included as background information for Zoning Amending Bylaw 5689-2017-5050(269)

(l) Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5690-2017  
LUC17-003 (Oberoi) - a bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract 171-1972 for the property at 32270 Lougheed Highway  
See excerpt from Public Hearing minutes and previous staff report for 5689-2017-5050(269)

(m) 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  
Adoption
(n) **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)

(o) **Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5713-2018**  
LUC18-004 (DOM) - a bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 621-1977 for property located at 33366 - 2nd Avenue

19. **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

RECOMMENDATION: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Regular Council Meeting – April 3, 2018  
(b) Special Council Meeting – April 9, 2018  
(c) Regular Council Meeting – April 16, 2018

20. **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

21. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

Moved by Councillor Plecas:

1. That Council resolution numbers RC18/126, RC18/127 and RC18/128 be rescinded;
2. That a completed bike route along 7th Avenue, connecting the Hatzic area to the east and Wren Street to the west, be designed and established that will:
   - ensure consideration of all forms of mobility to improve overall safety;
   - satisfy efficient use of road space with best practices for all types of mobility users and in consideration of financial capacity; and
   - ensure there is active participation from mobility users in the design of the bike lanes;
3. That upon completion of the design of the bike route, with costing and Council approval, grant applications be submitted to the Cycling Infrastructure Partnership program;
4. That ‘Safer Cycling Courses’ be supported and greater participation of cycling be promoted through social media and event opportunities;
5. That cycling path connectivity within the District be enhanced by drafting up routes to defined destinations and, in future, develop the plans to cost out, budget and submit a funding request to the Gateway Cycling program for additional bike lanes.
6. That staff work with Experience the Fraser and landowners to develop a plan to build a ‘dual pathway’ on the north side of the Fraser River from Hatzic to Silverdale; and
7. That a member of the cycling community be appointed to the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee.
For ease of reference:

RC18/126
That staff proceed with implementation of phase one of dedicated bicycle lanes on 7th Avenue from Stave Lake Street to Taulbut Street.

RC18/127
That the 7th Avenue bike lane design as detailed in the Engineering Technologist III’s presentation to Council on March 5, 2018 as shown in the following image:

RC18/128
1. That the implementation costs of the revised design option for the 7th Avenue bike lanes in the amount of $110,000 be funded from the existing Paving Program budget; and

2. That the required five year maintenance cost for this option in the amount of $66,000 be added to the District’s Operating budget beginning in 2023 and every five years thereafter.

22. QUESTION PERIOD

23. ADJOURNMENT
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
SUBJECT: 2017 Audit Results and Communications
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A – Audit Results and Communications Report to Mayor and Council

This report is provided to present Council with the results of the audit of the District’s 2017 financial statements, as well as related communications from the District's auditor. The District’s auditor will be in attendance at the Council meeting to present their audit findings, and answer any related questions. This report is provided for information purposes only and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present to Council the results of the audit of the District’s 2017 financial statements.

BACKGROUND:
The District’s auditor, BDO Canada LLP, have provided their “Audit Results and Communications Report to the Mayor and Council”, which is attached as Appendix A. Their report provides a summary of their audit of the District’s financial statements for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017. The District’s auditor, BDO Canada LLP, will be in attendance at the Council meeting to present their audit findings, and answer any related questions.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Following is a brief summary of the Auditor’s report:

- **Materiality:** outlines the materiality levels determined by the auditor for use in conducting the audit. Misstatements are considered to be material if they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements. Final materiality was $1,540,000, based on approximately 2% of normalized revenues;

- **Audit Findings:** summarizes the auditor’s findings during the audit, and comments on the approach taken and the results found during testing/verification of key audit areas. All audit testing was executed as planned and no issues were noted, the estimates in the financial statements are reasonable, and the disclosures relating to accounting estimates are in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. There were no significant unadjusted differences or disclosure omissions identified. One year-end audit adjustment was identified and approved during the course of the audit;

- **Fraud Discussion:** Canadian generally accepted auditing standards require the auditor to discuss fraud risk with Council on an annual basis. This discussion outlines the auditor’s responsibilities for detecting fraud, and confirms the auditor is not aware of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud;
• **Internal Control Matters**: internal controls are intended to prevent, detect and correct fraud and errors. This section outlines the auditor’s procedures for reviewing the District’s internal controls environment, and confirms there were no significant deficiencies in internal controls found;

• **Appendix A – Draft Independent Auditor’s Report**: includes a draft of the Independent Auditor’s Report that will be appended to the District’s 2017 financial statements, which includes the Auditor’s opinion on the District’s financial statements. The Auditor’s opinion is that the District’s 2017 financial statements are presented fairly in all material respects;

• **Appendix B – Representation Letter**: discusses the various representations that management made to the auditor during the course of the audit;

• **Appendix C – Management Letter**: highlights areas observed by the auditor where they feel they can provide practical and constructive comments on various District policies and practices. It should be noted that the existence of points does not mean that there are significant problems with systems or staff; they are just recommendations to make good systems better. The District’s responses to these comments are included in the Audit Results and Communications Report; and

• **Appendix D – Audit Adjustments**: one audit adjustment was identified during the course of the audit, related to a spreadsheet formula error that “double-counted” certain developer contributed assets. Management approved the adjustment prior to the issuance of the audit report, and the adjustment is reflected in the District’s 2017 financial statements.

Lastly, the report confirms the auditor’s independence to the District, Mayor and Council.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial implications directly associated with this report. A separate report discussing the District’s 2017 financial statement results is included on this agenda.

**COMMUNICATION:**

No communication action is required.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

The District’s auditor, BDO Canada LLP, have provided the attached “Audit Results and Communications Report to Mayor and Council,” as a summary of their audit of the District’s financial statements for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
The District of Mission

Audit Results and Communications
Report to the Mayor and Council

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017
April 26, 2018

Mayor and Council
The District of Mission
8645 Stave Lake Street
Mission, BC   V2V 4L9

Dear Mayor and Council:

We are pleased to present the results of our audit of the financial statements of the District of Mission (the “District”) for the year ended December 31, 2017. The purpose of our report is to summarize certain aspects of the audit that we believe to be of interest to the Mayor and Council and should be read in conjunction with the draft financial statements.

Our audit and therefore this report will not necessarily identify all matters that may be of interest to the Mayor and Council in fulfilling its responsibilities.

This report has been prepared solely for the use of the Mayor and Council and should not be distributed without our prior consent. Consequently, we accept no responsibility to a third party that uses this communication.

We wish to express our appreciation for the co-operation we received during the audit from the District’s management and staff that assisted us in carrying out our work. We look forward to discussing the contents of this report and any other matters that you consider appropriate.

Yours truly,

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

BC/mkn
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Results</th>
<th>Our audit of the financial statements was designed to obtain reasonable, rather than absolute, assurance as to whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. A detailed description of our audit results has been included on page 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of Audit</td>
<td>As of the date of this final report, we have substantially completed our audit of the December 31, 2017 financial statements pending the completion of the items highlighted below. These items will need to be completed prior to issuance of our audit report on the financial statements:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                        | • Receipt of the signed management representation letter  
|                        | • Subsequent events review through to financial statement approval date  
|                        | • Approval of financial statements by Council |
| Key Audit Areas        | In accordance with our audit plan, our procedures focused on the following areas that we identified as containing risks of material misstatements: |
|                        | • Management override of internal controls  
|                        | • Revenue recognition  
|                        | • Employee future benefits  
|                        | • Landfill liability  
|                        | • Cash and investments  
|                        | • Staff salaries  
<p>|                        | • Tangible capital assets and accumulated amortization |
|                        | We have summarized the results of our audit procedures for each of these risk areas, beginning on page 6 of this report. |
| Internal Control Over Financial Reporting | We did not identify any significant deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting during the year ended December 31, 2017 that we considered to be material weaknesses. |
| Fraud and Illegal Activities | We developed procedures within our audit plan as recommended by CAS 240 - The Auditor’s Responsibilities Relating to Fraud in an Audit of Financial Statements. Based on these procedures, we have not encountered any illegal activities or fraudulent events with respect to the District. |
| Significant Events     | As of the date of this letter, we have not identified any significant events which we believe should be brought to your attention. |
| Significant Accounting Policies | The District’s significant accounting policies are listed in the financial statements. We believe management’s selection of accounting policies is appropriate under Canadian public sector accounting standards. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting estimates are an integral part of the financial statements and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are based on management’s current judgments. These judgments are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on knowledge and experience about past and current events,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumptions about future events and interpretations of the financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our comments on the significant estimates included in the financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statements are included on page 9 of this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materiality, Audit Adjustments and Unadjusted Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our final materiality level of $1,540,000 changed marginally from our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning materiality of $1,390,000 in our audit Planning Report dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no unadjusted misstatements for the year ended December 31,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary of the year end audit adjustments approved by management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including the impact on the annual surplus of the District, are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included in Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no material omissions with respect to the disclosures in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2017 that we have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We confirm that we are still independent as of the date of this letter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A draft version of the representation letter to be signed by management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is included in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We intend to issue an unmodified audit report on the financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2017 once the outstanding items referred to above are satisfactorily resolved and the financial statements are approved the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[With respect to the Annual Report, we review this document to ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that there is no inconsistency with the financial statements and that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the information is consistent with our knowledge of the District. We are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not responsible for, nor did we review the Annual Report to determine if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the information was complete or sufficient for the readers, if factors were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omitted or if the disclosures were adequate.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATERIALITY

Misstatements, including omitted financial statement disclosures, are considered to be material if they, individually or in aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

We communicated to you our planning materiality levels in our Planning Report to the Mayor and Council. Our materiality levels have changed slightly from our audit Planning Report presented to the Mayor and Council on December 1, 2017. Final materiality was $1,540,000 based on approximately 2% of normalized revenues. This increase from planning materiality of $1,390,000 resulted from differences between estimated and actual annual results for the year ended December 31, 2017.

AUDIT FINDINGS

Based on our knowledge of the District’s operations, our past experience in this area, and knowledge gained from management and the Council, we have identified the following significant risks; those risks of material misstatement that, in our judgment, require special audit consideration.

Significant risks arise mainly because of the complexity of the accounting rules, the extent of estimation and judgment involved in the valuation of these financial statement areas, and the existence of new accounting pronouncements that affect them.

As part of our ongoing communications with you, we are required to have a discussion on our views about significant qualitative aspects of the District’s accounting practices, including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures.
### Key Audit Areas

**Management Override of Controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of management’s ability to directly or indirectly manipulate accounting records, and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively.</td>
<td>We tested the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements.</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned and no issues were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[This key area is required for all audits pursuant to Canadian audit standards.]

**Revenue Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting standards have changed in this area and are complex and open to interpretation. There is a risk that revenue may be incorrectly deferred into future periods.</td>
<td>Verified a sample of deferred revenue balances by examining supporting documentation to validate the accounting treatment. Reviewed the agreements to ensure that revenue is being recognized in accordance with latest revenue recognition standards. Reviewed minutes to determine whether any contributions received should be deferred and whether any grants had not yet been recorded.</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned and no issues were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Future Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The calculation of the estimated liability associated with employee future benefits is complex and relies upon many significant assumptions.</td>
<td>We reviewed assumptions used by the actuary in the actuarial report.</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned and no issues were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landfill Liability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A significant liability that is calculated based on management assumptions and engineering reports. Due to the nature of the high level of estimates required and the possibility of new information becoming available this liability calculation is considered a risk area.</td>
<td>We reviewed calculations related to the liability recorded, as well as reviewed third party engineering reports. We also performed an audit of the significant assumptions used in the calculations.</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned and no issues were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash and Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to its nature, cash and investments are almost always considered to be a risk area in any audit.</td>
<td>We reviewed the year end reconciliations and obtained third party confirmations.</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned and no issues were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A significant single type of expenditure that cover many employees and departments. As a municipality, this figure is often of particular interest to financial statement users (taxpayers).</td>
<td>We applied computer audit testing to analyze all payroll transactions in the year. We performed system testing, tests of controls and analytical review of staff salaries.</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned and no issues were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tangible Capital Assets and Accumulated Amortization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important that the useful lives of tangible capital assets owned by the</td>
<td>We performed tests of control for appropriate authorization of purchases</td>
<td>All audit testing in this area was executed as planned. An error was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District are appropriate and remain accurate. This involves a high level of</td>
<td>combined with substantive testing of additions and disposals and</td>
<td>noted regarding developer contributed assets which management adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimation and coordination of the finance department with other departments.</td>
<td>amortization calculations. Useful lives of existing assets were reviewed.</td>
<td>for in the financial statements. See Appendix D for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES**

Management is responsible for determining the District’s significant accounting policies. The choice between accounting policy alternatives can have a significant effect on the financial position and results of the organization. The application of those policies often involves significant estimates and judgments by management. Based on the audit work that we have performed, it is our opinion that the estimates in the financial statements are reasonable and the disclosures relating to accounting estimates are in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

**UNADJUSTED DIFFERENCES**

There were no unadjusted differences or disclosure omissions identified through the course of our audit engagement.

**AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

Year end audit adjustments were discussed with management and approved before the release of the draft financial statements. A summary of these adjustments is included in Appendix D.
MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIONS

During the course of our audit, management made certain representations to us. These representations were verbal or written and therefore explicit, or they were implied through the financial statements. Management provided representations in response to specific queries from us, as well as unsolicited representations. Such representations were part of the evidence gathered by us to be able to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base our audit opinion. These representations were documented in our audit working papers through memoranda of discussions with management, as well as by written representations received from management. A copy of the representation letter we have requested from management is included in Appendix B of this report.
FRAUD DISCUSSION

Canadian generally accepted auditing standards require us to discuss fraud risk with the Council on an annual basis. Further to our discussion in our Planning Report dated December 1, 2017, we have prepared the following comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Discussion</th>
<th>BDO Response</th>
<th>Question to Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of existing oversight processes with regards to fraud.</td>
<td>Based on our discussions during the planning of our audit, the Council’s oversight processes include:</td>
<td>Are there any new processes or changes in existing processes relating to fraud since the date of our previous discussions, that we should be aware of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council charters;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussions at Council meetings;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of related party transactions; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consideration of tone at the top.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of actual, suspected or alleged fraud.</td>
<td>Currently, we are not aware of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud.</td>
<td>Are you aware of any instances of actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the District?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUDITOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES FOR DETECTING FRAUD

We are responsible for planning and performing the audit to obtain reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free of material misstatements, whether caused by error or fraud.

The likelihood of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than the likelihood of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from error, because fraud may involve collusion as well as sophisticated and carefully organized schedules designed to conceal it.

The scope of the work performed was substantially the same as that described in our Planning Report to the Mayor and Council dated December 1, 2017.
INTERNAL CONTROL MATTERS

During the course of our audit, we performed the following procedures with respect to the District’s internal control environment:

- Documented operating systems to assess the design and implementation of control activities that were relevant to the audit.
- Discussed and considered potential audit risks.

The results of these procedures were considered in determining the extent and nature of substantive audit testing required.

We are required to report to you in writing, significant deficiencies in internal control that we have identified during the audit. A significant deficiency is defined as a deficiency or combination of deficiencies in internal control that, in the auditor’s professional judgment, is of sufficient importance to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

As the purpose of the audit is for us to express an opinion on the District’s financial statements, our audit cannot be expected to disclose all matters that may be of interest to you and, as a result, the matters reported may not be exhaustive. As part of our work, we considered internal control relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such that we were able to design appropriate audit procedures. This work was not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control.

**SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCIES IN INTERNAL CONTROL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Issue and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None noted.</td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OTHER REQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS**

Professional standards require independent auditors to communicate with those charged with governance certain matters in relation to an audit. In addition to the points communicated within this letter, the table below summarizes these additional required communications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Communication</th>
<th>Audit Planning Presentation</th>
<th>Audit Results Presentation</th>
<th>Auditor Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Our audit strategy and audit scope</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in our Planning Report dated December 1, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Going concern matters</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Significant estimates or judgments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Page 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audit adjustments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unadjusted differences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Omitted disclosures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Disagreements with management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>There were no disagreements with management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consultations with other accountants or experts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>No external experts were consulted during this engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Major issues discussed with management in regards to retention</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Significant difficulties encountered during the audit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>No significant difficulties were encountered during our audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Significant deficiencies in internal control</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>No significant deficiencies were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Material written communication between BDO and management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>No material written communications were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Any relationships which may affect our independence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No independence issues noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Communication</td>
<td>Audit Planning Presentation</td>
<td>Audit Results Presentation</td>
<td>Auditor Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Any illegal acts identified during the audit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>No illegal activities identified through the audit process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Any fraud or possible fraudulent acts identified during the audit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No fraud identified through the audit process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Significant transactions with related parties not consistent with ordinary business operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Non-compliance with laws or regulations identified during the audit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>No legal or regulatory non-compliance matters were noted as part of our audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Limitations of scope over our audit, if any</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Written representations made by management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Any modifications to our opinion, if required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please see our draft independent auditor’s report included in Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BDO RESOURCES

BDO is one of Canada’s largest accounting services firms providing assurance and accounting, taxation, financial advisory, risk advisory, financial recovery and consulting services to a variety of publicly traded and privately held companies.

BDO serves its clients through 105 offices across Canada. As a member firm of BDO International Limited, BDO serves its multinational clients through a global network of over 1,100 offices in more than 100 countries. Commitment to knowledge and best practice sharing ensures that expertise is easily shared across our global network and common methodologies and information technology ensures efficient and effective service delivery to our clients.

Outlined below is a summary of certain BDO resources which may be of interest to Council.

PUBLICATIONS

Local and Municipal Governments - BDO Insights

TAX BULLETINS, ALERTS AND NEWSLETTERS

BDO’s national tax department issues a number of bulletins, alerts and newsletters relating to corporate federal, personal, commodity, transfer pricing and international tax matters.

For additional information on tax matters and links to archived tax publications, please refer to the following link: Tax Library | BDO Canada.
APPENDIX A - Draft Independent Auditor’s Report

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT

To the Mayor and Council of the District of Mission

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the District of Mission, which comprise the Statement of Financial Position as at December 31, 2017, and the Statements of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, Changes in Net Financial Assets and Cash Flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management’s Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor’s Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity’s preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity’s internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly in all material respects, the financial position of the District of Mission as at December 31, 2017, and the results of its operations, changes in net financial assets and cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Chartered Professional Accountants

Vancouver, British Columbia
May 7, 2018
APPENDIX B - Representation Letter

May 7, 2018

BDO Canada LLP
Chartered Professional Accountants
600 Cathedral Place
925 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2

This representation letter is provided in connection with your audit of the financial statements of the District of Mission (the “District”) for the year ended December 31, 2017 for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards:

We confirm that to the best of our knowledge and belief, having made such inquiries as we considered necessary for the purpose of appropriately informing ourselves:

Financial Statements

- We have fulfilled our responsibilities, as set out in the terms of the audit engagement dated November 23, 2016, for the preparation of the financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards; in particular, the financial statements are fairly presented in accordance therewith.

- Significant assumptions used by us in making accounting estimates, including those measured at fair value, are reasonable.

- Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of Canadian public sector accounting standards.

- All events subsequent to the date of the financial statements and for which Canadian public sector accounting standards require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed.

- The financial statements of the District use appropriate accounting policies that have been properly disclosed and consistently applied.

Information Provided

- We have provided you with:
  - access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements, such as records, documentation and other matters;
  - additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of the audit; and
  - unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.

- We are responsible for the design, implementation and maintenance of internal controls to prevent, detect and correct fraud and error, and have communicated to you all deficiencies in internal control of which we are aware.

- All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements.
• We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements.

• We have disclosed to you the identity of the entity’s related parties and all the related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.

Fraud and Error

• We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.

• We have disclosed to you all information in relation to fraud or suspected fraud that we are aware of and that affects the entity and involves:
  - management;
  - employees who have significant roles in internal control; or
  - others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.

• We have disclosed to you all information in relation to allegations of fraud, or suspected fraud, affecting the entity’s financial statements communicated by employees, former employees, analysts, regulators, or others.

Existence, Completeness and Valuation of Specific Financial Statement Balances

• All assets, wherever located, to which the District had satisfactory title at the year end, have been fairly stated and recorded in the financial statements. There are no liens or encumbrances on the entity’s assets.

• All financial instruments have been appropriately recognized and measured in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

• Significant assumptions used in arriving at the fair value of financial instruments are reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

• The inventories as set out in the financial statements represent all of the inventories to which the District held title as at the Statement of Financial Position date. Inventories do not include any goods consigned to the entity, merchandise billed to customers or any items for which the liability has not been provided in the books.

• The employee future benefit costs, assets and obligation have been determined, accounted for and disclosed in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. The source data and plan provisions provided are complete and accurate. The plans included in the valuation are complete. The determination of the discount rate and the use of specific actuarial assumptions are our best estimate assumptions. We feel that the extrapolations are accurate and have properly reflected the effects of changes and events occurring subsequent to the most recent valuation that had a material effect on the extrapolation.

General Representations

• The nature of all material uncertainties have been appropriately measured and disclosed in the financial statements, including all estimates where it is reasonably possible that the estimate will change in the near term and the effect of the change could be material to the financial statements.
• There were no direct contingencies or provisions (including those associated with guarantees or indemnification provisions), unusual contractual obligations nor any substantial commitments, whether oral or written, other than in the ordinary course of business, which would materially affect the financial statements or financial position of the entity, except as disclosed in the financial statements.

• We confirm that there are no derivatives or off-balance sheet financial instruments held at year end that have not been properly recorded or disclosed in the financial statements.

• We have disclosed to you all significant customers and/or suppliers of the District who individually represent a significant volume of business with the entity. We are of the opinion that the volume of business (sales, services, purchases, borrowing and lending) done by the District with any one party is not of sufficient magnitude that discontinuance would have a material negative effect on the ongoing operations of the entity.

• There have been no plans or intentions that may materially affect the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities.

• We confirm that operating segments are appropriately identified and disclosed in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

• No significant matters, other than those disclosed in the financial statements, have arisen that would require a restatement of the comparative financial statements.

• We have made the following additional significant representations to you during the course of your audit which we understand that you have relied upon:
  - All tangible capital assets and inventory have been recorded and additions for the year are complete and accurate. Amortization based on the expected useful life of the tangible capital asset and residual value is our best estimate for the consumption of a portion of the tangible capital asset for the year. Where the value of any tangible capital asset has been impaired, an appropriate provision has been made in the financial statements or has otherwise been disclosed to you.
  - Management has assessed its potential liabilities under the Contaminated Sites standard including sites that are no longer in productive use and sites for which the District accepts responsibility. Overall, there were no such sites that had contamination in excess of an environmental standard which required remediation at this time, therefore no liability was recognized at December 31, 2017.

**Other Representations Where the Situation Exists**

• We have informed you of all known actual or possible litigation and claims, whether or not they have been discussed with legal counsel. Since there are no actual, outstanding or possible litigation and claims, no disclosure is required in the financial statements.

Yours truly,

______________________________  ______________________________
Signature                          Position

______________________________  ______________________________
Signature                          Position
April 26, 2018

Mr. Kris Boland, CPA, CGA, Director of Finance
District of Mission
8645 Stave Lake Street
Mission, BC  V2V 4L9

Dear Mr. Boland:

As your external auditors, we are engaged to provide an audit opinion on your year-end financial statements. An external audit requires testing of transactions and balances and review of those internal control systems upon which we may place reliance. A positive opinion on the financial statements does not necessarily mean that your internal control systems are all operating effectively. This is because we review only those internal control systems where we feel that failure in those systems could result in a material error on the financial statements. With those systems that we do review, our focus is on the assertions necessary to meet our financial statement audit objectives.

Our review of systems, transactions and balances as well as discussions with staff at various levels gives us a unique insight into your operations. While conducting this work we make note of items that come to our attention where we feel that improvement could be made or alternatives could be considered. We are fortunate in that we work with a great number of clients and observe a wide variety of processes. We see firsthand any procedures that are emerging as best practices.

As matters come to our attention, we make note of these for subsequent follow-up. For minor matters we discuss directly with the staff involved. More important matters are brought forward in this letter (known as a management letter).

It is worth noting that we have management letter comments for virtually all audits of all clients. The existence of points does not mean that there are significant problems with your systems or staff. They are just recommendations to make good systems better.

Status of Prior Year Recommendations

1. Tendering Process

   Observation

   We noted last year that there was no formal procedure documented in the tender awarding process. When tenders are submitted they are reviewed by the purchasing manager, however, there is no sign off or review notes on the document indicating that the tender has been examined. In the purchasing policy there is also no mention of lead time (the time period a tender needs to be outstanding before it closes).
Recommendation

To ensure all the tenders submitted are properly examined and evaluated, we recommended adding a procedure for the purchasing manager to document the review of tenders. We also recommended adding a lead time requirement for the tendering process to ensure sufficient time was given for bid submission.

2017 management update

Since the management comments noted in last year's audit report, the Purchasing process has changed slightly, which has resulted in the process aligning with the auditor's recommendation. First, the District receives all submissions via email to one central email address for competitive bid responses, rather than in hard copy format as was the case last year. The time/date stamp is included in the District's email program and all emails are archived by the District's Information Services department. All emails sent and received are archived, even if the user deletes the messages from their email application. Second, the District has changed all of the live process durations to a minimum of four weeks to comply with the Canadian Free Trade Agreement, which came into effect in July 2017. Third, the Purchasing Department has engaged the assistance of a part-time administrative clerk to document all of the department's standard operating procedures, including the review of tenders. All of the standard operating procedures are being converted to the District's procedure template. Finally, the Manager of Purchasing and Stores implemented the practice of consensus evaluations at the District. The Purchasing Department oversees evaluation meetings with stakeholder departments to ensure fair, legal and defensible evaluations for all submissions received.

2. Allowances for Members of Legislative Assemblies and Certain Municipal Officers

We commented last year that the one-third non-taxable allowance currently available to Councillors will be repealed in 2019. We recommended that management review alternatives (such as increasing Council remuneration rates) to determine if it is necessary or desirable to offset the pending income tax increases that will be faced by Councillors.

2017 management update

Staff have been researching alternatives and discussing options with our municipal colleagues, and have drafted a report for Council's consideration. The report is tentatively scheduled to be presented at the May 7, 2018 Regular Meeting of Council.

Current year observations

1. Electronic Budget Consultations

Budget consultations are sometimes viewed by local government as a necessary evil. Certainly local governments appreciate and understand the importance of transparency in fiscal planning and that of citizen engagement. However, the effort that goes into in-person budget forums or even online surveys is often quite high, while the number of citizens in attendance at budget forums or that reply to online surveys is quite low.

There are some new tools available that are aiming to change this. They aim to greatly enhance citizen engagement while also providing local governments with timely and accurate information. One of these tools, “PlaceSpeak” (www.placespeak.com) has been used by several of our clients who speak highly of the results.
PlaceSpeak uses a unique geo-verification technology to ensure that you are hearing from real, relevant taxpayers who reside within your jurisdiction. This allows for accessible and transparent engagement, enabling the collection of legitimate, evidence-based feedback to inform budget decisions. Contrast this with the typical process used by local governments where only the “squeaky wheels” have the time or inclination to show up to meetings. In the current environment it can be very difficult to know if the “squeaky wheels” are really speaking for the citizen group as a whole or whether they are only concerned with their special interests.

A tool like PlaceSpeak provides the benefits of:
- Collecting jurisdiction-specific feedback
- Providing accessible engagement
- Allowing for engagement on an ongoing basis - not just the current budget cycle
- Deterring trolls and bots that might be attracted to less robust solutions

The District has recognized the value of electronic communication and has been actively evaluating potential options in this area. We recommend that you build on this by considering use of a more robust high-tech solution to enhance your outreach in this area.

Management comments

Currently the District of Mission undertakes highly accessible in-person and online consultation using industry-leading tools and processes that include geo-targeting and maintaining a verified list of interested individuals across the community who have opted-in as a reference group for consultation. The tools and processes are compliant with BC and Canadian law. The Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives has evaluated PlaceSpeak and similar platforms, and is working towards submitting a spending package to seek funding to implement a location-based online consultation solution to complement the online and in-person engagement. With the cost to implement individual consultations at $4,999 the expense is a significant consideration given the priorities and demands on the District regarding consultation overall.

2. Employer Health Tax

In February 2018, the new NDP government proposed an Employer Health Tax (EHT) in their first budget. This announcement was accompanied by the proposed elimination of the Medical Services Plan premiums (MSPP) effective January 1, 2020. MSPPs are levied on individual taxpayers while the proposed EHT will be levied on businesses’ payroll. The proposed EHT is expected to come into effect on January 1, 2019.

For many organizations, payroll is the single largest expenditure. As a result, we would like to take this opportunity to remind management to consider this new tax in developing future budgets and financial plans.

For additional information, please refer to the following BDO resource: https://www.bdo.ca/en-ca/insights/tax/tax-alerts/british-columbia-employer-health-tax/.

Management comments

Staff have calculated the estimated impact of the proposed EHT, and noted it for 2019 budget development. Staff have advised Mayor and Council, the local Member of the Legislative Assembly, and senior staff of the estimated impact of this pending change.
3. Use of Complex Formulas in Excel

Observation

During the audit, we noted an error (since corrected) in the calculation of developer contributed assets. (Some storm and sanitary mains assets were double counted.) The complexity of the formulas used to determine the calculated value of the assets very likely contributed to this.

Recommendation

We recommend review of formulas in any spreadsheets that feed accounting entries to see if they can be simplified. In addition, following a sample of calculations through from start to finish can help ensure the integrity of the formulas. Once this is done, the relevant formula spreadsheet cells should be “locked” to ensure that no formulas are purposely or accidently tampered with.

Management Comments

Management agrees the Excel workbooks used to calculate values for the developer contributed assets are complex and the risk of an error is more likely than other workbooks. Management is working with other departments to explore the possibility of getting standardized developer asset costing data which would help to reduce the complexity of the formulas in these workbooks and reduce the risk of calculation errors. Management hopes this costing data would be made available for use for the District’s 2019 fiscal year end. Until this is fully implemented, management will perform a more thorough review of randomly sampled calculations in the spreadsheets for developer contributed asset additions from start to finish to verify the integrity of the formulas. Management will also review and approve any formula changes made by staff for these spreadsheets prior to posting to the general ledger and tangible capital asset sub-ledgers.

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

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

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

Yours truly,

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

BC/mkn

cc: Mayor and Council
APPENDIX D - Audit Adjustments

SUMMARY OF AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

The following is a summary of year end audit adjustments made during the course of our audit engagement. All adjustments were approved by management before the issuance of our draft independent auditor’s report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Accumulated Surplus</th>
<th>Annual Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To adjust developer contributed assets that were double counted in error</td>
<td>$ (339,800)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (339,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted Differences</td>
<td>$ (339,800)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (339,800)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF DISCLOSURE OMISSIONS

The following is a summary of disclosures that have not been made within the financial statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Omission</th>
<th>Management’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None noted.</td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
SUBJECT: Investment Holdings Quarterly Report – March 31, 2018

This report will bring Council and the public up-to-date on the District’s cash and portfolio investment holdings. This report is provided for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a quarterly update of the District’s cash and portfolio investment holdings.

BACKGROUND:
In accordance with the District’s Investment Policy FIN.20, staff report to Council on the District’s investment holdings on a quarterly basis.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The following table summarizes the District’s cash and portfolio investment holdings as at March 31, 2018 with comparatives to March 31, 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As at March 31, 2018</th>
<th>Approx. Return</th>
<th>As at March 31, 2017</th>
<th>Approx. Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General bank account</td>
<td>$5,061,365</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>$6,866,741</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum savings account</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>13,082,173</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashable term deposits</td>
<td>24,696,210</td>
<td>1.95% - 2.25%</td>
<td>21,336,902</td>
<td>1.80% - 2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term deposits</td>
<td>53,570,182</td>
<td>2.10% - 3.10%</td>
<td>38,170,008</td>
<td>2.00% - 2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrual and extendible step-up notes</td>
<td>6,034,679</td>
<td>2.00% - 2.40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial coupon bonds</td>
<td>4,013,040</td>
<td>2.25% - 2.95%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Portfolio Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,375,508</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$79,455,824</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excluding general bank interest earnings, the District's investment portfolio has yielded an average annualized return of approximately 2.23% for the three months ended March 31, 2018 compared to an average annualized return of approximately 2.14% for the three months ended March 31, 2017. Interest earnings for the three months ended March 31, 2018 was $522,816 compared to interest earnings for the three months ended March 31, 2017 of $411,517.

Cash and portfolio investments are $13,919,684 higher as at March 31, 2018 compared to March 31, 2017 primarily as a result of building up reserve balances.

All investment decisions made are in compliance with Section 183 of the Community Charter and ensuring the primary objective is the preservation of capital as per the District's Investment Policy FIN.20.

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

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The District's total cash and portfolio investment balance is $93,375,508 as at March 31, 2018 compared to $79,455,824 as at March 31, 2017. Interest earnings for the three months ended March 31, 2018 was $522,816 compared to interest earnings for the three months ended March 31, 2017 of $411,517.

SIGN-OFFS:

Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
SUBJECT: Draft 2017 Financial Statements
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A – Draft 2017 Financial Statements
Appendix B – Annual Surplus Reconciliation

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
That the District of Mission’s draft 2017 financial statements, attached as Appendix A to the Manager of Accounting Services’ report dated May 7, 2018 entitled Draft 2017 Financial Statements, be approved.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present the District’s draft 2017 financial statements, including the draft audit opinion for Council’s consideration and approval.

BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission’s draft 2017 financial statements, including the draft audit opinion, are attached as Appendix A. In accordance with Canadian audit standards, Council is required to approve the financial statements before the auditors issue their final audit report. In accordance with Section 167 of the Community Charter, audited financial statements that have been prepared by the District's Financial Officer, and presented to Council for its acceptance, are required to be submitted to the Inspector of Municipalities by May 15, 2018.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The District’s annual surplus for 2017 as per the financial statements was $15,977,008. This amount is calculated on an accrual-basis in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and is similar to “net income” for a business. It does not include certain items such as principal payments on debt and transfers to reserves, which poses a problem for both the District’s annual budgeting process from a financial planning perspective, as well as the need to satisfy “balanced budget” legislation. For example, current year tax revenue is used to pay principal payments on debt, and no cash-basis surplus arises from this transaction. However, under the accrual-basis, tax revenue is recorded as revenue, while principal payments on debt result in a reduction in liabilities; therefore, tax revenue is included on the Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, while principal payments on debt are reducing debt on the Statement of Financial Position. This differing treatment of principal payments on debt is an example of how the cash-basis and accrual-basis annual surplus figures differ. A reconciliation of the accrual-basis surplus and the cash-basis surplus is included in the attached Appendix B.
As a result, the District prepares a “balanced” cash-based budget then makes a number of adjustments to the classification of certain items to arrive at an accrual-based budget. Using the cash-basis, the general operating fund surplus for the year was $1,705,445 (the general operating fund includes municipal services that are primarily funded by property taxation). The general operating fund surplus doesn't include any surpluses related to self-funding District operations such as the water, sewer, drainage and waste management utilities, or the Forestry Enterprise, as these surpluses are automatically transferred to their respective capital reserves.

In the Deputy Treasurer/Collector’s report to Council dated April 3, 2018 entitled Quarterly Financial Reporting – December 31, 2017 the cash-basis surplus was $1,705,769. This figure was reduced by $324 as a result of year-end adjustments, to arrive at the final surplus figure of $1,705,445. The cash-basis surplus was as a result of several budget variances that occurred in 2017. Some of the more significant budget variances include a surplus of approximately $704,500 in the RCMP contract, additional $133,000 in planning fees, $159,000 in building permit fees and $187,000 in engineering inspection fees, soil permits and royalties collected as a result of increased development activity. The majority of these variances are not expected to be relied on as ongoing occurrences; therefore no corresponding budget adjustments were made in the 2018 budget.

A summary of the District’s draft 2017 financial statements follows.

**Audit Opinion**

The District’s external auditors have concluded their audit testing and have issued what is considered to be a “clean audit”; in other words, in the Auditor's independent opinion, the District’s draft 2017 financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects.

**Statement of Financial Position**

The statement of financial position, which is similar to a balance sheet, summarizes the District's assets and liabilities, the net of which results in accumulated surplus. The components of accumulated surplus are detailed in Note 12 to the financial statements which includes operating surplus and reserve fund balances, and the amount invested in capital assets (i.e. infrastructure, facilities, equipment and land). Assets on the statement of financial position are broken down into two categories:

- Financial assets: includes assets which are available to discharge existing liabilities. Examples include cash, accounts receivable, and investments.
- Non-financial assets: includes assets that are held for use in the provision of services and have useful lives extending beyond one year. The majority of non-financial assets are tangible capital assets, such as roads, drainage, water and sewer infrastructure, and municipal facilities, which are used to provide ongoing municipal services.

At the end of 2017, the District had net financial assets of approximately $64.3 million, which means financial assets were greater than liabilities. This represents a $9.1 million increase in net financial assets over the prior year. Further details of the change in net financial assets can be found in the Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets.

The District had non-financial assets of about $457.5 million at the end of 2017, the majority of which represents the historical acquisition cost of tangible capital assets, less accumulated amortization. This represents an increase in non-financial assets of approximately $6.9 million over the prior year, primarily as a result of tangible capital assets acquired during the year, less amortization. The District's net financial assets, together with its non-financial assets, contributed to its overall accumulated surplus position of approximately $521.8 million as at the end of 2017.
Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus
This statement, which is similar to an income statement, summarizes the District’s revenues and expenses for the year, the net of which results in the accrual-basis annual surplus. The annual surplus is added to the prior year’s accumulated surplus, to arrive at the ending accumulated surplus balance for the year. Based on total revenues of approximately $78.5 million and expenses of approximately $62.5 million during the year, the annual surplus per the accrual-basis of accounting of approximately $16.0 million is shown in this statement. The ending accumulated surplus position reflected in this statement of approximately $521.8 million corresponds with the accumulated surplus shown on the Statement of Financial Position.

Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets
This statement adjusts the annual surplus for transactions involving non-financial assets, to arrive at the increase in net financial assets for the year. The net increase in financial assets is then added to the net financial assets at the beginning of the year to arrive at the year-end balance for net financial assets. The District’s net financial assets at the end of 2017 were approximately $64.3 million, which corresponds with the net financial assets figure in the Statement of Financial Position.

Statement of Cash Flows
This statement summarizes the sources and usage of cash throughout the year, in the categories of operating, investing, financing, and capital transactions. The change in cash and cash equivalents is reflected in the final cash position shown, which reconciles with the cash and cash equivalents balance shown on the Statement of Financial Position. The District’s cash and cash equivalents balance at the end of 2017 was approximately $51.7 million, a significant portion of which are held in highly liquid investments earning competitive rates of return; see Note 2 in the financial statements for more details on cash and cash equivalents.

Notes to the Financial Statements
The Notes to the Financial Statements reflect significant accounting policies, the details of certain amounts shown in the Statement of Financial Position and Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, as well as other pertinent information that helps to explain the financial statements to the reader. For example, a breakdown of the investments balance shown in the Statement of Financial Position is included in Note 5, including a summary of investment holdings and rates of return. In this note the reader is presented both the carrying (or book) value as well as the market value of the District’s investment holdings. As an aside, the District’s intent is to generally hold these investments to maturity; therefore, any difference between market value and carrying value is deemed to be temporary in nature.

Note 12 shows the detailed composition of the District’s $521.8 million accumulated surplus, which consists primarily of amounts invested in tangible capital assets, as well as operating surplus balances and reserve fund balances.

Schedule 1 – Schedule of Tangible Capital Assets
Schedule 1 reflects the historical cost of tangible capital assets and the changes in the balance of these assets as a result of additions, disposals and amortization expense. The District had approximately $607.1 million (historical cost) of tangible capital assets at the end of 2017, with accumulated amortization of about $150.5 million, for a net book value of tangible capital assets of about $456.6 million. Total additions to tangible capital assets were $16.9 million in 2017, of which $7.5 million were infrastructure assets received from developers through property development activities during the year.
Schedule 2 – Statement of Operations by Segment

Schedule 2 shows revenues and expenses for the year broken down into functional areas (i.e. segments). The total revenues and expenses for all of the segments balance to the Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, as does the total annual surplus. Details of the functions included in each segment can be found in Note 17.

Schedule 3 – Long-Term Debt

Schedule 3 provides details on the District’s various long-term debt issues that are outstanding, including annual debt servicing requirements for the next five years. The District had approximately $5.06 million of external debt outstanding at the end of 2017, consisting of amounts borrowed for the construction of Fire Station #1 in 1998, and the construction/renovation of the leisure centre, sports-park and water park in 2004 through 2006. The debt for the Fire Station #1 is scheduled to be fully repaid in 2018 and the debt related to the leisure centre, sports-park and water park is scheduled to be fully repaid by the end of 2026. There is no debt outstanding for the District’s water, sewer, drainage, and waste management utilities.

Schedule 4 – Internal Debt/Transfers Outstanding

Schedule 4 lists all of the District’s outstanding internal debt (i.e. borrowing from reserves) including advances, adjustments and payments. The outstanding internal debt of $3.1 million as at December 31, 2017, is entirely related to borrowing for Development Cost Charge (DCC) projects. In other words, other reserves have had to prepay for certain DCC projects, because insufficient DCC funds were collected prior to acquisition or construction of those DCC projects. The intent is that as DCC funds are collected from future development, these collections are used to pay back the lending reserve funds. No additional internal loans for DCC projects were undertaken during 2017.

Paying for growth related DCC projects prior to actual growth occurring is an ongoing challenge, as DCCs are intended to be a “cost-recovery” tool, while infrastructure required to service development is typically required to be constructed prior to DCCs being collected. It is important to adhere to a solid pay back plan if and when funds are advanced for DCC projects. Difficulties with payback arise when DCC collections are slow and when the funding of current DCC projects takes precedence over the payback of existing internal loans.

During 2017, the District repaid approximately $55,000 of internal loans from DCCs collected during the year.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications directly associated with this report. Staff will report back to Council to recommend if any transfers from accumulated surplus to other reserve funds should be considered.

COMMUNICATION:
The District’s audited 2017 financial statements will be forwarded to the Inspector of Municipalities, prior to the legislated deadline of May 15, 2018. These financial statements will also form part of the District’s 2017 Annual Report, which will be included on a public Council meeting agenda prior to the June 30, 2018 legislated deadline.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
In accordance with audit standards, Council is required to approve the financial statements (Appendix A) before the auditors issue their final audit report. As per Section 167 of the Community Charter, financial statements are required to be approved by Council prior to May 15th each year. A summary of the District’s 2017 financial results and financial position is included in this report.
The District’s accrual-basis annual surplus for 2017 as per the financial statements was $15,977,008, and the general operating fund cash-basis surplus was $1,705,445 for the year. A reconciliation of the accrual-basis surplus and the cash-basis surplus is included in Appendix B of this report. As detailed in the Quarterly Financial Reporting – December 31, 2017 report to Council, the cash-basis surplus was as a result of several budget savings that occurred in 2017. Some of the more significant budget savings contributing to this surplus include $704,500 of savings in the RCMP contract, an additional $187,000 in engineering inspection fees, soil permits and royalties, $159,000 in building permit fees and $133,000 in planning fees as a result of increased development activity.

The District’s audited 2017 financial statements will be forwarded to the Inspector of Municipalities, prior to the legislated deadline of May 15, 2018. These financial statements will also form part of the District’s 2017 Annual Report, which will be included on a public Council meeting agenda prior to the June 30, 2018 legislated deadline.

SIGN-OFFS:

Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services  
Reviewed by:  
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer:  
Reviewed
Independent Auditor’s Report

To the Mayor and Council of the District of Mission

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the District of Mission, which comprise the Statement of Financial Position as at December 31, 2017, and the Statements of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, Changes in Net Financial Assets and Cash Flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management’s Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor’s Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity’s preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity’s internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly in all material respects, the financial position of the District of Mission as at December 31, 2017, and the results of its operations, changes in net financial assets and cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Chartered Professional Accountants

Vancouver, British Columbia
May 7, 2018
District of Mission
Management's Responsibility for Financial Reporting
December 31, 2017

The accompanying financial statements of the District of Mission (the "District") are the responsibility of the District's management and have been prepared in compliance with legislation, and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles for governments, as established by the Public Sector Accounting Board of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada. A summary of significant accounting policies are described in the notes to the financial statements. The preparation of financial statements necessarily involves the use of estimates based on management's judgement, particularly when transactions affecting the current accounting period cannot be finalized with certainty until future periods.

The District maintains systems of internal controls designed to provide reasonable assurance that assets are safeguarded, transactions are properly authorized and recorded in compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements, and reliable financial information is available on a timely basis for preparation of the financial statements. These systems are monitored and evaluated by management.

Council meets with management and the external auditors to review the financial statements and discuss any significant financial reporting or internal control matters prior to their approval of the financial statements.

The financial statements have been audited by BDO Canada LLP, independent external auditors appointed by the District. The accompanying Independent Auditor's Report outlines their responsibilities, the scope of their examination and their opinion of the District's financial statements.

Ron Poole
Chief Administrative Officer

Kris Boland CPA, CGA
Director of Finance

Date: May 7, 2018
### District of Mission

**Statement of Financial Position**

**As at December 31, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents (Note 2)</td>
<td>$51,672,609</td>
<td>$43,474,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables (Note 3)</td>
<td>8,377,741</td>
<td>7,093,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories held for resale</td>
<td>154,445</td>
<td>115,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans receivable (Note 4)</td>
<td>280,519</td>
<td>609,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Note 5)</td>
<td>44,901,813</td>
<td>38,839,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td>105,387,127</td>
<td>90,132,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (Note 7)</td>
<td>12,473,827</td>
<td>11,954,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>5,092,820</td>
<td>3,792,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt (Note 8, Schedule 3)</td>
<td>5,056,537</td>
<td>5,651,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>6,004,535</td>
<td>3,865,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted revenue (Note 9)</td>
<td>11,108,279</td>
<td>8,416,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee future benefits (Note 10)</td>
<td>1,399,617</td>
<td>1,290,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>41,135,615</td>
<td>34,970,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td>64,251,512</td>
<td>55,161,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Schedule 1)</td>
<td>456,643,539</td>
<td>449,266,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories of supplies and land</td>
<td>683,512</td>
<td>882,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>196,801</td>
<td>486,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td>457,523,852</td>
<td>450,636,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated Surplus (Note 12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$521,775,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>$505,798,356</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kris Boland CPA, CGA  
Director of Finance

Randy Hawes  
Mayor

The accompanying notes and schedules are an integral part of these financial statements.
District of Mission

Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus

For the year ended December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Budget (Note 15)</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxation (Note 13)</td>
<td>$31,736,006</td>
<td>$31,808,561</td>
<td>$30,259,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of services and regulatory fees</td>
<td>27,968,967</td>
<td>31,001,626</td>
<td>30,546,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers (Note 14)</td>
<td>2,781,370</td>
<td>3,474,241</td>
<td>3,271,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue (Note 9)</td>
<td>712,756</td>
<td>175,147</td>
<td>383,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>1,227,281</td>
<td>1,697,018</td>
<td>1,498,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>1,623,046</td>
<td>1,916,348</td>
<td>1,702,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td>4,478,328</td>
<td>7,523,397</td>
<td>8,462,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>866,832</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,527,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,463,170</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,124,945</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective services</td>
<td>16,340,229</td>
<td>15,786,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and public works</td>
<td>7,560,183</td>
<td>7,243,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, recreation and culture services</td>
<td>7,386,381</td>
<td>7,958,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and finance</td>
<td>5,006,298</td>
<td>5,163,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit services</td>
<td>2,920,857</td>
<td>2,713,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government and fiscal services</td>
<td>1,984,605</td>
<td>2,139,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development services</td>
<td>2,310,905</td>
<td>2,414,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1,444,191</td>
<td>1,453,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>226,716</td>
<td>253,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage utility</td>
<td>2,080,491</td>
<td>1,993,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility</td>
<td>3,818,551</td>
<td>3,084,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management utility</td>
<td>4,630,363</td>
<td>5,087,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utility</td>
<td>3,649,186</td>
<td>3,647,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest enterprise</td>
<td>4,056,108</td>
<td>3,547,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,415,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,486,162</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Surplus</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus, Beginning of Year</td>
<td>505,798,356</td>
<td>505,798,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Accumulated Surplus, End of Year | $512,911,046 | $521,775,364 | $505,798,356 |

The accompanying notes and schedules are an integral part of these financial statements.
## District of Mission

### Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets

For the year ended December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Surplus</td>
<td>$7,112,690</td>
<td>$15,977,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets, including developer contributions in-kind</td>
<td>(12,688,286)</td>
<td>(16,947,214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>8,308,146</td>
<td>8,857,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gain)/loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(866,832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sale proceeds, tangible capital assets</td>
<td>198,978</td>
<td>1,579,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,931,528</td>
<td>8,600,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in inventories of supplies and land</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>199,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in prepaid expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>289,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>489,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Net Financial Assets</td>
<td>2,931,528</td>
<td>9,089,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Financial Assets, Beginning of Year</td>
<td>55,161,976</td>
<td>55,161,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Financial Assets, End of Year</td>
<td>$58,093,504</td>
<td>$64,251,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes and schedules are an integral part of these financial statements.
## District of Mission

### Statement of Cash Flows

For the year ended December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Flows from Operating Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus</td>
<td>$15,977,008</td>
<td>$14,745,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items Not Involving Cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>8,857,615</td>
<td>8,438,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>(175,147)</td>
<td>(383,834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gain)/loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(866,832)</td>
<td>103,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td>(7,523,397)</td>
<td>(8,462,350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in employee future benefits</td>
<td>108,623</td>
<td>(50,351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Non-Cash Operating Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>(1,284,532)</td>
<td>(287,389)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>519,703</td>
<td>1,285,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>1,300,786</td>
<td>823,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>2,138,963</td>
<td>(15,826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories held for resale</td>
<td>(38,685)</td>
<td>130,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans receivable</td>
<td>329,100</td>
<td>(506,180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories of supplies and land</td>
<td>199,253</td>
<td>(21,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>289,866</td>
<td>(247,650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Cash from Operating Transactions</strong></td>
<td>19,832,324</td>
<td>15,551,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Flows from Investing Transactions</strong></td>
<td>(6,062,069)</td>
<td>2,991,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Flows from Financing Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt principal repaid</td>
<td>(594,859)</td>
<td>(571,581)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted revenue collections and interest earnings</td>
<td>2,866,972</td>
<td>2,611,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Cash from Financing Transactions</strong></td>
<td>2,272,113</td>
<td>2,039,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Flows from Capital Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>1,579,840</td>
<td>241,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash used to acquire tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(9,423,822)</td>
<td>(11,013,773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Cash from Capital Transactions</strong></td>
<td>(7,843,982)</td>
<td>(10,772,084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Cash and Cash Equivalents</strong></td>
<td>8,198,386</td>
<td>9,810,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents, Beginning of Year</td>
<td>43,474,223</td>
<td>33,663,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents, End of Year</strong></td>
<td>$51,672,609</td>
<td>$43,474,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes and schedules are an integral part of these financial statements.
District of Mission

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended December 31, 2017

The District of Mission (the "District") is a municipality in the Province of British Columbia, and operates under provisions of the Local Government Act and the Community Charter. The principal activities of the District include the provision of local government services to residents and businesses.

The Community Charter requires local governments to annually adopt a five year financial plan, wherein the total proposed expenditures and transfers to other funds for the year must not exceed the total of the proposed funding sources and transfers from other funds for the year. Budget information presented in the financial statements reflects the budget for the year 2017 of the District of Mission’s 2017-2021 five year financial plan, adopted by Council Bylaw #5612-2016 (see also Note 15).

1. Significant Accounting Policies

The financial statements of the District are prepared by management in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards ("PSAS").

a. Basis of Accounting

The financial statements are prepared using the accrual basis of accounting. The accrual basis of accounting records revenue as it is earned and becomes measurable. Expenses are recognized as they are incurred and become measurable based upon receipt of goods or services and/or the creation of a legal obligation to pay.

b. Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of certain receivables and accrued liabilities as at the date of the financial statements, and that affect the reported amount of related revenues and expenses during the reporting period. As such, actual results could differ from the estimates. Areas requiring the greatest degree of estimation include employee future benefits, assessment of contingent liabilities, liabilities for contaminated sites, landfill closure and post-closure liabilities, allowance for doubtful accounts receivable, and the estimated useful lives of tangible capital assets.

c. Inventories Held for Resale

Inventories held for resale are valued at the lower of cost and net realizable value.

d. Investments

Investments are recorded at cost. Investments are written down to net realizable value when there has been, in the opinion of management, a decline in market value that is not temporary. Investments in the MFA Short-Term Bond Fund are recorded at market value, which approximates cost.

e. Non-Financial Assets

Non-financial assets are not available to discharge existing liabilities, and are generally held for use in the provision of services. They typically have useful lives extending beyond the current year (with the exception of prepaid expenses), and are not intended for sale in the ordinary course of operations.
1. Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

f. Tangible Capital Assets

Tangible capital assets, which are a type of non-financial asset, are recorded at cost, which includes all amounts that are directly attributable to acquisition, construction, development or betterment. The costs of tangible capital assets, less residual value, are amortized on a straight-line basis over their estimated useful lives as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Useful Life Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and improvements</td>
<td>5 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>20 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology infrastructure</td>
<td>3 to 80 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>not amortized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>35 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill infrastructure</td>
<td>10 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks infrastructure</td>
<td>10 to 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling depot (regional)</td>
<td>7 to 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage conveyance infrastructure (local)</td>
<td>25 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment plant (regional)</td>
<td>2 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>10 to 80 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>5 to 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water distribution infrastructure (local)</td>
<td>10 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply infrastructure (regional)</td>
<td>4 to 75 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the year of acquisition or disposal, amortization is prorated based on the number of days that the tangible capital asset is in service or use in the year. Assets under construction are not amortized until they are put into service. Tangible capital assets received from developers through property development activities are recorded at their fair value at the date of receipt and are recorded as revenue.

g. Inventories of Supplies and Land

Inventories of supplies and land are valued at cost.

h. Deferred Revenue

Deferred revenue consists of prepaid property taxes and utilities, and various other amounts that have been collected for which the related services have yet to be performed. The District recognizes these revenues in the period which the related services are performed.

i. Restricted Revenue

Revenues or receipts, which are restricted by legislation or that contain stipulations that create a liability, are deferred and reported as restricted revenues. When qualifying expenses are incurred and/or stipulations are met, restricted revenues are recognized as revenues in the period which this occurs.
District of Mission

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended December 31, 2017

1. Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

    j. Employee Future Benefits

        The District and its employees make contributions to the Municipal Pension Plan (the "Plan"), and the employees accrue benefits under this Plan based on service. The District’s contributions to the Plan are expensed when incurred.

        In addition to the Plan, sick leave and other retirement benefits accrue to the District’s employees. The costs of these benefits are actuarially determined based on years of service, estimated retirement age, and expected future salary and wage levels. The obligations under these benefit plans are accrued based on the projected benefits earned as the employees render the services necessary to earn the future benefits.

    k. Contaminated sites

        A liability for remediation of a contaminated site is recognized when the site is no longer in productive use and the following criteria are satisfied: an environmental standard exists; contamination exceeds the standard; the District is either directly responsible or has accepted responsibility for remediation; it is expected that future economic benefits will be given up and a reasonable estimate of the liability can be made.

    l. Revenue Recognition - Taxation

        Taxes are recorded at estimated amounts when they meet the definition of an asset, have been authorized, and the taxable event occurs. Annual levies for non-optional municipal services and general administrative services are recorded as taxes for municipal services in the year they are levied. Taxes receivable are recognized net of an allowance for anticipated uncollectible amounts. Levies imposed by other taxing authorities are not included as taxes for municipal purposes.

        Through BC Assessment’s appeal process, taxes may be adjusted by way of supplementary roll adjustments. The effects of these adjustments on taxes may have been included in initial estimates when recording revenue; to the extent that adjustments exceed the initial estimates, they are recognized at the time they are awarded.

    m. Government Transfers

        Government transfers, which include legislative grants, are recognized as revenue in the financial statements when the transfer is authorized and any eligibility criteria are met, except to the extent that transfer stipulations give rise to an obligation that meets the definition of a liability. Transfers are recognized as deferred revenue when transfer stipulations give rise to a liability. Transfer revenue is recognized in the statement of operations as the stipulation liabilities are settled.

    n. Related Parties

        Effective January 1, 2016, the District adopted the new accounting standard PS 2200 Related Party Disclosures. The standard defines those entities or individuals that are considered to be a related party, and requires disclosure of certain related party transactions, typically when a related party transaction has occurred at a value different from that which would have been arrived at if the parties were unrelated. This new standard has been applied prospectively.
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Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended December 31, 2017

1. Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

   n. Related Parties (continued)

   The impact of adoption of this standard resulted in no disclosures, as the District does not have any related parties as defined in the standard, and therefore no related party transactions exist.

   o. Inter-entity Transactions

   Effective January 1, 2016, the District adopted the new accounting standard PS 3420 Inter-entity Transactions. The standard establishes how to account for and report transactions between public sector entities that comprise a government’s reporting entity from both a provider and recipient perspective. This new standard has been applied prospectively.

   The impact of adoption of this standard resulted in no transactions or disclosures, as the District does not control any entities. Therefore, no inter-entity transactions exist.

2. Cash and Cash Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$10,613,491</td>
<td>$17,474,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashable term deposits</td>
<td>41,059,118</td>
<td>26,000,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$51,672,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,474,223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Current interest rates on cash balances are based on prevailing bank rates, and range from 1.20% to 2.00% (1.20% to 2.00% in 2016). Cashable term deposits are comprised of BC Credit Union term deposits which are cashable either immediately or within 30 days of issue, with interest rates ranging from 1.75% to 2.25% (1.80% to 2.25% in 2016).

3. Receivables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$2,706,004</td>
<td>$2,109,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development cost charges receivable</td>
<td>297,165</td>
<td>66,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable</td>
<td>2,160,356</td>
<td>1,574,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and utilities receivable</td>
<td>3,214,216</td>
<td>3,341,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,377,741</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,093,209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Loans receivable

   Loans receivable consist of two mortgages with various terms, both of which are secured by the underlying real estate.

   A long-term mortgage was extended to the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce in 2001 for the construction of their facility on District owned land. The mortgage matures April 1, 2030, with a semi-annual interest rate of 5.5%.
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4. Loans receivable (continued)

The District agreed to a 2 year deferral of regular monthly payments from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017, during which time interest continues to accrue.

A short-term mortgage was extended to the Upper Fraser Valley Habitat for Humanity Society in 2016. The mortgage was originally set to mature August 1, 2017, however during the year the District agreed to extend the maturity date to March 31, 2018. The annual interest rate is 3.0%, non-compounding.

A short-term mortgage that was extended in 2016 was paid out in full in 2017, as originally agreed. This mortgage did not bear any interest.

5. Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrying Value</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrual and step-up notes</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term deposits</td>
<td>35,902,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,776,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Short-Term Bond Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,062,780</td>
<td>3,062,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial government and agencies bonds</td>
<td>2,999,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,999,168</td>
<td>2,956,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$44,901,813</td>
<td>$44,788,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,839,744</td>
<td>$38,839,744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accrual and step-up notes are comprised of Canadian bank products, with maturities in years 2022 through 2023, with interest rates ranging from 2.00% to 2.40%. Fixed term deposits are comprised of Canadian bank GICs and BC Credit Union term deposits, and mature in years 2018 through 2021 (2017 through 2021 in 2016), with interest rates ranging from 2.10% to 2.80% (2.00% to 2.80% in 2016). The provincial government and agencies bonds mature in 2023, with a yield of 2.25%.
6. Municipal Finance Authority Debt Reserve Cash Deposits and Demand Notes

The District issues debt instruments through the Municipal Finance Authority ("MFA") of British Columbia. As a condition of these borrowings, a portion of the debt proceeds are withheld by the MFA in a debt reserve fund as cash deposits. These debt reserve funds may be used by the MFA if they do not have sufficient funds to meet the debt payment obligations of the participating municipalities. The District also executes demand notes in connection with each debt issue whereby the District may be required to loan certain amounts to the MFA. These demand notes are contingent in nature. The balances of the cash deposits and demand notes, which are not reported elsewhere in these financial statements, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$173,917</td>
<td>$170,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$173,917</td>
<td>$170,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$320,759</td>
<td>$320,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$320,759</td>
<td>$320,759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Accounts Payable and Accrued Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$8,623,272</td>
<td>$8,578,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill closure and post-closure care costs</td>
<td>2,408,891</td>
<td>2,047,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and benefits payable</td>
<td>1,441,664</td>
<td>1,328,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,473,827</td>
<td>$11,954,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District’s landfill site is regulated by the Province of British Columbia, and as such the District is subject to certain design, operating, closure and post-closure obligations at the site.

The costs associated with landfill closure and post-closure care are recognized over the operating life of the landfill site in accordance with PSAS PS 3270. The District has estimated and recognized a liability of $2,408,891 as at December 31, 2017 ($2,047,065 in 2016), for future estimated closure and post-closure costs at the landfill site. The estimated total expenses for closure and post-closure care are approximately $15.8 million, with approximately $13.4 million remaining to be recognized. There are currently no assets designated for settling the landfill closure and post-closure care liability.

The landfill closure and post-closure care liability is based on the discounted costs associated with the phased closure of various landfill cells and environmental monitoring for 30 years after the landfill is closed. Approximately 69% of the landfill’s capacity remains, and the landfill is predicted to reach capacity around 2068. The discount rate used to estimate the liability as at December 31, 2017 is 3.18% (3.62% in 2016).
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8. Long-Term Debt Interest

The District does not carry any debt for other entities. All existing long-term debt is repayable in Canadian dollars. Refer to Schedule 3 for additional details on outstanding long-term debt, including interest rates, maturity dates, and payments due within each of the next five years. Details of the District's interest expenses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt interest - general operations</td>
<td>$243,300</td>
<td>$378,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on prepayments</td>
<td>27,730</td>
<td>25,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interest expense</td>
<td>$271,030</td>
<td>$403,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Restricted Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan</th>
<th>Development Cost Charges</th>
<th>Park Land Acquisition</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$47,410</td>
<td>$4,491,333</td>
<td>$3,877,711</td>
<td>$8,416,454</td>
<td>$6,188,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>951</td>
<td>111,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,291,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>951</td>
<td>2,403,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal loan payments made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(55,263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal loan payments received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(143,131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(198,394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,361</td>
<td>$6,695,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,108,279</td>
<td>$8,416,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10. Employee Future Benefit Obligations

The District provides sick leave and retirement benefits to its employees. The accrued obligations related to these benefits are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued benefit liability, beginning of year</td>
<td>$1,290,994</td>
<td>$1,341,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current service cost</td>
<td>173,500</td>
<td>169,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest cost</td>
<td>48,700</td>
<td>59,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit payments</td>
<td>(156,527)</td>
<td>(315,701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of actuarial (gain)/loss</td>
<td>42,950</td>
<td>36,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrued benefit liability, end of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,399,617</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,290,994</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized actuarial (gain)/loss</td>
<td>286,383</td>
<td>397,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrued benefit obligation, end of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,686,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,688,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District estimated the accrued benefit obligations by actuarial valuation as at December 31, 2015, with extrapolations to December 31, 2017. The next actuarial valuation is planned to occur for the year ending December 31, 2018, with results available in 2019.

The significant actuarial assumptions adopted in measuring the District's accrued benefit obligations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected future wage and salary increase</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Pension Plan

The District and its employees contribute to the Municipal Pension Plan (a jointly trusteeed pension plan). The board of trustees, representing plan members and employers, is responsible for administering the plan, including investment of assets and administration of benefits. The plan is a multi-employer defined benefit pension plan. Basic pension benefits are based on a formula. As at December 31, 2016, the plan has about 193,000 active members and approximately 90,000 retired members. Active members include approximately 38,000 contributors from local governments.

Every three years, an actuarial valuation is performed to assess the financial position of the plan and adequacy of plan funding. The actuary determines an appropriate combined employer and member contribution rate to fund the plan. The actuary's calculated contribution rate is based on the entry-age normal cost method, which produces the long-term rate of member and employer contributions sufficient to provide benefits for average future entrants to the plan. This rate may be adjusted for the amortization of any actuarial funding surplus and will be adjusted for the amortization of any unfunded actuarial liability.

The most recent valuation for the Municipal Pension Plan as at December 31, 2015 indicated a $2,224 million funding surplus for basic pension benefits on a going concern basis. As a result of the 2015 basic account actuarial valuation surplus and pursuant to the joint trustee agreement, $1,927 million was transferred to the rate stabilization account and $297 million of the surplus ensured the required contribution rates remained unchanged.
10. Employee Future Benefit Obligations (continued)

The District paid $1,604,833 ($1,469,319 in 2016) for employer contributions while employees contributed $1,385,902 ($1,288,922 in 2016) to the plan in fiscal 2017.

The next valuation will be as at December 31, 2018, with results available in 2019.

Employers participating in the plan record their pension expense as the amount of employer contributions made during the fiscal year (defined contribution pension plan accounting). This is because the plan records accrued liabilities and accrued assets for the plan in aggregate, resulting in no consistent and reliable basis for allocating the obligation, assets and cost to individual employers participating in the plan.

11. Contingent Liabilities

The District has been named as a defendant in various legal actions. No reserve or liability has been recorded regarding any of these legal actions or possible claims if the amount of loss, if any, is indeterminable. Settlement, if any, made with respect to these actions would be accounted for as a charge to expenses in the period in which any outcomes are known.

In 2010, the District received lands at no cost from the Province of British Columbia that were previously dedicated as provincial highway lands held for future use. The District believes there is a possibility of contamination existing on these lands from various previous industrial uses, although the scope and cost of remediation is not known at this time, and there is no known event at this time that would require remediation to be initiated. The District has not accepted responsibility for any remediation that may be required in the future.
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12. **Accumulated Surplus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Increase / (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General operating surplus</td>
<td>$7,930,970</td>
<td>$6,640,988</td>
<td>$1,289,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer operating surplus</td>
<td>834,869</td>
<td>818,448</td>
<td>16,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water operating surplus</td>
<td>993,235</td>
<td>973,699</td>
<td>19,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Corporation surplus</td>
<td>808,869</td>
<td>808,869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated surplus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon tax</td>
<td>214,666</td>
<td>227,526</td>
<td>(12,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General operating carry forwards</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,539</td>
<td>(50,539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling operations</td>
<td>65,192</td>
<td>65,192</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit operations</td>
<td>204,134</td>
<td>126,481</td>
<td>77,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted Surplus</strong></td>
<td>11,058,015</td>
<td>9,711,742</td>
<td>1,346,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reserve Funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Increase / (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>146,118</td>
<td>128,392</td>
<td>17,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community amenity</td>
<td>2,110,144</td>
<td>1,638,685</td>
<td>471,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community works gas tax</td>
<td>2,778,267</td>
<td>3,934,504</td>
<td>(1,156,237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>243,682</td>
<td>10,755</td>
<td>232,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage capital</td>
<td>555,265</td>
<td>361,694</td>
<td>193,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial stabilization</td>
<td>875,063</td>
<td>789,988</td>
<td>85,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>3,541,495</td>
<td>2,608,291</td>
<td>933,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>952,439</td>
<td>662,192</td>
<td>290,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General capital</td>
<td>3,417,724</td>
<td>2,340,651</td>
<td>1,077,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information systems</td>
<td>233,138</td>
<td>271,913</td>
<td>(38,775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>925,663</td>
<td>827,479</td>
<td>98,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land sale</td>
<td>2,003,792</td>
<td>603,124</td>
<td>1,400,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>240,355</td>
<td>235,628</td>
<td>4,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major capital</td>
<td>1,894,007</td>
<td>1,465,967</td>
<td>428,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>530,069</td>
<td>519,643</td>
<td>10,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>2,130,371</td>
<td>2,625,727</td>
<td>(495,356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads capital</td>
<td>843,529</td>
<td>493,654</td>
<td>349,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer capital</td>
<td>15,825,526</td>
<td>14,376,979</td>
<td>1,448,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>3,355,428</td>
<td>4,056,519</td>
<td>(701,091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water capital</td>
<td>16,528,272</td>
<td>14,519,298</td>
<td>2,008,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Reserve Funds**  
59,130,347  
52,471,063  
6,659,284

**Investment in Tangible Capital Assets**  
451,587,002  
443,615,551  
7,971,451

**Total Accumulated Surplus**  
$521,775,364  
$505,798,356  
$15,977,008
District of Mission

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended December 31, 2017

13. Taxation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Taxation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General municipal property taxes</td>
<td>$ 31,569,325</td>
<td>$ 31,643,819</td>
<td>$ 30,087,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessments and area charges</td>
<td>166,681</td>
<td>164,742</td>
<td>172,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total municipal taxation</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,736,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,808,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,259,605</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Collections for Other Taxing Authorities: | | | |
| Province of BC - school taxes | 14,873,900 | 15,807,997 | 15,143,851 |
| Fraser Valley Regional District | 643,197     | 776,846     | 698,550    |
| Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District | 1,377,768   | 1,390,897   | 1,338,543  |
| BC Assessment | 377,873     | 384,013     | 365,145    |
| Municipal Finance Authority of BC | 1,181       | 1,660       | 1,283      |
| Downtown Business Association | 77,852      | 85,934      | 83,838     |
| **Total collections for other taxing authorities** | **17,351,771** | **18,447,347** | **17,631,210** |
| Payments to other taxing authorities | (17,351,771) | (18,447,347) | (17,631,210) |
| **Net taxation for municipal purposes** | **$ 31,736,006** | **$ 31,808,561** | **$ 30,259,605** |

14. Government Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>$ 1,192,253</td>
<td>$ 1,734,520</td>
<td>$ 1,501,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,589,117</td>
<td>1,739,721</td>
<td>1,769,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total government transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,781,370</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,474,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,271,272</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. Budget Reconciliation

The District prepares its five year Financial Plan Bylaw, i.e. budget, in accordance with both Section 165 of the Community Charter, and Canadian public sector accounting standards. As a result, typically no reconciliation of the two is required.

The Community Charter requires that property value taxes and parcel taxes be reported separately in the Financial Plan Bylaw, while those amounts are combined and reported as taxation revenue in the financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General municipal property taxes</td>
<td>$31,569,325</td>
<td>$31,643,819</td>
<td>$30,087,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessments and area charges</td>
<td>166,681</td>
<td>164,742</td>
<td>172,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxation revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,736,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,808,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,259,605</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Letters of Credit and Performance Bonds

In addition to the deposits reflected in the financial statements, the District is holding irrevocable letters of credit and performance bonds in the amount of approximately $7.4 million as at December 31, 2017 ($4.9 million as at December 31, 2016), which were received from various parties to ensure completion of various works within the District. These amounts are not reflected in the financial statements but are available to satisfy any liability arising from non-performance by the parties.

17. Segment Reporting

The District provides a wide range of municipal services. These services have been grouped into related departmental functions or service areas for segment reporting purposes in Schedule 2, which shows the associated revenues and expenses for each segment. The various segments and associated departmental functions or service areas are as follows:

Administration and Finance

- General Administration: general government administration including Council support, managing legal issues, conducting elections, records management, and oversight of other departmental areas.

- Finance and Purchasing: financial oversight and management including reporting, financial planning, accounting, payroll, investments, property tax collections, procurement of goods and services and operation of central stores.

- Human Resources: recruitment and selection, employee and labour relations, compensation and benefits, workplace health and safety, organizational learning, corporate training and development.

- Information Technology: planning, maintaining and operating the District’s information systems technology and infrastructure.

- Grants to Organizations: provides grants to Mission non-profit organizations including arts and culture, recreation and social services, and community events.
17. Segment Reporting (continued)

Cemetery

• Administration and operation of the District’s cemetery and crematorium, including arranging for burials and memorials.

Development Services

• Planning: land use planning and administration of the District’s Official Community Plan (OCP) and zoning bylaws.

• Economic Development: generating and coordinating economic development, tourism and film activity in the community.

Engineering and Public Works

• Engineering: oversees and plans the District’s extensive infrastructure network of roads, bridges, drainage systems, etc., and provides for maintenance of municipal facilities.

• Public Works: maintains and builds infrastructure including roads, pedestrian walkways, and provides for snow removal and efficient operation of the District’s gravel pit.

• Environmental Services: provides direction on environmental issues and leads the District’s commitment to community-wide stewardship of the natural environment.

• Equipment Fleet: operation and maintenance of the District’s fleet of municipal vehicles and equipment. Vehicle and equipment costs are charged back to the various user departments.

General Government and Fiscal Services

• Property taxation, investments, general fund debt servicing, municipal hall shared office services, insurance, and general cost recovery transactions.

Library

• The Library is a member of Fraser Valley Regional Library system, providing access to books, magazines, DVDs, CD music, materials in other languages, free downloadable e-books and e-audio books. The library provides information services including programs for all ages, meeting room and study space, wireless connection, online instant chat, and basic computer instruction.

Parks, Recreation and Culture Services

• Operation of the District’s recreational facilities including the leisure centre and various parks and trails, and for the development and implementation of arts and cultural programs/events.

• Social Development: developing and implementing an action oriented social development program aimed at realizing the District of Mission’s mission statement, which is, “...to build a safe and healthy community abundant in economic, cultural and recreation opportunities.”
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17. Segment Reporting (continued)

Protective Services

- Police Services: utilizes contracted RCMP members and municipal employees to provide proactive general and community policing services within the District. Regional integrated police units also provide services to the community related to homicide investigations, emergency response, traffic re-construction, dog unit assistance, and forensic identification.

- Fire and Emergency Services: fire response, investigation and prevention services, emergency response services (for motor vehicle accidents and medical incidents), and emergency planning.

- Bylaw and Inspection Services: administering and enforcing the District’s regulatory bylaws.

- Restorative Justice: supports people involved with and affected by crime, conflict and other forms of wrong-doing in repairing the harms done, rebuilding relationships, restoring trust and transforming community through a voluntary facilitated process involving victims, accused persons, other affected parties and community members.

- Victim Services: helps victims and their families cope with the effects of crime/trauma by providing emotional support and information on the status of the police investigation and/or the court case.

- Emergency Support Services: helps victims meet their basic survival needs during a disaster, and to re-establish themselves as quickly as possible after a disaster.

Transit Services

- Oversees the local bus system (in partnership with the City of Abbotsford), and contributing to the West Coast Express train service between Mission and Vancouver.

Drainage Utility

- Plans for and maintains the District’s drainage network, which is responsible for managing all aspects of stormwater, including snow and rainfall related runoff.

Sewer Utility

- Oversees the regional sewage treatment plant and related source control activities (in partnership with the City of Abbotsford), and plans for and maintains the District’s localized sewage conveyance system.

Waste Management Utility

- Oversees contracted curbside collection of refuse, compost and recyclables, and is responsible for overseeing contracted operations at the District’s landfill site.

Water Utility

- Oversees the regional water supply and treatment systems (in partnership with the City of Abbotsford), and plans for and maintains the District’s localized water distribution system.
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17. Segment Reporting (continued)

Forest Enterprise

• Administers and operates the Mission Tree Farm, which includes harvesting of timber, tree planting, forestry road construction/maintenance, trail building, log marketing, and other forestry related activities.

18. Comparative Figures

Certain comparative figures for 2016 have been reclassified to conform to the 2017 financial statement presentation.

19. Funds Held in Trust

The District administers the following trusts on behalf of third parties. As related trust assets are not owned by the District, the trusts have been excluded from the financial statements. The following table provides a summary of the transactions within these trusts during the year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31, 2016</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Investment Income</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
<th>December 31, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery perpetual care trust fund</td>
<td>$ 865,790</td>
<td>$ 33,339</td>
<td>$ 17,705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 916,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery pre-need sales trust fund</td>
<td>13,025</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 878,815</td>
<td>$ 33,339</td>
<td>$ 17,953</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 930,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Schedule 1 - Tangible Capital Assets

Included in additions are capital assets such as land and infrastructure, which were contributed to the District from developers through property development activities, totalling $7,523,397 in 2017 ($8,462,350 in 2016). The amount of interest capitalized was -$ in 2017 (-$ in 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost, December 31, 2016</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Cost of Disposals</th>
<th>Cost, December 31, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets under construction</td>
<td>$2,749,661</td>
<td>(395,058)</td>
<td>(13,812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and improvements</td>
<td>47,039,505</td>
<td>29,967</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>102,237,871</td>
<td>1,842,476</td>
<td>(20,605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology infrastructure</td>
<td>2,472,392</td>
<td>447,835</td>
<td>(224,608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>102,311,430</td>
<td>1,428,379</td>
<td>(476,498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>2,241,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill infrastructure</td>
<td>7,496,511</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks infrastructure</td>
<td>7,417,268</td>
<td>93,392</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling depot (regional)</td>
<td>526,150</td>
<td>12,443</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage conveyance infrastructure (local)</td>
<td>50,043,168</td>
<td>2,281,450</td>
<td>(4,136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment plant (regional)</td>
<td>20,842,346</td>
<td>341,004</td>
<td>(92,974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>162,217,331</td>
<td>5,460,147</td>
<td>(282,464)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>11,790,509</td>
<td>2,100,675</td>
<td>(887,846)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water distribution infrastructure (local)</td>
<td>47,618,479</td>
<td>2,262,086</td>
<td>(51,295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply infrastructure (regional)</td>
<td>25,288,202</td>
<td>1,042,418</td>
<td>(37,885)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 592,292,723 $ 16,947,214 $ (2,092,123) $ 607,147,814
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$143,025,775</td>
<td>(143,025,775)</td>
<td>$143,025,775</td>
<td>$143,025,775</td>
<td>$143,025,775</td>
<td>$143,025,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,857,615</td>
<td>(8,857,615)</td>
<td>$8,857,615</td>
<td>$8,857,615</td>
<td>$8,857,615</td>
<td>$8,857,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,379,115</td>
<td>(1,379,115)</td>
<td>$1,379,115</td>
<td>$1,379,115</td>
<td>$1,379,115</td>
<td>$1,379,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,504,275</td>
<td>(150,504,275)</td>
<td>$150,504,275</td>
<td>$150,504,275</td>
<td>$150,504,275</td>
<td>$150,504,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $143,025,775                               | (143,025,775)         | $143,025,775                         | $143,025,775                               | $143,025,775                    | $143,025,775                    |
| $8,857,615                                 | (8,857,615)           | $8,857,615                           | $8,857,615                                 | $8,857,615                      | $8,857,615                      |
| $1,379,115                                 | (1,379,115)           | $1,379,115                           | $1,379,115                                 | $1,379,115                      | $1,379,115                      |
| $150,504,275                               | (150,504,275)         | $150,504,275                         | $150,504,275                               | $150,504,275                    | $150,504,275                    |

| $ (143,025,775)                           | $ (8,857,615)         | $1,379,115                           | $ (150,504,275)                           | $456,643,539                    | $449,266,948                    |

| $ (143,025,775)                           | $ (8,857,615)         | $1,379,115                           | $ (150,504,275)                           | $456,643,539                    | $449,266,948                    |

| $ (143,025,775)                           | $ (8,857,615)         | $1,379,115                           | $ (150,504,275)                           | $456,643,539                    | $449,266,948                    |
District of Mission

For the year ended December 31, 2017

Schedule 2 - Statement of Operations by Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Protective services</th>
<th>Engineering and public works</th>
<th>Parks, recreation and culture services</th>
<th>Administration and finance</th>
<th>Transit services</th>
<th>General government and fiscal services</th>
<th>Development services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 30,015,462</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of services and regulatory fees</td>
<td>1,254,139</td>
<td>824,676</td>
<td>2,581,507</td>
<td>215,011</td>
<td>728,443</td>
<td>2,795,777</td>
<td>374,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers</td>
<td>512,852</td>
<td>120,280</td>
<td>137,736</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,366,311</td>
<td>88,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,305</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>935,311</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>121,536</td>
<td>29,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>433,622</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,303,560</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(13,786)</td>
<td>(2,815)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>898,391</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,767,841</td>
<td>5,274,059</td>
<td>2,837,964</td>
<td>244,457</td>
<td>728,443</td>
<td>37,475,179</td>
<td>463,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>214,489</td>
<td>3,138,621</td>
<td>1,297,564</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>414,422</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good and services</td>
<td>10,613,816</td>
<td>900,097</td>
<td>2,302,580</td>
<td>659,798</td>
<td>2,710,503</td>
<td>1,097,472</td>
<td>272,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,901</td>
<td>413,238</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271,030</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>4,957,967</td>
<td>3,205,166</td>
<td>4,338,102</td>
<td>4,090,106</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>356,854</td>
<td>2,134,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>15,786,272</td>
<td>7,243,884</td>
<td>7,958,147</td>
<td>5,163,142</td>
<td>2,713,237</td>
<td>2,139,778</td>
<td>2,414,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>$(14,018,431)</td>
<td>$(1,969,825)</td>
<td>$(5,120,183)</td>
<td>$(4,918,685)</td>
<td>$(1,984,794)</td>
<td>35,335,401</td>
<td>$(1,951,426)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## District of Mission

For the year ended December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Drainage utility</th>
<th>Sewer utility</th>
<th>Waste management utility</th>
<th>Water utility</th>
<th>Forest enterprise</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,748,010</td>
<td>$ 45,089</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 31,088,561</td>
<td>31,001,626</td>
<td>30,546,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>276,577</td>
<td>92,083</td>
<td>4,847,011</td>
<td>5,651,837</td>
<td>6,814,787</td>
<td>4,542,271</td>
<td>3,474,241</td>
<td>3,271,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248,092</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,558</td>
<td>49,875</td>
<td>31,080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,474,241</td>
<td>3,271,272</td>
<td>383,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,107</td>
<td>316,388</td>
<td>47,237</td>
<td>327,896</td>
<td>61,079</td>
<td>1,697,018</td>
<td>1,498,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,358,437</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(55,617)</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>8,124</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>1,916,348</td>
<td>1,702,595</td>
<td>8,462,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,319,266</td>
<td>1,056,943</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>843,628</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,523,397</td>
<td>8,462,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,360)</td>
<td>(7,598)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,361,772</td>
<td>276,577</td>
<td>3,197,024</td>
<td>6,500,421</td>
<td>5,705,394</td>
<td>8,017,917</td>
<td>4,612,980</td>
<td>78,463,170</td>
<td>76,124,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>1,075,733</td>
<td>1,134,597</td>
<td>240,231</td>
<td>1,307,784</td>
<td>30,828</td>
<td>8,857,615</td>
<td>8,438,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,436,342</td>
<td>66,746</td>
<td>489,866</td>
<td>1,426,714</td>
<td>4,391,771</td>
<td>1,572,972</td>
<td>2,793,468</td>
<td>30,734,599</td>
<td>31,031,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>445,953</td>
<td>393,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271,030</td>
<td>403,804</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,140</td>
<td>183,595</td>
<td>428,039</td>
<td>522,862</td>
<td>455,838</td>
<td>766,451</td>
<td>717,898</td>
<td>22,176,965</td>
<td>21,008,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,453,482</td>
<td>253,687</td>
<td>1,993,638</td>
<td>3,084,173</td>
<td>5,087,840</td>
<td>3,647,207</td>
<td>3,547,107</td>
<td>62,486,162</td>
<td>61,379,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ (91,710)</td>
<td>$ 22,890</td>
<td>$ 1,203,386</td>
<td>$ 3,416,248</td>
<td>$ 617,554</td>
<td>$ 4,370,710</td>
<td>$ 1,065,873</td>
<td>$ 15,977,008</td>
<td>$ 14,745,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## District of Mission

For the year ended December 31, 2017

Schedule 3 - Long-Term Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Issue #</th>
<th>Year Issued</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year of Maturity</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Firehall/EOC building</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Leisure centre/sports park/water park</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Leisure centre/sports park/water park</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Long-Term Debt
## Future Payments (Principal & Interest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Outstanding December 31, 2017</th>
<th>Principal Outstanding December 31, 2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$129,916</td>
<td>$253,646</td>
<td>$90,937</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,446,760</td>
<td>3,759,928</td>
<td>321,815</td>
<td>321,815</td>
<td>321,815</td>
<td>321,815</td>
<td>321,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,056,537</td>
<td>$5,651,396</td>
<td>$577,037</td>
<td>$486,100</td>
<td>$486,100</td>
<td>$486,100</td>
<td>$486,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## District of Mission

**For the year ended December 31, 2017**

### Schedule 4 - Internal Debt/Transfers Outstanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrowing Fund</th>
<th>Lending Fund</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year Funds</th>
<th>Funds Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCC</td>
<td>Major Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Gaudin Creek re-alignment, property purchase</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Sewer DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Cedar Valley gravity trunk sewer, forcemain, and pump station</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Sewer Extension DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Cedar Valley local improvement area sewer extension</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewage Treatment DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Headworks upgrade, transformer installation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Bridge DCC</td>
<td>Parkland Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Silverdale industrial subdivision bridge</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Industrial Water DCC</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Silverdale industrial subdivision water infrastructure</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Industrial Sewer DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Silverdale industrial subdivision sewer infrastructure</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

*Note: DCC = Development Cost Charge*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 261,608</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ (30,305)</td>
<td>$ 231,303</td>
<td>$ 4,945</td>
<td>$ (4,945)</td>
<td>$ 231,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,346,430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ (1,711)</td>
<td>$ 1,344,719</td>
<td>$ 26,996</td>
<td>$ (26,996)</td>
<td>$ 1,344,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 295,488</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 295,488</td>
<td>$ 5,928</td>
<td>$ (5,928)</td>
<td>$ 295,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 17,050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 17,050</td>
<td>$ 342</td>
<td>$ (342)</td>
<td>$ 17,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 743,507</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ (23,247)</td>
<td>$ 720,260</td>
<td>$ 14,684</td>
<td>$ (14,684)</td>
<td>$ 720,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 331,048</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 331,048</td>
<td>$ 6,642</td>
<td>$ (6,642)</td>
<td>$ 331,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 138,079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 138,079</td>
<td>$ 2,770</td>
<td>$ (2,770)</td>
<td>$ 138,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## District of Mission

### Annual Surplus Reconciliation

For the year ended December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash-basis annual surplus, general operating fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,705,445</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-cash items included in accrual-basis surplus:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td><strong>(8,857,615)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of disposed tangible capital assets</td>
<td><strong>(713,008)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td><strong>175,147</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td><strong>7,523,397</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-cash items</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,872,079)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash items excluded from accrual-basis surplus:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to reserves</td>
<td><strong>17,384,267</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from reserves for operating purposes</td>
<td><strong>(1,495,336)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt principal payments &amp; actuarial adjustments</td>
<td><strong>594,859</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash items</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,483,790</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital revenues and expenses included in accrual-basis surplus:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small capital expenses</td>
<td><strong>(1,127,649)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants</td>
<td><strong>304,412</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital recoveries</td>
<td><strong>483,089</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital revenues and expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>(340,148)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrual-basis annual surplus, as per financial statements</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 15,977,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
SUBJECT: 2018 Annual Tax Rates Bylaw
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix “A” – Estimated Increase in Property Tax and Utility Charges on Average Home
Appendix “B” – 2018 Tax Rates (Dollars of Tax per $1,000 Taxable Value)
Appendix “C” – Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5727-2018

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
That Council has hereby considered its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies regarding the distribution of property taxes among the tax classes, as set out within its 2018-2022 Financial Plan Bylaw [Bylaw 5687-2017].

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to allow Council the opportunity to consider its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies, and for consideration of first three readings to the District’s Annual Tax Rates Bylaw. This bylaw is listed under the Bylaws for Consideration section of this agenda.

BACKGROUND:
Pursuant to Sections 165 and 197 of the Community Charter, Council must pass a financial plan bylaw and a tax rates bylaw before May 15th of each year. Council adopted the 2018-2022 Financial Plan Bylaw 5687-2017 on December 20, 2017 that included a 3.63% increase in the property tax levy, for municipal and policing services, a 1% increase to water user rates, 4% increase to sewer user rates and a 4.6% increase in the drainage utility levy. Bylaws for the water and sewer utility user rates have previously been adopted and are not part of this report. The municipal tax rates and drainage utility rates have now been established in a proposed bylaw which is listed on the agenda under the Bylaws for Consideration section for consideration of first three readings.

Per the Community Charter, tax rates need to be established for municipal revenue and for amounts collected for the year by means of rates established by the municipality to meet its taxing obligations in relation to another local government or other public body. In other words, the tax rates bylaw needs to include the District’s municipal tax rates (for general, policing, drainage, library, diking, and business improvement area purposes) as well as the Fraser Valley Regional District and Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District tax rates, which are set by the District based on the Regional District’s approved budgets. See Schedule A of Appendix “C” for these rates set out in the proposed bylaw.
The tax rates set by other taxing authorities, namely School taxes, BC Assessment Authority and Municipal Finance Authority are not included in our tax rates bylaw as these rates are set directly by those authorities. These authorities have provided their tax rates for Mission and those rates, along with the proposed rates for the District’s Bylaw are included in Appendix “B” for communication purposes only.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The various municipal tax rates included in proposed Bylaw 5727-2018, which is now being brought forward for consideration of first three readings, are consistent with Council’s financial plan and the overall 3.63% property tax levy increase and the 4.6% increase to the drainage utility levy approved by Council. It should be noted that the average assessed value of a residential home in Mission increased by approximately 19.56% between 2017 and 2018 due to market conditions. The municipal tax rates included in this bylaw have reflected this increase in assessed value by first reducing the 2017 tax rates to generate the same amount of property taxes in 2018, before calculating the 2018 approved increase of 3.63%. In other words, the District automatically adjusts its tax rates downward to ensure that the increase in assessed value as a result of market changes does not result in additional property tax revenue. There is a common misconception that market increases in assessed values on their own generate additional property tax revenue, but that is in fact not true.

The impact on an average residential home in Mission valued at $670,097 (last year’s average assessed home adjusted by the market increase) and using the tax rates in this bylaw will see an estimated increase to the property taxes collected from all sources of $179.74. The following chart shows the breakdown between municipal, drainage and other taxing authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL CLASS PROPERTY</th>
<th>Estimated 2018 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2017 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal, Drainage &amp; Library Property Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>1256.80</td>
<td>1205.92</td>
<td>50.88</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>708.40</td>
<td>690.36</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Municipal Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,965.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,896.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.63%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Utility Levy</td>
<td>106.82</td>
<td>102.11</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional Library</td>
<td>87.43</td>
<td>85.61</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal, Drainage &amp; Library Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,159.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,084.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.62%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes Collected on Behalf of Other Taxing Authorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial School Taxes</td>
<td>983.03</td>
<td>885.87</td>
<td>97.16</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional District</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District</td>
<td>98.16</td>
<td>94.32</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Assessment Authority</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Finance Authority</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Taxing Authorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,157.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,053.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Property Taxes from all Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,317.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,137.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>179.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Before home owner grant*
This estimated tax increase of $179.74, plus the 1% increase to the water utility user charge and the 4% increase to the sewer utility user charges will have a combined impact of $200.50 over 2017, or approximately 4.6%, (see Appendix “A”) for residential properties with all utilities.

It should be noted that 48.5% of the $200.50 increase is due to the School Tax increase at $97.16, while the municipal tax increase of $68.92 represents only 34.4% of the total increase.

Local governments must formally consider their proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with the objectives and policies as set out under Section 165(3.1)(b) [distribution of property taxes among property classes] of the Community Charter (included as Schedule A in the 2018-2022 Financial Plan Bylaw 5687–2017), before adopting their annual property tax rates bylaw. The District’s property tax distribution for 2018, which is similar to prior years, is in-line with the property tax distribution chart included as part of the financial plan bylaw.

The percentage of property tax proposed to be collected from each class in 2018 is shown in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 PROPERTY TAX DISTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational / Non-Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To show that the municipal tax rates for 2018 have been considered in conjunction with Council’s tax class property tax distribution policies and objectives, Council needs to pass a formal motion stating this.

**Downtown Business Improvement Levy**

Included in the tax rate bylaw is a Business Improvement Area (BIA) levy on classes 5 (light industry) and class 6 (business/other) properties within the Downtown Business Improvement Area. As specified under the District of Mission Business Improvement Area Establishment Bylaw 5405-2014, this levy is for the purpose of funding a Business Promotion Scheme to carry out certain works and services and to market and promote business within the BIA.
The downtown BIA contains 118 properties located from approximately Murray Street to Birch Street and from Railway Avenue to 2nd Avenue. This area was slightly enlarged in 2014 to coincide with the Mission City Downtown Action Plan area.

Bylaw 5405-2014 empowers Council to collect monies from these properties for the years 2014 to 2018 based on the assessed value of land and improvements for general municipal purposes. This bylaw was passed by Council on March 17, 2014 as requested by the Downtown Business Association.

The money collected under Section 4 of this Bylaw is for funding the Business Promotion Scheme and is to be used for the following activities and expenditures:

(a) encouraging business;
(b) street beautification;
(c) insurance, licenses, accounting fees and dues;
(d) office expenses, rent, and administrative support;
(e) downtown revitalization, maintenance and beautification; and
(f) business training and conferences.

For 2018, the BIA levy will generate $88,082, which will be passed on to the Mission Downtown Business Association on August 1, 2018 for the Business Promotion Scheme.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The revised roll from BC Assessment as at March 31, 2018 showed that the non-market construction (NMC) value, or inventory of new lots or new buildings within the District, would generate approximately $121,000 more in property taxes than estimated in the 2018 financial plan for the general operating fund, and approximately $22,800 in additional drainage revenue for the drainage fund.

The increase in property tax revenue could be transferred to an operating or capital reserve for 2018; however, in light of this winter’s snow events and other budget issues, staff recommends this additional revenue remain in the general operating fund to reduce budget pressures that may occur. The increase in drainage revenue will also be left in the drainage fund and any surplus will be transferred to the Drainage Capital Reserve Fund at year end.

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

COMMUNICATION:

The public will be notified of the 2018 tax rates when the 2018 tax notices are received by Mission property owners.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Pursuant to Sections 165 and 197 of the Community Charter, Council must pass a tax rates bylaw before May 15th of each year. Council must also consider its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies regarding the distribution of property taxes among the tax classes, as set out within its 2018-2022 Financial Plan Bylaw [Bylaw 5687-2017].
The municipal tax rates and drainage utility rates have now been established in proposed Bylaw 5727-2018, and this bylaw is listed on the agenda under the Bylaws for Consideration section for consideration of first three readings. Bylaws for the water and sewer utility user rates have previously been adopted and are not part of this report.

It should be noted that the average assessed value of a residential home in Mission increased by approximately 19.56% due to market conditions. The municipal tax rates included in this bylaw have reflected this increase by first reducing the 2017 tax rates to generate the same amount of property taxes in 2018, before calculating the 2018 approved increase of 3.63%.

It should be noted that School Tax rate increase accounts for approximately 48.5% of the total increase on the average property tax notice, while the municipal property tax portion accounts for only 34.4% of the increase. See Appendix “A” for details between municipal increase and increase from other taxing authorities.

The revised roll from BC Assessment as at March 31, 2018 showed that the non-market construction (NMC) value, or inventory of new lots or new buildings within the District, would generate additional property tax revenue than estimated in the 2018 financial plan for the general operating fund and additional drainage levy in the drainage fund.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
Appendix "A"

Estimated Increase in Property Tax and Utility Charges on Average Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL CLASS PROPERTY</th>
<th>Estimated 2018 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2017 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal, Drainage &amp; Library Property Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>1256.80</td>
<td>1205.92</td>
<td>50.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>708.40</td>
<td>690.36</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Municipal Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,965.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,896.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Utility Levy</td>
<td>106.82</td>
<td>102.11</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional Library</td>
<td>87.43</td>
<td>85.61</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal, Drainage &amp; Library Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,159.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,084.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.62%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxes Collected on Behalf of Other Taxing Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Taxing Authorities</th>
<th>Estimated 2018 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2017 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial School Taxes</td>
<td>983.03</td>
<td>885.87</td>
<td>97.16</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional District</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District</td>
<td>98.16</td>
<td>94.32</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Assessment Authority</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Finance Authority</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Taxing Authorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,157.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,053.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated Property Taxes from all Sources | 3,317.20 | 3,137.46 | 179.74 | 5.7% | |

Municipal Utility Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Utilities</th>
<th>Estimated 2018 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2017 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water User Fees</td>
<td>498.72</td>
<td>493.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer User Fees</td>
<td>414.00</td>
<td>398.16</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse User Fees</td>
<td>165.24</td>
<td>165.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling &amp; Composting User Fees</td>
<td>130.08</td>
<td>130.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Utilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,208.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>1187.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Property Taxes & Utility Charges | $4,525.24 | $4,324.74 | $200.50 | 4.6% | |

For Residential Properties With Only Rural Recycling Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Taxes From all Sources (see above for details)</th>
<th>Estimated 2018 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2017 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal, Drainage &amp; Library Property Taxes</td>
<td>2,159.45</td>
<td>2,084.00</td>
<td>75.45</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxing Authorities</td>
<td>1,157.75</td>
<td>1,053.46</td>
<td>104.29</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Property Taxes from all Sources</strong></td>
<td>3,317.20</td>
<td>3,137.46</td>
<td>179.74</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Utility Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Utilities</th>
<th>Estimated 2018 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2017 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Recycling &amp; Composting User Fees</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Utilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.64</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Property Taxes & Utility Charges | $3,334.84 | $3,155.10 | $179.74 | 5.7% | |

Before home owner grant
APPENDIX "B"
2018 Tax Rates (Dollars of Tax per $1000 Taxable Value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>General &amp; Debt</th>
<th>Police Services</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>E = A to D</th>
<th>Subtotal Municipal Purposes</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mission Diking District</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Silverdale Diking District</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Business Improvement Area (BIA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>1.87555</td>
<td>1.05716</td>
<td>0.15941</td>
<td>0.13047</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>3.22259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Utility</td>
<td>23.28429</td>
<td>13.12358</td>
<td>1.97892</td>
<td>1.61965</td>
<td>0.59987</td>
<td>40.00644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Supportive Housing</td>
<td>1.87555</td>
<td>1.05716</td>
<td>0.15941</td>
<td>0.13047</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>3.22259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Major Industry</td>
<td>6.35713</td>
<td>3.58377</td>
<td>0.54040</td>
<td>0.44229</td>
<td>0.58273</td>
<td>10.92359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Light Industry</td>
<td>6.35713</td>
<td>3.58377</td>
<td>0.54040</td>
<td>0.44229</td>
<td>0.58273</td>
<td>10.92359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Business/Other</td>
<td>7.50902</td>
<td>4.23287</td>
<td>0.63828</td>
<td>0.52240</td>
<td>0.41991</td>
<td>12.90257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Managed Forest</td>
<td>6.62911</td>
<td>3.73706</td>
<td>0.56351</td>
<td>0.46121</td>
<td>0.51417</td>
<td>11.39089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recreational/Non-profit</td>
<td>5.56411</td>
<td>3.13659</td>
<td>0.47297</td>
<td>0.38710</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>9.56077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Farm</td>
<td>12.67937</td>
<td>7.14640</td>
<td>1.07761</td>
<td>0.88198</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>21.78536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Provincial School</th>
<th>Fraser Valley Regional District</th>
<th>Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District</th>
<th>BC Assessment Authority</th>
<th>Municipal Finance Authority</th>
<th>K = F to J</th>
<th>L = E + K</th>
<th>Subtotal Other Authorities (Not Including Special Area Municipal Levies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>1.46700</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.04030</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>1.72774</td>
<td>4.95033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Utility</td>
<td>13.40000</td>
<td>0.91566</td>
<td>0.51268</td>
<td>0.50370</td>
<td>0.00070</td>
<td>15.33274</td>
<td>55.33918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Supportive Housing</td>
<td>0.10000</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.32044</td>
<td>3.54303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Major Industry</td>
<td>4.20000</td>
<td>0.25005</td>
<td>0.49803</td>
<td>0.50370</td>
<td>0.00070</td>
<td>5.45248</td>
<td>16.37607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Light Industry</td>
<td>4.20000</td>
<td>0.25005</td>
<td>0.49803</td>
<td>0.12410</td>
<td>0.00070</td>
<td>5.07288</td>
<td>15.99647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Business/Other</td>
<td>4.20000</td>
<td>0.29534</td>
<td>0.35888</td>
<td>0.12410</td>
<td>0.00050</td>
<td>4.97882</td>
<td>17.88139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Managed Forest</td>
<td>1.90000</td>
<td>0.26074</td>
<td>0.43944</td>
<td>0.25600</td>
<td>0.00060</td>
<td>2.85678</td>
<td>14.24767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recreational/Non-profit</td>
<td>2.50000</td>
<td>0.21885</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.04030</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>2.90583</td>
<td>12.46660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Farm</td>
<td>7.00000</td>
<td>0.49862</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.04030</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>7.68560</td>
<td>29.47096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 197 of the Community Charter, the Council shall, before the 15th day of May in each year, establish tax rates for municipal revenue and for amounts collected for the year by means of rates established by the municipality to meet its taxing obligations in relation to another local government or other public body, based on the assessed value of taxable land and improvements;

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 Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5727-2018".

2. The following rates are hereby imposed and levied for the year 2018:

(a) for general municipal purposes, including debt, of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “A” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

(b) for policing purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “B” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

(c) for drainage purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “C” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

(d) for library purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “D” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

(e) for purposes of the Fraser Valley Regional District, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “F” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

(f) for purposes of the Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for regional hospital district purposes, those rates appearing in column “G” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

(g) for purposes of the Mission Diking District, on the assessed value of land and improvements within the said Diking District and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “J” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
(h) for purposes of the Silverdale Diking District, on the assessed value of land and improvements within the said Diking District and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “K” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw; and

(i) for purposes of the Downtown Mission Business Improvement Area (BIA), on the assessed value of land and improvements for Class 5 and 6 only within the said BIA area and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “L” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this >

READ A SECOND TIME this >

READ A THIRD TIME this >

ADOPTED this >

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR   MICHAEL YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "District of Mission Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5727-2018".

CORPORATE OFFICER

______________________________
## DISTRICT OF MISSION
### Schedule "A" of Bylaw 5727 - 2018
#### 2018 Tax Rates (Dollars of Tax per $1000 Taxable Value)

### Tax Rates for Municipal Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>General &amp; Debt</th>
<th>Policing</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>E = A to D Subtotal Municipal Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>1.87555</td>
<td>1.05716</td>
<td>0.15941</td>
<td>0.13047</td>
<td>3.22259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Utility</td>
<td>23.28429</td>
<td>13.12358</td>
<td>1.97892</td>
<td>1.61965</td>
<td>40.00644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Supportive Housing</td>
<td>1.87555</td>
<td>1.05716</td>
<td>0.15941</td>
<td>0.13047</td>
<td>3.22259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Major Industry</td>
<td>6.35713</td>
<td>3.58377</td>
<td>0.54040</td>
<td>0.44229</td>
<td>10.92359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Light Industry</td>
<td>6.35713</td>
<td>3.58377</td>
<td>0.54040</td>
<td>0.44229</td>
<td>10.92359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Business/Other</td>
<td>7.50902</td>
<td>4.23287</td>
<td>0.63828</td>
<td>0.52240</td>
<td>12.90257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Managed Forest</td>
<td>6.62911</td>
<td>3.73706</td>
<td>0.56351</td>
<td>0.46121</td>
<td>11.39089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recreational/Nonprofit</td>
<td>5.56411</td>
<td>3.13659</td>
<td>0.47297</td>
<td>0.38710</td>
<td>9.56077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Farm</td>
<td>12.67937</td>
<td>7.14640</td>
<td>1.07761</td>
<td>0.88198</td>
<td>21.78536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Taxes Rates on Behalf of Other Taxing Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Fraser Valley Regional District</th>
<th>Fraser Valley Regional Hospital</th>
<th>H = F + G Subtotal Other Authorities</th>
<th>I = E + H Total Municipal &amp; Other Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.22024</td>
<td>3.44283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Utility</td>
<td>0.91566</td>
<td>0.51268</td>
<td>1.42834</td>
<td>41.43478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Supportive Housing</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.22024</td>
<td>3.44283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Major Industry</td>
<td>0.25005</td>
<td>0.49803</td>
<td>0.74808</td>
<td>11.67167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Light Industry</td>
<td>0.25005</td>
<td>0.49803</td>
<td>0.74808</td>
<td>11.67167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Business/Other</td>
<td>0.29534</td>
<td>0.35888</td>
<td>0.65422</td>
<td>13.55679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Managed Forest</td>
<td>0.26074</td>
<td>0.43944</td>
<td>0.70018</td>
<td>12.09107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recreational/Nonprofit</td>
<td>0.21885</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.36533</td>
<td>9.92610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Farm</td>
<td>0.49862</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.64510</td>
<td>22.43046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Area Municipal Levies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Mission Diking District</th>
<th>Silverdale Diking District</th>
<th>L Business Improvement Area (BIA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Residential</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Utility</td>
<td>0.59987</td>
<td>0.41808</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Supportive Housing</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Major Industry</td>
<td>0.58273</td>
<td>0.40613</td>
<td>1.52849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Light Industry</td>
<td>0.58273</td>
<td>0.40613</td>
<td>1.52849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Business/Other</td>
<td>0.41991</td>
<td>0.29265</td>
<td>1.52849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Managed Forest</td>
<td>0.51417</td>
<td>0.35835</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recreational/Nonprofit</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Farm</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
SUBJECT: Proposed Framework for Regulation of Cannabis in Mission
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A – Cannabis Regulation Discussion Paper
Appendix B – Public Information Sheet

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the Cannabis Regulation Discussion Paper and Public Information Sheet, attached to the Deputy CAO’s report dated May 7, 2018, be shared with the public and stakeholders on the District’s website;
2. That comments received from the public and stakeholders be brought to a future Council meeting; and
3. That staff be authorized to update the Discussion Paper in (1) to reflect new information that is released by the provincial and federal government as their legislation is finalized over the coming months.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present a Cannabis Regulation Discussion Paper (Paper) that proposes a framework for regulating medicinal and recreational cannabis in Mission.

BACKGROUND:
The federal government has introduced legislation to legalize the recreational use of cannabis. The proposed Cannabis Act will regulate and restrict the production, distribution, sale and use of recreational cannabis and is expected to pass into law in July 2018. The federal legislation will create significant responsibilities for all levels of government. British Columbia has started developing regulations and has provided some guidance on the retail model that will be used but the legislation has not yet been released to the public.

With significant changes coming to the cannabis landscape, now is a good time for local governments to release their proposed framework for regulating cannabis in their communities. Staff have written the Discussion Paper (Paper) (Appendix A) that sets out the District of Mission’s proposed framework for regulating both medicinal and recreational cannabis in Mission going forward. It is acknowledged that this framework is a work in progress as confirmation of what degree of regulation is within a local government’s purview will not be known definitively until the Cannabis Act and provincial regulations become law.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Sections 1 and 2 of the Paper include an introduction and background section, respectively, that discuss the purpose of the Paper and the existing and past regulatory regime for medical cannabis, the proposed Cannabis Act (Act) that sets out the new regulatory regime for recreational cannabis, the proposed provincial regulations including the existing regime for Licensed Commercial Producers operating in the Agriculture Land Reserve (ALR) and the current regulatory regime in Mission.

Section 3 of the Paper discusses the proposed regulatory framework for Mission going forward. This includes a discussion of managing existing personal and designated grow medicinal licences, where those licences are permitted in Mission under the Zoning Bylaw, how Licensed Commercial Producers will operate in the future on lands within the ALR, the proposed model for retail cannabis sales in Mission and other amendments to the Smoking Regulation, Building and Business Licensing bylaws.

With respect to the District’s Smoking Regulation Bylaw, staff researched the idea of banning smoking entirely from public property including sidewalks in Mission. The evolution of controlling smoking has been a step-wise one that has been driven by public health protection. It is not possible to ban smoking from sidewalks, except for those bans already in place near doorways and bus shelters because people do have options to avoid the smoke while on a sidewalk and public health is not at risk to the same degree where restrictions have been established. In addition, enforcement would not be feasible.

Staff also looked at prohibiting people in public from being under the influence of cannabis similar to what is in place for public intoxication from alcohol. The intoxication prohibition is regulated under the province’s Liquor Control and Licensing Act and is beyond the jurisdiction of a local government. Regulation of being under the influence of cannabis may be included in the provincial regulations which will be released shortly.

Section 4 lists the next steps which include releasing the Paper for public information and review and for staff to start working on bylaw amendments to implement the proposed regulatory regime outlined in the Paper.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

COMMUNICATION:

Staff recommends that the Paper be released to the public and shared with those making enquiries to staff about how Mission will regulate cannabis going forward. Any comments received will be brought back to Council in conjunction with related amendments to the relevant bylaws. Given the Paper is aimed at those wanting to grow or sell cannabis in Mission, staff have also developed a shortened version of the paper (Appendix B) that is targeted at the general public and will also issue a press release.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Staff has drafted a Discussion Paper that proposes a framework for regulating medical and recreational cannabis. The Paper sets out the background explaining the past and present federal, provincial and local laws. A set of proposed new approaches for moving forward are also presented. Council approval of using the Paper to communicate with the public and other stakeholders is requested. Provided Council is in support of the proposed approaches, staff will prepare the necessary bylaw amendments. Comments received as part of the public communication will be brought to a subsequent meeting.
SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed by:
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
Appendix A

CANNABIS REGULATION

A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR THE DISTRICT OF MISSION

April 2018

1 Introduction

The federal government has introduced legislation to legalize the recreational use of cannabis. The proposed Cannabis Act will regulate and restrict the production, distribution, sale and use of cannabis and is expected to pass into law in July 2018. The federal legislation will create significant responsibilities for all levels of government. British Columbia has started developing regulations and has provided some guidance on the retail model that will be used in this province but the legislation has not yet been released to the public.

With significant changes coming to the cannabis landscape, now is a good time for local governments to release their proposed framework for regulating cannabis in their communities. This discussion paper sets out the District of Mission’s framework for regulating both medicinal and recreational cannabis going forward. It is acknowledged that this framework is a work in progress as confirmation of what degree of regulation is within a local government’s purview will not be known definitively until the Cannabis Act and provincial regulations become law nor will the District’s final framework be known until adopted by the Council in the coming months. As such, this document is provided for convenience only and should not be relied on to make property acquisition or any other business decisions. The District of Mission is not responsible for any direct or indirect damages that may occur as a result of relying on the information presented in this discussion paper.

2 Background

Cannabis regulatory requirements have long been in place in Canada. Legal access to dried cannabis for medical purposes was first provided in 1999 using unique section 56 exemptions under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA). Recognizing that individuals with a medical need had the right to possess cannabis for medical purposes led to the implementation of the Marihuana Medical Access Regulations (MMAR) in 2001.

2.1 Existing Regulatory Framework for Medical Cannabis

In response to additional court challenges, the federal government implemented the Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations (MMPR) in June 2013. The MMPR created conditions for a commercial industry responsible for the production and distribution of cannabis for medical purposes. Under the MMPR, individuals with a medical need could access quality-controlled dried cannabis produced under secure and sanitary conditions. Further court challenges resulted in cannabis oils and fresh cannabis being made available and permitted licence holders to possess and alter cannabis.

The Access to Cannabis for Medical Purposes Regulations (ACMPR) is Canada's response to the Federal Court of Canada's February 2016 decision in Allard v. Canada. This decision found that requiring individuals to get their cannabis only from Licensed Commercial Producers violated liberty and security rights protected by section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Court found that individuals who require cannabis for medical purposes did not have "reasonable access".

The ACMPR are designed to provide an immediate solution required to address the Court judgement. Moving forward, Health Canada will evaluate how a system of medical access to cannabis should
function alongside the federal government's commitment to legalize, strictly regulate and restrict access to cannabis.

The ACMPR contain four parts. Part 1 is similar to the framework under the MMPR. It sets out a framework for commercial production by Licensed Commercial Producers responsible for the production and distribution of quality-controlled fresh or dried cannabis or cannabis oil or starting materials (i.e., cannabis seeds and plants) in secure and sanitary conditions.

Part 2 is similar to the former MMAR regime. It sets out provisions for individuals to produce a limited amount of cannabis for their own medical purposes or to designate someone to produce it for them.

Parts 3 and 4 include:

- Transitional provisions, which mainly relate to the continuation of MMPR activities by Licensed Commercial Producers.
- Consequential amendments to other regulations that referenced the MMPR to update definitions and broaden the scope of products beyond dried cannabis.

Under the ACMPR, Health Canada will continue to accept and process applications to become a Licensed Commercial Producer that were submitted under the former MMPR. Further, all licences and security clearances granted under the MMPR will continue under the ACMPR, which means that Licensed Commercial Producers can continue to register and supply clients with cannabis for medical purposes. New applicants can continue to apply for licences to produce under the ACMPR.

2.2 Proposed Cannabis Act

Following Royal Assent, the federal government intends to bring the proposed Cannabis Act (Act) into force no later than July 2018. It will still take several months before the wholesale and retail networks are established. As of July 2018, non-medical cannabis will be legal in Canada and adults would be able to legally possess, grow and purchase limited amounts of cannabis. This would mean that possession of small amounts of cannabis would no longer be a criminal offence. The rationale for legalizing recreational cannabis is that if there is an open supply of recreational cannabis, there should not be a need for illegal grow operations.

The cannabis for medical purposes approach will continue to exist under the ACMPR to provide access to individuals who have the authorization of their healthcare practitioner to use cannabis for medical purposes.

As noted above, upon coming into force, adult Canadians would be able to purchase cannabis from a retailer that has been authorized by the province or territory to sell and distribute cannabis. Adults will also be able to purchase cannabis directly from a federally Licensed Commercial Producer or the provincial wholesaler by ordering online with secure delivery at home by mail.

As per the amendment adopted by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Health, the federal government intends to authorize the legal sale of cannabis edible products and concentrates no later than 12 months following the coming into force of the proposed legislation. By that time, regulations would be made to address the specific risks associated with these types of products.

The Act provides that provinces and territories may, acting on their own authorities, set additional restrictions and local requirements related to cannabis beyond what are present in the proposed Act, such as setting a different minimum age, setting zoning restrictions for cannabis-related businesses, outlining specific restrictions on where and how cannabis can be cultivated and consumed, compliance and enforcement and road safety laws.
2.3 Proposed Provincial Regulations

Each province will decide the retail model for cannabis in its jurisdiction. Recognizing that the July 2018 timeline may not be enough time for each province to establish their retail approach before legalization, the federal government will establish an online retail system as an interim solution. To date, British Columbia has indicated that it plans to have its retail cannabis structure in place by July 2018 and that the details of that approach will include:

- A minimum age of 19 to purchase recreational cannabis;
- A government-run wholesale distribution model operated by the BC Liquor Distribution Branch;
- A retail model that includes both public and private retail opportunities in stores but the province will be the only retailer for online purchases;
- Licensing, compliance and enforcement to be done by the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch; and
- A significant role for local governments in that they can restrict operating hours, require additional security requirements, ban retail sales altogether, cap the number of stores and specify zoning requirements.

Current holders of licences relating to medical cannabis under the ACMPR made under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act will be automatically licensed under the Act for those activities. In other words, it appears that if the Act is made law, licence holders under the ACMPR will be able to conduct the activities authorized by their licence with respect to both medical and non-medical (i.e., recreational) cannabis.

As above, the existing medical system which operates under the ACMPR will continue. The federal government will initially allow the two systems to operate in tandem and has indicated that it intends to evaluate the medical regime within five years of the Act coming into force. However, there is some immediate cross-over between the two systems. For example, companies licensed to cultivate or sell under the ACMPR are deemed to be licensed under the Act as well.

2.4 Growing Cannabis in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR)

The province amended the Agricultural Land Reserve Regulation to specifically identify federally licensed Licensed Commercial Producers, under the MMPR, medical cannabis production as a farm use in the ALR which local governments can regulate, but not prohibit. As is discussed below, regulation by a local government must be consistent with standards established by the Minister of Agriculture. Further, the province has amended the farm class regulation to exclude federally-licensed medical cannabis production facilities as a qualifying farm product for assessment and taxation purposes. This means the facilities would not be eligible for the benefits of farm classification and would have to pay the business tax rate for the various components of the Licensed Commercial Producer operation that are within buildings only. The surrounding land would be eligible for farm status should it meet the requirements.

The Minister of Agriculture has also developed a corresponding Bylaw Standard (Standard) that is available here in its entirety:


The Standard establishes the limits to which local governments can restrict the production of cannabis (and other agricultural operations) in the Agricultural Land Reserve, and provides local governments
with ready-to-use bylaw provisions developed following consultations with local governments. The Standard does not impact Licensed Commercial Producer facilities outside of the Agricultural Land Reserve but Council does have the ability to apply it outside the ALR. The Standard is designed to ensure as much land as possible in the ALR is used for agricultural purposes, while balancing the needs of communities and other legislation.

2.5 Current Cannabis Regulation in Mission

The District’s Zoning Bylaw prohibits the sale of cannabis, medical cannabis and cannabis products, and includes the sale of drug paraphernalia such as bongs, hookah pipes, glass pipes, and other smoking aids within all zones. In addition, Licensed Commercial Producers that are authorized under the federal MMPR are prohibited in all zones. It is recognized that this prohibition is not legal for Licensed Commercial Producers wanting to operate within the ALR. A change to the District’s Zoning Bylaw to address this is discussed below. It is expected that Licensed Commercial Producers, licensed by any federal legislation, will be permitted within the ALR although the province needs to confirm this.

Selling of cannabis from a retail cannabis dispensary is illegal in Canada at this time and also prohibited under the District’s Zoning Bylaw. Until Council decides on whether to allow retail cannabis dispensaries in Mission, enforcement action will be taken on any person or company that attempt to open a retail cannabis business in Mission ahead of it being legalized.

3 Proposed Regulatory Framework in Mission

As above, the framework outlined below is a proposed one. Until the provincial regulations are known and until the Act is passed into law, this proposed framework is remains a proposal. The proposal is being released to the public in order that those interested in producing and selling cannabis in Mission in the future can make informed decisions.

The underlining principle in developing the proposed regulatory framework is that Mission will take a precautionary approach. This means that Mission, if granted the authority from the federal and provincial governments, will use its authority sparingly at first in order to fully understand the impact of the new Cannabis regulatory regime in Canada. Once a complete understanding of the implications is known, Mission will consider relaxing its authority to allow aspects of the regulatory framework that are restricted at the outset.

3.1 Personal and Designated Grower Licences Under the MMAR in Residential Zones

Personal and Designated Grower licences were issued to individuals under the MMAR several years ago. The location of the majority of these licences (approximately 800) is unknown to District staff other than ones that have been the subject of bylaw complaints. Similar licences are still issued under the ACMPR. These licences likely exist in all zones in Mission with the exception of institutional zones.

The District will continue to regulate nuisances, such as odours, through the Good Neighbour Bylaw on a complaint basis.

If not done properly, these licences (and unlicensed illegal grow operations) can present health and safety risks to the community in terms of substandard electrical systems and potential unregulated connection to the municipal water system. The BC Real Estate Association and Canadian Homebuilders’ Association continue to lobby the federal, provincial and local governments about impacts to the housing inventory due to legal and illegal grow operations, concerns about how the home warranty program is affected and the need to establish consistent remediation and tracking standards so that a safe housing inventory is maintained.
The District will begin work on developing a bylaw similar to the City of Surrey’s Controlled Substance Property Bylaw. This bylaw focuses on the harms of cannabis grow operations to the public and views them through a lens of public safety and addresses the challenges within the scope of a local government’s responsibilities. Depending on the condition of the building, an electrical repair order could be issued, electricity and/or water service could be disconnected, or the occupancy permit could be revoked, all triggering some level of remediation to the residence.

3.2 Personal and Designated Grower Licences Under the MMAR in Commercial and Industrial Zones

Several large cannabis grow operations, operating under personal or designated grower licences, are located on commercial and industrial zoned properties. The known locations have caused odour issues for neighbouring businesses. The District believes that cannabis production is an agricultural land use under the Zoning Bylaw and is not permitted in commercial or industrial zones.

In addition to causing issues for neighbouring businesses, producing cannabis on industrial or commercial zoned properties is not the best use of the land in terms of employment opportunities. Mission has a limited land base for industrial activities and employment and the growing of cannabis on these properties further exacerbates the issue. While each situation would have to be evaluated separately with respect to the current zoning of the property and other factors, the District will actively enforce the Zoning Bylaw and seek to have these licensed grow operations moved to where it is a permitted use under the Zoning Bylaw.

3.3 Licensed Commercial Producers under the ACMPR and Cannabis Act

Licensed Commercial Producers are those companies that have been licensed under one or more federal regulations to produce cannabis on a commercial scale, which will be sold to medical and recreational cannabis users by mail or to the provincial wholesaler for selling to retail outlets. As mentioned above, Licensed Commercial Producers are permitted under provincial regulation to operate on lands within the ALR.

3.3.1 Licensed Commercial Producers within the Agricultural Land Reserve

The District will not require rezoning of lands within the ALR where a Licensed Commercial Producer wants to locate. The District will require that Licensed Commercial Producers follow the Minister’s Bylaw Standard mentioned above which sets out the province’s expectations regarding setbacks, distances to schools and parks and other considerations to protect agriculture, the community and natural resources. The District’s Building Bylaw and Business Licensing Bylaws will also apply. The District expects that these operations will be taxed at existing business rates and no farm exemption will apply.

The District is interested in discussing with the industry the potential to locate a regional quality assurance (QA) facility in Mission, preferably on lands within the ALR. Such a facility could serve the testing needs of many different Licensed Commercial Producers and negate their need of developing these expensive laboratory components at their growing locations.

3.3.2 Licensed Commercial Producers outside the Agricultural Land Reserve

There is no requirement for the District to permit Licensed Commercial Producers from operating outside the ALR. At this time, the District will not be amending its Zoning Bylaw to permit Licensed Commercial Producers on any lands other than land within the ALR. This decision could be revisited in the future.

3.4 Regulating the Growing of Four Cannabis Plants at Home

The District is not interested in regulating home cultivation of recreational cannabis that is being considered under the Act as not requiring a licence (ie: no more than 4 plants). As above, the District
will consider adopting a bylaw similar to the City of Surrey’s Controlled Substance Property Bylaw. In addition, existing bylaws, such as the Good Neighbour Bylaw, already regulate nuisances, such as odour, associated with home cultivation.

3.5 Regulation of Cannabis Retail Outlets

Early indications are that retail sales of cannabis will only include dried cannabis, cannabis oils and seeds – all produced by Licensed Commercial Producers and distributed through the provincial wholesaler. Only cannabis accessories such as rolling papers, pipes and bongs can be sold along with cannabis products – snacks, tobacco etc. will not be able to be sold in cannabis retail outlets. The province has indicated that both private and government operated retail outlets will be permitted within BC. At the time of writing, cannabis retail outlets remain illegal in Canada.

Recreational cannabis will be available for purchase through the province’s online system. Once legal, the District will consider only government operated retail outlets and only ones that are located within the following established shopping malls:

- The Junction
- Mission Common
- Mission Hills
- Lougheed 11
- Mission Gate
- Park Place
- Smart Centres

A new zone will be created to permit retail sale of cannabis, in addition to existing commercial uses, and rezoning of a specific commercial retail unit will be required. The requirement to be located in an established shopping mall provides an extra layer of monitoring and compliance by the property owner. Retail sales from privately operated stores will not be permitted at this time. The number of government operated stores will not be regulated. The hours of operation are likely to be set the same as government operated liquor stores.

3.6 Regulation of Wholesale and Distribution

The province has confirmed that it will be the sole wholesaler of recreational cannabis. While there is no indication to date that wholesaling will be located in Mission, the District would consider supporting a wholesale operation in Mission provided it was located on land within the ALR.

3.7 Business Licensing and Building Bylaw Implications of the Cannabis Act

Notwithstanding that Licensed Commercial Producers can only locate on lands within the ALR, they will require a business licence as will any government operated retail outlet. Government operated retail stores will be required to submit proof that their staff have completed applicable provincial employee training certification.

Additional safety requirements may be required once a review of provincially legislated safety requirements has been completed in conjunction with the RCMP and once the provincial requirements are known. In addition, the District may choose to adjust the hours of operation of retail outlets depending on provincial regulations.

At this time, it is anticipated that the business licence fee for retail outlets and Licensed Commercial Producers will be set at the maximum amount under the Business Licensing Bylaw.
3.8 Use of Organic Solvents for Making Cannabis Concentrates

It is well known that individuals who grow their own cannabis also manufacture their own oils and other products, such as shatter, using highly flammable organic solvents such as butane. Using organic solvents to alter the chemical or physical properties of cannabis is prohibited by the Act unless authorized by the Act. There have been several examples where explosions and fires have started as a result of careless use of these solvents. While the District’s Zoning Bylaw prohibits the sale, storage, or distribution of butane in quantities greater than 453 grams (16 ounces) in all zones, changes to the Zoning Bylaw will prohibit the making of cannabis concentrates using organic solvents throughout Mission unless authorized by the federal government.

3.9 Regulating Smoking of Cannabis

The Act will amend the federal government’s Non Smokers Health Act to prohibit cannabis smoking and vaping in federally regulated places but regulation of public consumption of cannabis will otherwise fall to the province and possibly local governments.

Currently, the District’s Smoking Regulation Bylaw defines smoking as smoking of tobacco and any other weed or substance and bans smoking on all municipal property. The bylaw will be amended to clearly include smoking of cannabis as smoking under the bylaw and will be restricted the same way as tobacco is. Prohibitions on being under the influence of cannabis in public, similar to that which is currently in place with respect to public intoxication from alcohol, will need to be addressed by the provincial government.

Vaping is not included within the District’s Smoking Regulation Bylaw at this time but is regulated by the province under the Tobacco and Vapour Products Control Act. This Act prohibits vaping within workplaces and within 6 metres of a ventilation intake or door to a workplace or public building. The District’s Smoking Regulation Bylaw will be amended to treat vaping the same as smoking.

4 Next Steps

Amendments to bylaws will be prepared and considered by Council once the provincial regulations are made public and the authority to regulate cannabis by a local government is clear.

Comments from the public are invited on this discussion paper are welcome and will be shared with Council at a future meeting. This discussion paper will also be sent to the Mission Community Wellness Committee for their feedback.

Questions and comments regarding this discussion paper can be emailed to info@mission.ca or in writing to:

District of Mission
Proposed Framework for Cannabis Regulation
8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC, V2V 4L9
Appendix B

Proposed Cannabis Regulation Framework

Public Information Package

Introduction
The Federal government has introduced the Cannabis Act to regulate and restrict the production, distribution, sale and use of cannabis. It is expected to pass into law in July 2018. The federal law creates responsibilities for all levels of government. Additionally, British Columbia has begun drafting provincial regulations that will have an impact on local governments, and have provided guidance on the retail model to be used in BC.

This Public Information Package and the more detailed discussion paper provide information to interested individuals and organizations on Mission’s current position regarding cannabis regulation. It is provided for convenience only and should not be relied upon to make property acquisition or business decisions.

Current Regulations
Selling cannabis from a retail location is currently illegal in Canada and prohibited under Mission’s Zoning Bylaw.

Mission’s Zoning Bylaw prohibits the sale of cannabis, medical cannabis, cannabis products, and includes the sale of drug paraphernalia and smoking aids within all zones.

Enforcement action will be taken on any persons or company attempting to open a retail cannabis business or operation prior to it being fully legalized and permitted under Federal and Provincial law and Municipal Bylaw.

Additionally, we recognize that currently Licenced Commercial Producers authorized under Federal law are prohibited, and anticipate a change in the Zoning Bylaw to permit Licenced Commercial Producers within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).

Proposed Regulatory Framework
The framework proposed here and in the full Discussion Paper is not final and depends on several assumptions and speculations relating to Federal and Provincial law. It is provided simply to assist those interested in the issue in understanding the municipality’s current positions.

Overall Approach
Mission will take a precautionary approach to cannabis regulation. The municipality will use its authority sparingly to determine the impact of the new Cannabis regulations in Canada prior to relaxing any municipal regulations. Additionally, we anticipate the business licence fees for retail outlets and Licensed Commercial Producers will be set at the maximum amount under the Business Licensing Bylaw.

Personal and Designated Grower Licences
For operations in Residential Zones Mission will enforce the Good Neighbour Bylaw on a complaint basis to ensure Personal and Designated Grower Licences under the MMAR and ACMPR are not negatively impacting the community.

When poorly run, these grows cause serious damage to buildings, nuisance, and dangers for the community. Mission will develop a bylaw to reduce the harms related to cannabis production and to support the identification and remediation of issues.

Production in Commercial and Industrial Zones
Cannabis production is an agricultural land use. It is not permitted in Commercial or Industrial Zones and Mission will actively enforce the Zoning Bylaw and seek to have licenced grow operations removed from these zones.

Licenced Commercial Producers
We expect Licenced Commercial Producers will be permitted under Provincial regulation to operation on Agricultural Lands. Mission will not require rezoning of lands within the ALR where a Licenced Commercial
Producer wants to locate, but will require they follow the Minister’s Bylaw Standard and conform to Mission’s Building Bylaw and Business Licencing Bylaw.

Commercial Producers will be taxed at the existing business rates and no farm exemption will apply.

**Growing up to Four Cannabis Plants at Home**
Mission is not interested in regulating the home cultivation that is being considered under the Act as not requiring a licence. Mission will actively enforce the good neighbour bylaw and will consider adopting a bylaw similar to the City of Surrey’s Controlled Substance Property Bylaw to ensure public safety and support the identification and remediation of issues that could harm residential buildings.

**Retail Sales**
Retail sales from privately operated stores will not be permitted at this time. Once legal, Mission will consider only government operated retail outlets, and will likely create zoning to restrict the activity to established shopping malls specifically listed in the Zoning Bylaw.

**Wholesale, Distribution, and Quality Assurance**
Mission would consider permitting a wholesale or quality assurance operation provided it was located on land within the ALR.

**Use of Solvents in Producing Derivatives**
Using organic solvents to alter the chemical or physical properties of Cannabis is prohibited except where authorized by the Act.

Mission’s zoning bylaw prohibits the sale, storage, or distribution of butane in quantities greater than 453 grams (16 ounces) in all zones, and we anticipate updating the Zoning Bylaw to prohibit the making of Cannabis concentrates in all zones unless where authorized by the Federal Government.

**Regulating Smoking and Vaping**
Mission’s Smoking Regulation Bylaw defines smoking as smoking of tobacco and any other weed or substance, and bans smoking on all municipal property. Provincial regulations prohibit vaping within workplaces and within six (6) meters of ventilation intakes or doors to workplaces or public buildings.

We anticipate updating Mission’s Smoking Regulation Bylaw to treat vaping and smoking of cannabis in the same way as smoking tobacco and ensure restrictions are consistent.

**Next Steps**
Once Provincial regulations are made public and municipal authority is clear Mission will bring forward bylaw amendments for consideration. The process will include the opportunity for public comment, and we welcome any and all feedback on the full discussion paper by email at info@mission.ca or in writing to:

District of Mission
Proposed Framework for Cannabis Regulation
8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC, V2V 4L9
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
SUBJECT: Council Remuneration Effective in 2019
ATTACHMENTS: A – Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06
B – Comparator Municipalities’ Remuneration for Elected Officials

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Mayor’s salary be established at $XX,XXX starting January 1, 2019;
2. That a Councillor’s salary be established at XX% of the Mayor’s salary or $XX,XXX starting January 1, 2019; and
3. That Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06 be amended as per the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer’s report dated May 7, 2018.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend amendments to Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06 including establishing new salaries for Mayor and Councillors that would be effective January 1, 2019 – after the next civic election.

BACKGROUND:
Mayor and Council’s remuneration is set out in the Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy C-ADM.06 (Appendix 1, the “Policy”). The Policy sets the salaries and benefits to be paid to the 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. Council approved using Port Moody, West Vancouver, Vernon, Penticton and Campbell River as comparator local governments at their March 5, 2018 meeting.

As per the Policy, the Mayor’s and Councillors’ salaries for 2018 are $73,906 and 29,560, respectively. Currently, a Councillor's salary is 40% that of the Mayor's.

Decision points or direction from staff are noted in bold throughout the report.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Comparator Municipality Salary Analysis

Appendix 2 provides the salaries for the comparator municipalities. The Policy states that the average of these comparators is to be used to calculate the Mayor’s and Councillors’ salary at the District. The most recent salaries reported for the comparator municipalities is for 2016. Increasing these by the consumer price index of 2.2% for 2017 and an estimated consumer price index (CPI) of 2% for 2018 brings these average salaries to $76,433 and $28,973, respectively. Therefore, the Mayor’s current salary is $2,527 below the average and Councillors’ salary is $587 greater than the average for 2018.
Assuming the consumer price index will be 2% for 2018, the existing 2018 Councillors’ salary of $29,560 would be approximately the same as if the average comparator Councillor’s salary was adjusted for CPI starting in 2019 and therefore a Councillors’ salary would stay the same in 2019 as it was in 2018. The Mayor’s salary should be increased by $2,527 and adjusted for an assumed CPI of 2% bringing the 2019 salary to $77,962. This would mean a Councillor’s salary would drop to 38% of the Mayor’s.

As per the existing Policy, staff recommends the Mayor’s salary for 2019 be established at $77,962 and a Councillor’s salary be set at $29,560. Note that Council’s decision regarding the issues raised below could end up adjusting these values.

**Direction is requested as to the 2019 salaries for Mayor and Councillors.**

**Loss of Non-Taxable Allowance**

Currently, one-third of the Mayor’s and Councillors’ salary is non-taxable as per the federal *Income Tax Act*. This tax exemption also applies to provincial income tax. As with many municipalities, this non-taxable portion is considered as 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 and for non-District sanctioned meetings or events that Council members choose to attend, and as such these expenses will not be reimbursable (**Section 3(a) of Appendix 1**).

Changes to the *Income Tax Act* in 2019 mean that income tax will be deducted from the entire remuneration of a Council member. Staff have researched what measures other municipalities are implementing to ensure that Council members are made whole after this change. Other jurisdictions seem to be split throughout the province with some increasing existing salaries while others are leaving the issue to be addressed by the next Councils.

Subsequent reviews as per the Policy will need to be careful to choose comparator municipalities that will treat the loss of the non-taxable allowance in the same way that Mission chooses.

The table below provides the federal and provincial income tax rates based on taxable income.

**Table of Federal and Provincial Income Tax Rates on Taxable Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Tax Rates</th>
<th>Provincial Tax Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15% on the first $46,605 of taxable income</td>
<td>5.06% on the first $39,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.5% on the next $46,603 of taxable income (on the</td>
<td>7.70% from $39,677 to $79,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of taxable income over 46,605 up to $93,208)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% on the next $51,281 of taxable income (on the</td>
<td>10.5% from $79,354 to $91,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of taxable income over $93,208 up to $144,489),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% on the next $61,353 of taxable income (on the</td>
<td>12.29% from $91,108 to $110,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of taxable income over $144,489 up to $205,842)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% of taxable income over $205,842</td>
<td>14.70% from $110,631 to $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.80% on $150,001 and greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notwithstanding that each elected official will have their own unique income and tax situation, staff chose the average federal and provincial income tax rates for up to $93,208 and $91,107, respectively, representing the rates generally applicable based on the Mayor’s salary, and arrived at suggesting an approximate 24.75% increase to current salaries if Council chooses to adjust salaries upwards to compensate for the loss of the non-taxable allowance. This would result in increases in the 2019 salaries for the Mayor and Councillors of $6,432 and $2,439, respectively, and bring 2019 salaries to $84,394 and $32,000, respectively, when CPI and comparators are used.
If Council accepts this solution, expenses incidental to carrying out a Council member’s duties would be treated the same as they are today and detailed expense claims would not be submitted other than for formal conferences, seminars and related travel. The following table shows the various increases that would result in the 2019 salaries described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Salary</th>
<th>2018 Comparator Increase</th>
<th>2019 Salary Adjusted for 2% CPI</th>
<th>Adjustment for loss of Non-Taxable Allowance</th>
<th>2019 Proposed Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>$73,906</td>
<td>$2,527</td>
<td>$1,529</td>
<td>$6,432</td>
<td>$84,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>$29,560</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,439</td>
<td>$32,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 38% of Mayor’s salary.

An alternative to increasing salaries to account for the loss of the non-taxable allowance is for salaries to be set for 2019, based on the comparators and CPI, and have Councillors keep track of mileage and other incidental expenses and submit for reimbursement on a regular basis. From staff’s perspective, this approach is not preferred because of the additional work for staff and Council.

While researching what other local governments were proposing with respect to the loss of the non-taxable allowance, staff noted several other methods that are being used to compensate Mayors and Councillors. These include:

1. Mayor’s salary set at a percentage of a representative group of Mayors’ salaries e.g.: 85% of median;
2. Councillor’s salary set as a percentage of the Mayor’s; most use between 35% and 45%;
3. Mayor’s salary is set at a percentage (e.g.: 80% in City of Langley) of the average of salaries of other public body positions such as principal of the largest high school, federal MP, BC Provincial Court Judge, BC Cabinet Minister, BC MLA and Superintendent of the RCMP;
4. Mayor’s salary is 2.5 times the salary of a Councillor and Councillor’s salary is 75% of the average salary of the city’s full-time employees (Abbotsford model starting in 2019).

For interest, staff calculated the 2018 median and average salary (adjusted for inflation) for Mayor’s in the comparator municipalities as well as what a Councillor’s salary would be at various percentages as per model 2 above. These are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Mayor’s Salary</th>
<th>Median Mayor’s Salary</th>
<th>Councillors’ Salary as a Percentage of Average Mayor’s Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$76,433</td>
<td>$71,580</td>
<td>$26,752 $30,573 $34,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 adjusted for CPI and non-taxable allowance</td>
<td>$84,394</td>
<td>$77,331</td>
<td>$29,538 $33,758 $37,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission Mayor’s Salary 2018 - $73,906
Mission Councillor’s Salary 2018 - $29,560 = 40% of Mayor’s salary
Staff support linking a Councillor’s salary to a percentage of the Mayor’s simply from an ease of calculation perspective. As above, currently, a Councillor receives 40% of the Mayor’s salary and that would drop to 38% should the CPI, Policy changes and above adjustments made for the loss of the non-taxable portion be implemented. Staff would recommend that the Councillors continue to receive 40% of the Mayor’s salary and that the Policy be adjusted accordingly. This recommendation is based on ratios used in other municipalities but staff recognizes that Councillors are in the best position to determine what this ratio should be, based on experience and the assumption that the Mayor’s position should be considered a full-time position at 35 hours per week.

Also for interest, staff calculated the average District full-time employee’s salary for 2018 to be $73,160. Using the Abbotsford model in (4) above, the Mayor and a Councillor would receive $137,175 and $54,870, respectively.

Direction is requested as to how to accommodate the loss of the non-taxable allowance.

Direction is requested as to whether a Councillor’s salary should be tied to the Mayor’s and at what percentage.

Benefits

The Mayor and Councillors receive Canada Pension Plan benefits from the District but not Employment Insurance. Under the existing remuneration policy, the Mayor, but not family members, receives benefits including Medical Services Plan, Extended Health and Dental paid in full by the District. Councillors are offered the same benefits but the premiums are paid entirely by the Councillor. Optional life and accident insurance is available to both Mayor and Councillors but entirely at their cost.

There is variation in the benefits offered to elected officials in British Columbia. Of the comparator municipalities, Campbell River and West Vancouver offer the same as Mission, Vernon and Port Moody offer the same benefits as Mission to both Mayor and Councillors at the city’s cost and Penticton covers 50% of the cost of the same benefits as Mission to both Mayor and Councillors. The argument against providing benefits to Councillors in most cases is that the role is a part-time position and benefits are not normally provided to part-time employees. The cost of providing the same benefits the Mayor receives to all Councillors, but not their family members, would be approximately $8,800.

Part-time employees at the District of Mission receive various benefits either as a percentage of their salary or for those part-time employees working 30 hours (43%) or more per 70 hour pay period, they have the option of receiving the same benefits that are provided to full-time CUPE employees. These include the District paying 85% of the cost of Medical Services Plan and Extended Health premiums and 100% of Dental premiums.

Direction is requested as to any desired changes to the benefits provided to the Mayor and Councillors.

Policy Changes

Staff are also recommending several changes to the Policy to reflect the move to a four year term, the adoption of a new Policy that addresses contractual increases to account for inflation and some minor typographical errors.

The proposed changes are included in the table below. Provided Council agrees with the proposed changes and provides direction where requested, staff will bring a revised Policy to a subsequent meeting for consideration.
### Section Proposed Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b)</td>
<td>• Change 3 years to 4 years to reflect new 4 year term of Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2e)     | • Set the Mayor’s salary at $??,???  
|         | • Set the Councillor’s salary at XX% of the Mayor’s salary or $??,??? |
| 2f)     | • Add an interim fourth year to reflect new 4 year term of Council.  
|         | • Reference the new Council Policy ADM.22(C) Implementing Consumer Price Index Increases for Agreements when calculating cost of living increases.  
|         | • Delete reference to one-third non-taxable allowance to reflect the deletion of this exemption by the federal government starting in 2019. |
| 2h)     | • Add the word “Councillor” after the word “individual”. |
| 3a)     | • Replace this section with a new section based on Council direction regarding covering expenses that are incidental to the discharge of duties of office |
| 3c)     | • Change the word “tax” to “taxi” to fix a typo in original Policy.  
|         | • Delete the reference to the non-taxable allowance. |
| Other   | • Any changes required as part of Council direction resulting from this report. |

In summary, staff are seeking the following direction from Council:

- How to address the removal of the non-taxable allowance provided on one-third of existing salaries.
- The Mayor’s salary for 2019
- A Councillor’s salary for 2019
- Whether to tie a Councillor’s salary to the Mayor’s as a percentage? If so, what percentage?
- Policy changes including:
  - Whether to change from using comparator municipalities model to one based on average District of Mission employee salary or other positions of leadership in the municipality.
  - Any changes to benefits provided to the Mayor and Councillors.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The following table provides a summary of financial implications to the District’s 2019 budget assuming the following:

- Mayor’s salary is set at the average of the comparator municipalities’ salaries (as per Policy); no change to a Councillor’s salary
- Mayor’s and Councillors’ salaries are adjusted for the loss of the non-taxable allowance by adjusting 33% of the salary upwards by 24.75% and setting a Councillor’s salary to 40% of the Mayor’s salary
- Loss of GST rebate to the District for the non-taxable allowance
- Addition of MSP, dental, and extended health to all Council members
- New payroll tax to replace change in way MSP premiums are funded
- MSP credit for Mayor due to repeal of monthly fees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget Impact*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mayor’s salary due to Policy</td>
<td>$6,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.75% increase due to loss of non-taxable allowance &amp; setting Councillor’s salary to 40% of Mayor’s</td>
<td>$29,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits extended to all of Council</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New provincial payroll tax</td>
<td>$5,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of GST rebate on 1/3 of salary</td>
<td>$4,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP Credit for Mayor</td>
<td>($900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,953</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A 1% property tax increase in 2018 equaled a budget impact of approximately $300,000

In addition to the above, there will be a slight increase in Canada Pension Plan payments by the District as these are tied to salaries.

COMMUNICATION:

No further communication is required. As with any time that Councils make changes to remuneration there is always public interest. It needs to be noted that any increases or changes made as a result of this report do not take effect until 2019 and are to the benefit of the next Council and not the current Council. Staff will watch social and print media and clarify accordingly should the need arise.

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 that Council members will be entitled to. Council approved using Penticton, Vernon, West Vancouver, Port Moody and Campbell River as the comparators. Staff have suggested salaries that could be approved starting in 2019 as well as options to accommodate the federal government’s repeal of the non-taxable allowance in place today for one-third of elected officials’ salary. In addition, it is suggested that a Councillor’s salary be set at 40% of the Mayor’s going forward. Housekeeping changes are also recommended to the Policy.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed by:
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
**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 taxi 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:

ADM.06(PC) – Council and Staff Expenses

Council Procedure Bylaw 5345-2013

*** END OF POLICY ***
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## Attachment B – Comparator Municipalities’ Remuneration for Elected Officials (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
<td>71,442</td>
<td>28,576</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>
<td>97,600</td>
<td>38,500</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>
<td>93,085</td>
<td>33,187</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>
<td>99,436</td>
<td>39,709</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>
<td>92,748</td>
<td>36,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>58,612</td>
<td>720,200,507</td>
<td>$12,165,019,548</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92,241</td>
<td>37,095</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>
<td>96,684</td>
<td>33,839</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>
<td>97,776</td>
<td>33,823</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>
<td>35,288</td>
<td>16,597</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>
<td>62,551</td>
<td>22,959</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>
<td>65,067</td>
<td>22,600</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>
<td>86,958</td>
<td>33,760</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>
<td>68,800</td>
<td>22,194</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>
<td>83,230</td>
<td>37,454</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>
<td>64,706</td>
<td>21,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

** Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development Local Government Tax Rates and Assessments:
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/infra/tax_rates/tax_rates2016.htm

Shaded rows are the chosen comparator municipalities for the comparative analysis – average population is 36,498.
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
SUBJECT: Municipally Funded Grants – Policy Amendment
ATTACHMENT: Attachment A – Municipally Funded Grants Policy FIN.50

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
That Municipally Funded Grants Policy FIN.50 be amended by adding the following items to section 1. Process:
   a) Applications received after July 15 will not be considered.
   b) Delegations to Council by organizations missing the intake deadline will not be permitted, except under specific qualifying or emergency circumstances.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present recommendations to amend the current policy governing municipal grants to clarify the application process, to ensure it is equitable and fair to all applicants, and to ensure efficient use of staff resources.

BACKGROUND:
On July 6, 2015 Council adopted a new policy (FIN.50) to streamline and simplify the process to apply for municipally awarded grants. The changes included a simplified application form and stronger requirements for financial and other reporting from receiving organizations. The biggest change was a move to receiving all applications in July so that the applications could be reviewed and grants disbursed very early in the following year (e.g. for funding in 2018, applications had to be received by July 15, 2017). Receiving organizations get their funding early in the new year and the District is able to align the process with the budget discussions.

On January 16, 2017 Council made the following resolution (RC17/010):

   That staff report back to Council with options for a multi-year funding model for Fee for Service contracts.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Application Intake
One challenge that remains unchanged after the timeline adjustment is the submission of late and/or incomplete applications. The Municipal Grant Select Committee has expressed its frustration with late and incomplete applications for years, and has repeatedly asked staff to inform grant recipients that they need to be mindful of the deadline and the application criteria. Staff have provided this information year after year by letter and by telephone, but the same issues keep repeating.
The policy and the application form were simplified in 2015 to make the requirements very clear (see attachment). Policy FIN.50 lists the required supporting documents in section 1(c) “All applications should include copies of the following in order to receive optimal consideration:”. The application form itself has a checkbox list of required supporting documents and states “To ensure your application may be considered, please complete and return the application with all required documentation by July 15th (unless otherwise specified in the annual notification)”.

The selection committee is responsible for considering the applications, and can accept, deny, or reduce grant awards based on how complete the application is (“optimal consideration”). The committee meets one time to review all the applications as a group. Staff do not have the capacity to review each supporting document for accuracy or appropriateness before the applications are distributed to the selection committee. Staff cannot presume to know what committee members may deem acceptable or not. It is also difficult for staff to refuse a request to submit a late application because we know how important the grants are to the organizations. Further, late and incomplete applications have historically been accepted, and grant funds still awarded, despite warnings to not be late or incomplete next time.

It is recognized that many non-profit organizations rely on volunteers for administrative functions, however the level of administrative support provided to outside organizations related to the grant process is unsustainable. District staff are spending increasingly more time on follow up telephone calls and correspondence. Time spent chasing down missing information causes delays in bringing the applications forward for consideration. Other business processes in the District rely on the timely submission of documents and reasonable cut-off times so that the business can continue efficiently (e.g. applications for employment, agenda preparation, requests for proposals and competitive bidding documents).

It would be helpful to the process if staff had authority, through the policy, to not accept late applications over the counter, and to return any late applications received by mail. For application packages that are incomplete, the current practice of date-stamping the applications and providing them to the selection committee as is should continue. As noted above, staff cannot make assumptions as to what committee members may deem insufficient, and the committee has the power to make recommendations for grant awards based on how complete the application is.

Delegations

Every person has the democratic right to speak to their elected official(s), and appearing as a delegation is one way to exercise that right. The purpose of the staff recommendation to effectively eliminate that option for the grant application process only is to encourage adherence to the terms of the policy, and to prevent the appearance of another way around the rules if the deadline is missed.

The recommendation is not to stop emergent requests that could not have reasonably been included in the regular intake process. A recent example of this was the request for Challenge Day 2017, when other funding sources could not come through at the last minute and the organizers were left scrambling.

By not allowing appeals to Council because of a missed deadline, the process remains fair to everyone who submitted documents on time. Applications that are considered in isolation outside of the selection committee review process are not competing in the same arena as the others. It raises the question of whether an application considered after a delegation would have the same level of success if it had been considered amongst all the other requests. The total amount of grant funds requested always far exceeds the total amount of grant funds available, so the competition aspect is very real.

Fee for Service Contracts

Staff have carefully considered a multi-year funding model for the Fee for Service contracts, and recommend that the current annual funding model stay in place for the following reasons:

- annual review of the contracts allows greater flexibility to increase or decrease the grant
depending on the need for a service or the type of service provided;

- it allows new organizations and services to be considered early in their development;
- annual review of the contracts allows greater flexibility for adjustments to the terms of the contract;
- annual review of the contracts ensures the insurance and reporting requirements are met; and
- the Fee for Service grant budget was amended in 2018 to include an annual Consumer Price Index increase

Contract improvements being considered for 2019 are to require a resolution from each organization’s Board of Directors that the society is authorized to enter into the contract, and to include a clause in the execution block that the person signing the contract on behalf of the organization is properly authorized to do so.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

While there are no direct financial implications, the recommended policy amendments will significantly reduce the staff time spent on managing the intake process and presenting numerous reports to Council on the topic of grant awards.

COMMUNICATION:

Should the policy amendments be approved, the amended document will be posted to the District’s website immediately. The annual call for applications will be advertised in the Mission City Record right away, as the intake process for 2019 grant funding starts this month.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The purpose of this report is to present recommendations to amend Municipally Funded Grants Policy FIN.50 to clarify the application process, to ensure it is equitable and fair to all applicants, and to ensure efficient use of staff resources. The recommended policy amendments will level the field with respect to requests past the deadline, and will significantly reduce the staff time spent on managing the intake process and presenting numerous reports to Council on the topic of grant awards. Staff are not recommending a change to the current annual funding model for the Fee for Service contracts.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
PREAMBLE:
The adoption of this policy by Council Resolution includes the repeal of policy number FIN.18 and 19.

BACKGROUND:
Municipalities in British Columbia may:
- provide any service through another organization
- provide grants to organizations by council resolution

PURPOSE:
The Municipally Funded Grant types are as follows:
- Fee for Service Grant
- Community Enhancement Grant
- Community Event Grant
- Special Event Grant

The Municipally Funded Grants Program is designed to assist:
- local not-for-profit incorporated organizations or Community Contribution Companies (CCC) with delivery of services to the community that otherwise would likely be offered by the District, (Fee for Service Grants)
- local community-minded organizations offering events and services that facilitate the arts, cultural, recreational or social services functions, (Community Enhancement, Community Event and Special Event Grants)

POLICY:
1. Process
   (a) Council will consider applications for Municipally Funded Grants annually. Notification will be advertised in the local newspaper and on the District website.
   (b) Applications must be submitted to the District using the prescribed application form,
(included within this policy), on or before July 15\textsuperscript{th} of each year unless otherwise designated in the annual notification. A select committee will review the applications and prepare a report with recommendations to Mayor and Council who shall consider the request and make the final decision.

(c) All applications should include copies of the following in order to receive optimal consideration:
   
i. Constitution;
   ii. Current list of board members and number of employees, (full time and part time);
   iii. Annual general meeting minutes, (including manager’s report, if applicable);
   iv. Detailed proposed budget for the current year, detailed expenditures and revenues, including a list of all other grants and donations;
   v. Financial statements for the previous fiscal year;
   vi. Statement identifying the amount of reserved funds, if any, and the purpose of those funds; and
   vii. Identification of the name and position of any individuals who receive payment from the grant funds, (salary, honorarium or contract) together with the amount of compensation each receives.

(d) The committee report to Council will highlight relativity to the eligibility criteria.

2. **Eligibility Criteria** (*selection committee members are ineligible to apply for District Grants*)

(a) Organization’s Mandate:
   
i. **Fee for Service Grants**: Primarily must support a service or program that otherwise would likely be offered by the District. Staff Liaisons will be appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer to each organization to support activities and provide a close connection with the District.

   ii. **Community Enhancement Grants**: Are intended to assist the organization in the provision of local community focused activities. The grants will be awarded to community groups with a physical presence in Mission, in the fields of the arts, cultural, recreational or social services.

   iii. **Community Event Grants**: Are intended to support recurring events that Council has pre-determined provide a significant benefit to the broader community and is open to all members of the public without charge. Typically such grants are limited to not more than $5,000 per event annually.

   iv. **Special Event Grants**: Are intended to support one-time events that are of a cultural, social or recreational significance to the community, and that is open to the community at large.

(b) Nature of Organization:
   
i. **Fee for Service Grant Eligibility:**
      
      - Be registered as a not-for-profit incorporated society in British Columbia;
      - Be located in the District of Mission;
      - The general membership of the organization applying for a grant must consist of at least 50% of Mission’s residents; and
      - Be able to demonstrate that they are able to match the District’s contributions in either other donation dollars or in-kind services.
ii. Community Enhancement, Community Event & Special Event Grant Eligibility:
   - Is not commercial in nature;
   - Is incorporated, either under the Societies Act of British Columbia or under any federal act as a charitable organization, or, in the event that the funding applied for is equal to or less than $500, it is an unincorporated group with a written constitution which evidences objectives which are charitable in nature;
   - Has demonstrated sound financial and administrative management;
   - Has demonstrated financial need;
   - Funding would benefit the residents of the District of Mission.

RECORD OF AMENDMENTS/REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy #</th>
<th>Date Adopted</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Amended (Y/N)</th>
<th>Date Reissued</th>
<th>Authority (Resolution #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIN.50</td>
<td>2015-07-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC15/366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN.50(C)</td>
<td>2017-01-16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2017-01-16</td>
<td>RC17/009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MUNICIPALLY FUNDED GRANTS APPLICATION

This application form is for Non-profit Organizations who are applying for a municipally funded grant. To ensure your application may be considered, please complete and return the application with all required documentation by:

**July 15th** *(unless otherwise specified in the annual notification)*

**(SECTION 1) - ORGANIZATION INFORMATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name:</th>
<th>CRA/Society Act Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address (if different than above):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(SECTION 2a) - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION CHECK LIST (ATTACH COPIES TO APPLICATION):**

- Constitution;
- Current list of board members and number of employees, (full time and part time);
- Annual general meeting minutes, (including manager's report, if applicable);
- Detailed proposed budget for the current year, detailing expenditures and revenues, including a list of all other grants and donations;
- Financial statements for the previous fiscal year;
- Statement identifying the amount of reserved funds, if any, and the purpose of those funds; and
- Identification of the name and position of any individuals who receive payment from the grant funds, (salary, honorarium or contract) together with the amount of compensation each receives.

**(SECTION 2b) - DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE EVENT/PROJECT OR CALENDAR YEAR, (WHICHEVER OCCURS FIRST):**

- A separate, detailed evaluation of the use of funds.

**(SECTION 3) - DECLARATION BY AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY:**

I hereby certify that I have read the District of Mission Grants - Municipally Funded Grants Policy FIN.50 (attached), that the application complies with its requirements, and that the information contained in the application is complete and correct.

IF THERE IS A CHANGE IN THE STATUS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION THE DISTRICT OF MISSION MUST BE NOTIFIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (please print):</th>
<th>Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(SECTION 4) - USE OF GRANT DETAILS:**

Grant amount being requested: $

How will the District of Mission and its contribution be recognized by your organization? 

(continued on back of page)
The grant is being requested for: (choose only one)

- ☐ A Community Enhancement Grant (complete Section 4a)
  For non-profit Mission based community groups in the arts, cultural, recreational or social services field.

- ☐ Fee for Service Grant (complete Section 4a)
  To assist non-profit Mission based organizations with delivery of services to the community. The general membership of the organization must consist of at least 50% of Mission residents and be able to demonstrate the ability to match the District’s contribution in either other donation dollars or in-kind services. The services must be consistent with the District’s Goals and Objectives as posted on the District’s website. The service must be inclusive of all residents, support strong social and community values, and not be offensive to others.

- ☐ A Community Event Grant (complete Section 4b)
  A recurring event that provides some significant benefit to the broad community, and is open to all members of the public without charge, (the established limit per grant is $5,000 per event annually).

- ☐ A Special Event Grant (complete Section 4b)
  Any one-time or first-time event that is of cultural, social or recreational significance to the community.

(SECTION 4a) - DETAILS OF COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT: (use a separate sheet if required)

1. Describe the service your organization provides to the community: ............................................................................................................................

2. Number of clients/participants involved with your organization: .............................................................................................................................

3. Describe how your organization would utilize the grant funds and how it would benefit the community: ...........................................................

4. What other community support or sponsorship exists for this project? ...........................................................................................................

(SECTION 4b) - DETAILS OF COMMUNITY EVENT/ SPECIAL EVENT: (use a separate sheet if required)

1. Name of event: ...........................................................................................

2. Date of event: ............................................................................................

3. Purpose of event: ......................................................................................

4. Targeted audience: ..................................................................................

5. Projected number of attendees: .................................................................

6. Number of attendees for past 3 years (if applicable): ...............................

7. Proposed advertising/promotion of event: .................................................

8. Amount of projected local spending to hold the event: ............................

9. Other funding sources: ............................................................................

Ensure your Application Declaration on the front page is signed and dated. The District of Mission may contact you to request additional information, or clarification, to support your application. If you require further information, please contact Municipal Hall at: 604-820-3700.

The personal information on this form is collected for the purpose of an operating program of the District of Mission as noted in Section 26(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. If you have any questions about the collection and use of the information, please contact the Freedom of Information Coordinator (604-820-3724).
DATE: May 07, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Dale Unrau, Fire Chief
SUBJECT: Equipment Purchase of Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the contract for the purchase of one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck be awarded to Hub Fire Engines & Equipment Ltd. at a cost of $686,339 (including PST).

2. That any necessary change orders be approved by the Fire Chief, Fleet Supervisor and the Manager of Business Services, provided they are within the $725,000 project budget previously approved by Council.

PURPOSE:
The report is to fulfill the requirements of Purchasing Policy FIN.24 (the Policy) whereby Council approval is required to approve purchases over $250,000. Staff is therefore seeking approval to complete the purchase of one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck for use by the Mission Fire Rescue Service (MFRS).

BACKGROUND:
In February 2018, RFP 2018-002 was issued for the supply and delivery of one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck.

At the time of closing for RFP 2018-002, eight proposals had been received for the supply of one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck. The evaluation team reviewed the proposals received, and 5 proposals were deemed compliant. The highest scoring Proponent was Hub Fire Engines & Equipment Ltd., as it offered the best value to replace Mission’s Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck. The Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck proposed by Hub Fire Engines & Equipment Ltd. will meet the needs of MFRS.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The District’s budget includes $725,000 for the replacement of one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck in 2018. Hub Fire Engines & Equipment Ltd proposal of $686,339 (including PST) is within the previously approved budget for this project.

The remaining budget in 2018 of $38,661 (including PST) will allow for the purchase of some small tools and equipment required to outfit the truck for service and cover any possible change orders as a result of changes at the pre-construction meeting.

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance
COMMUNICATION:
The Manager of Purchasing and Stores will be communicating with the successful vendor.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The MFRS seeks the approval of Council to purchase one Fire Pumper/Rescue Truck to replace an existing truck that has exceeded its 20 year life cycle. The replacement of this fire apparatus is included in the District’s financial plan, and the recommended supplier’s proposal fits within the approved budget. As the value of this purchase exceeds $250,000, the Policy requires Council approval to complete the purchase.

SIGN-OFFS:

Dale Unrau, Fire Chief

Reviewed by:
Ilsa Foster, Manager of Purchasing and Stores

Reviewed by:
Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: May 07, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Dale Unrau, Fire Chief
SUBJECT: Fire Station 1 Renovations

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That approval be granted to proceed with the renovations described in this report for Fire Station 1;
2. That a budget increase of $29,801 required to complete the renovations be funded from the General Fund Accumulated Surplus; and
3. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to inform council of the status of the previously approved renovation of Fire Station 1 and to update on unforeseen costs and seek additional funding in order to complete the renovation.

BACKGROUND:
In July of 2017 council approved a budget of $129,250 from the General Fund Accumulated Surplus to complete renovations to the upstairs bathrooms and dorm areas of Station 1 to make more efficient use of the space with the move to 24 hour staffing, and to correct plumbing deficiencies. In consultation with the District’s Building Maintenance Supervisor the replacement of the 20 year old hot water tanks at Station 1 were added to the scope of the project with $2,000 funding coming from the facilities maintenance budget.

On December 20, 2017 a public tender was released requesting bids for the completion of the renovations. On closing of the tender process on February 14, 2018, 7 bids had been received. Tikal Construction Ltd., having the lowest compliant bid, was selected to complete the renovation and a Purchase Order for the sum of $125,000 excluding tax was issued on March 16, 2018 to complete the work.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
During the demolition phase of the renovation it was discovered that a number of items had been missed in the scope of work provided by the architect and also not picked up by any of the contractors during the mandatory onsite walkthrough of the project and therefore not reflected in the pricing schedule. Items missed in the original scope of work included, demolition of existing ceramic wall and floor tile, new flooring in bathrooms and hallway, and levelling of floors. The scope of work also only included patching of ceramic floor and wall tile from the original bathrooms rather than full removal and installation of new floor coverings. Staff discovered that there was a deficit in the original funding for the project and that further funds would be required to complete work that was not identified in the original project scope.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The funding estimate received by the Fire Chief and Building Maintenance Supervisor in June of 2017 including contingency was inadequate to cover the lowest compliant bid for the project of $125,000 in February of 2018. Initial cost estimates for the project are as follows:

1. Architectural fees $8,000
2. Plumbing and ventilation consultants $3,000
3. Renovation construction/demolition $106,500
4. Contingency $11,750
   Total requested budget funding = $129,250
   Hot water tank replacement funds $2,000
   Total funds = $131,250

Current expected costs to complete the original renovation plus items missed in the original project scope are as follows:

1. Architectural fees $8,000
2. Plumbing and ventilation consultants $3,000
3. Renovation construction/demolition $125,000
4. Demolition of wall and floor tile $3,200
5. Miscellaneous change order repairs $7,164
6. Flooring demolition/replacement $9,687
7. Contingency $5,000
   Total funds required = $161,051
   Current funding deficit = -$29,801

Staff recommend an additional budget of $29,801 be established to complete these renovations, with funding from General Fund Accumulated Surplus. General Fund Accumulated Surplus currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $5.6 million, as compared to a minimum recommended balance of $3.6 million.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The original price estimates were inadequate to complete the renovations at Station 1 along with the discovery of items missed in the original scope of work has led to the renovations at Station 1 being underfunded. Staff recommends that a further $29,801 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus be approved in order to complete the project.

SIGN-OFFS:

Dale Unrau, Fire Chief
Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture
SUBJECT: 1st Ave Public Art
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix A – North Vancouver Centennial Project

This report is provided to Council for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to update Council on the 1st Ave Public Art Project.

BACKGROUND:
A Request for Proposals (RFP) went out March 6, 2018 and closed March 27, 2018 seeking proposals from artists to design, fabricate and install public art that enhanced the streetscape improvements on 1st Ave.

Four proposals were received from artists located in Ontario, Quebec and California. Staff reviewed the proposals and none were felt to be appropriate for the 1st Ave project. As a result, staff completed research on other streetscape art projects and met with the Executive Director of the Mission Arts Council to discuss a concept similar to the North Vancouver Centennial Streetscape project. This was presented to the Cultural Resources Commission for consideration. PRC staff also met with Engineering staff managing the 1st Ave project to discuss its’ integration with the construction works.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The 1st Ave project discussed by the Cultural Resources Commission includes a series of locally sourced granite pieces placed flush into the sidewalk along all three blocks of 1st Ave. Each granite piece will be approximately 18” square and have etched into it local student art work which will be created through a community workshop and juried by members of the Cultural Resources Commission.

The theme of the art work will be “Our Natural Community” and feature local wildlife, flora, fauna or landscapes. Each granite piece will be carved by a stone carver and feature an etched ring around the art work noting the theme and the name of the item displayed. 12 granite pieces (1 each side of the bump outs) will be created to be placed into the sidewalk.

Granite strips were originally incorporated into the sidewalk design between paver and concrete sections but were removed to bring the project on budget. The granite art work pieces will allow some granite to be included back into the sidewalk design. They will be located under pedestrian lamp posts allowing them to be highlighted at night and out of the main walking thoroughfare. Also a granite rock would be installed in the planting bed where the clock was originally located listing the student artists’ names and recognizing the improvement project.
The Cultural Resources Commission did have some discussion around whether the art work featured should be that of students or of a professional artist. The Commission members voted and felt that local students would be a positive way to celebrate our youth and incorporate a unique, local aspect into the downtown project.

The timeline for the project is tight in order to coordinate with the 1st Ave contractor. Concrete template pieces will be placed in the sidewalk by the contractor as placeholders during construction and once all the granite pieces are complete they will be set in to replace the concrete templates. The aim is to hold the student workshop at the Leisure Centre in May or early June at the latest.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
This project supports Council’s lifestyle objective to “Encourage Public Art which is relevant to the community.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Funding for public art is included in the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department operating budget and is within the authority level for Department Head approval. The project cost is within budget.

COMMUNICATION:
PRC staff in conjunction with the Cultural Resources Commission and Mission Arts Council will oversee the project. An advertisement will go out locally to invite students to participate in a workshop to create the art work.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
This report is provided to Council for information purposes only. No staff recommendation accompanies this report.

SIGN-OFFS:

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
Appendix A – North Vancouver Centennial Project
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects
SUBJECT: Zoning Bylaw Review Project

RECOMMENDATION(S):
That Council receives this report as information. No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
To inform Council on the work plan and potential resource implications for the comprehensive review of the District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009. This report outlines the purpose of the review, approach, timeline and public consultation associated with the review. The timeline drafted anticipates that a new Zoning Bylaw would be adopted in the spring of 2019.

While there are other initiatives proposed to be undertaken by the Manager of Long Range Planning, those initiatives will be outlined in a subsequent report to Council that will be presented in the near future.

BACKGROUND:
On January 8, 2018 Council adopted Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw 5670-2017. The OCP is the District’s primary policy document and statement of objectives that guides decisions on planning and land use management. The Zoning Bylaw implements the policies set out in the OCP and is the regulatory tool that is specific to land use, density, building siting and other matters such as landscaping and lot coverage regulations. As the Zoning Bylaw falls under the umbrella of the OCP, it is important to ensure the Zoning Bylaw remains consistent with the goals and objectives of the OCP.

SCOPE OF WORK:
The Zoning Bylaw is the District’s primary regulatory document related to land use planning. Section 479 and 482 of the Local Government Act (LGA) states that a zoning bylaw may:

- divide the municipality into zones;
- list the permitted uses within a zone;
- provide regulations related to: density, size, shape and dimensions of buildings and structures (ex. height, setbacks, lot coverage etc.);
- regulate the shape, dimensions and area of parcels of land that may be created by
subdivision; and

- establish different density rules for a zone, one generally applicable for the zone and another applicable provided a certain condition is met, such as the provision of amenities or affordable/special needs housing.

Section 481 of the LGA states that a zoning bylaw may not:

- create regulations to prohibit or restrict the use of land for a farm business in a farming areas.

In addition to aligning the Zoning Bylaw with the new OCP, Council has also discussed and provided direction to staff to review a variety of land use issues relating to, but not limited to:

- secondary suites;
- form and character (massing) of single-family dwellings;
- compact residential lot development;
- Home Occupations;
- location and size of secondary dwelling units (coach house and garden cottage);
- potentially aligning the Zoning Bylaw with Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) regulations;
- recreational vehicle parking; and
- temporary/portable sheds.

In addition, staff has identified the need to update the Zoning Bylaw to reflect recent changes in the new OCP, including:

- increased density contemplated in the Suburban designation;
- the addition of new OCP designations, such as Neighbourhood Centre, Attached Multi-Unit Residential, Mid-Rise Multi-Unit Residential, Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential, Agriculture, Resource Industrial, Municipal Forest and Special Study Area;
- clearly established density and height targets; and
- establishment of specific policies related to the provision of affordable housing and aging in place.

The Zoning Bylaw review will take into consideration those items:

- listed in the LGA
- Council direction to staff to review
- staff identified issues; and
- those issues identified through the public feedback and the consultation process.

**APPROACH:**

A systematic and purposeful approach has been developed for the review of the Zoning Bylaw. Staff does not believe that a complete re-write of the Zoning Bylaw is necessary given the Bylaw’s overall support of the new OCP and tested applicability to land use planning. The approach staff will take towards the Zoning Bylaw review will include:
Ensuring consistency with OCP and Provincial Legislation

Section 478 of the LGA states that all bylaws adopted by the municipality must be consistent with the OCP. It is also important to ensure the Zoning Bylaw is consistent with other provincial legislation such as the *Transportation Act*, *Riparian Area Regulation* (RAR) and the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*.

Implementation of Best Practices

The Zoning Bylaw will be updated to reflect current best practices. Best practices are available through documents provided by various organizations including provincial government ministries as well as through jurisdictional comparisons of neighbouring municipalities' bylaws.

Modernization of Bylaw and Addressing Emerging Issues

The Zoning Bylaw does not address recent or pending changes to legislation, nor does it reflect the recent changes in market conditions within the Fraser Valley and Mission that have increased the variety and complexity of development applications. Some of the topic areas that will form part of the Zoning Bylaw review will include:

- pending legalization of recreational marihuana;
- anticipated increase in zoning powers for municipalities to regulate and require rental only housing;
- better management and regulation of secondary suites;
- improved clarity on density bonusing opportunities for the development industry in exchange for community benefits such as amenities, affordable housing and special needs housing;
- appropriate response to the shift from primarily single-family residential development applications to attached multi-unit residential applications which necessitates a review of the Multi-Unit Residential and Mixed-Use zones; and
- the increase in complexity of development applications, including:
  - requests to create air space parcels;
  - requests to build mixed-use commercial/residential developments involving multiple strata corporations;
  - requests to enter into Housing Agreements for the provision of affordable housing; and
  - mixed-use commercial/residential development.

Improving User Friendliness of Bylaw

While the Zoning Bylaw is generally straightforward to use and apply, there is an opportunity to increase the user friendliness of the document. This is often accomplished through better alignment of the zones to OCP land use designations as well as the addition of diagrams to illustrate key concepts within the Bylaw.

The review will update the Bylaw by the increasing the use of diagrams to illustrate key definitions and concepts, as well as update the language within the document to ensure it uses plain language and common everyday usages of terms.

Consolidation

Over the years, a wide variety of land use policies (“LAN” policies) have been developed to address a variety of issues. Staff have reviewed these policies and determined that some policies are more
regulatory in nature and therefore better incorporated into the Zoning Bylaw where other policies are deemed outdated or redundant and thus be repealed or replaced.

The review of the Zoning Bylaw will include a review of land use policies (LAN). Council’s consideration of a revised Zoning Bylaw will include accompanying recommendations to revise or repeal related policies and or to incorporate policies into the Zoning Bylaw.

**TIMELINE:**

Staff has identified a timeline that would conclude the review process and present a revised Zoning Bylaw in spring of 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Anticipated Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Commencement:</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Review and Issues Identification:</td>
<td>April to May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Council and Public Consultation:</td>
<td>May to June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Bylaw Preparation:</td>
<td>July 2018 to November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Council and Public Consultation as needed:</td>
<td>December 2018 to February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Approval Process:</td>
<td>March to April 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION:**

The review process will include multiple opportunities for the public to engage with the District:

**Website**

A webpage will be added to the District’s website. This page will include:

- general information regarding the process;
- a direct e-mail address for the public to contact staff; and
- a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) and associated answers.

**Open Houses**

A minimum of two open houses will be held to receive feedback from the public. Open houses will be held in June 2018 to gather preliminary public feedback and then additional open houses could be held in January 2019 to provide the public further opportunity to review the draft of the Bylaw. Although every open house will be open to the general public, it is expected that direct consultation with the building and development industry will be conducted. Additional public engagement opportunities can be considered as deemed necessary.

**District Committees**

The District’s Sustainable Housing Committee and Heritage Commission will be engaged as part of this review.
Outside Agencies

Outside agencies that will be engaged as part of this process include: Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD), Mission Downtown Business Association, Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce, Canadian Home Builders Association (Fraser Valley Chapter), Leq’á:mel First Nation, Sumas First Nation, Matsqui First Nation and Kwantlen First Nation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

While it is expected that the Zoning Bylaw review will be conducted using existing staff resources, no direct financial implications associated with this project have been identified at this time. Should additional resources be identified during the course of the project, staff will report back to Council on these matters along with periodic update on the progress of the project.

Ken Bourdeau, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects

Reviewed by:
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Hardeep Sidhu, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a 2-lot subdivision with secondary dwelling units
ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
- Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS:
32053 Trembath Avenue

APPLICANT:
D&D Design (Darren Hall)

OCP:
This application is in conformance with the current Attached Multi-Unit Residential OCP designation.

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: December 19, 2017
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to rezone 32053 Trembath Avenue to the Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision, and to allow for a secondary dwelling use on each property, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the application moving forward and such have listed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5733-2018-5050(289) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application was received from Darren Hall of D&D Design for the property located at 32053 Trembath Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to the Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision with the potential for secondary dwelling units, as shown in Appendix 3.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is approximately 1,502 m² (16,167 ft²) in size and is located in the Mission Core Neighbourhood. The subject property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling, which is to be demolished as part of the subdivision. District mapping does not indicate the presence of a watercourse on the property.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Attached Multi-Unit Residential in the OCP. The target zoning of RT465 Zone will allow the subdivision of the land into two (2) lots and will allow for a principal dwelling and accompanying secondary dwelling unit on each property in the form of a coach house, garden cottage or secondary suite. The proposed RT465 Zone provides for a minimum lot size of 465 m² (5,005 ft²). Proposed lots A and B both exceed the required lot size at 759.6 m² (8,176.2 ft²) and 742.6 m² (7,993.2 ft²), respectively.

The proposed rezoning conforms to OCP Policy 3.2.2 which states that higher density within established neighbourhoods should be encouraged to support walkability and to make the expansion of transit economically feasible.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within an urban residential neighbourhood comprised of single-family dwellings on generally large urban lots. The two (2) lot subdivision with secondary dwelling units will fit within the context of the surrounding properties and is believed to have little or no impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Servicing:

Municipal water and sanitary services are available to the property. Municipal storm sewer is not available on Trembath Avenue. As such, the existing storm sewer main shall be extended from Wren
Street to across the frontage of the subject site. The proposed lots will be required to connect to the municipal water, sanitary, and storm sewer services.

Upgrades to Trembath Avenue are limited to the extension of the existing curb and gutter to the east property line of the subject site.

**Tree Retention:**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of four (4) trees, two (2) trees for each of the two (2) lots created. This provision will be met as part of the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater) that will be removed except in the areas defined as (a) building envelope to a maximum of 2,000 m² (21,528 ft²) and (b) driveways.

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

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

**COMMUNICATION:**

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted a development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

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

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

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

**REFERRALS:**

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the proposed bylaw as outlined in Appendix 4.

**REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:**

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

1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve;
2. Engineering requirements for storm sewer extension, full-service municipal lots and road work completion must be satisfied; and

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

INFORMATIONAL NOTES

Approval of Development Permit DP17-044 (Multi-Unit Residential: Form & Character) is delegated to staff for approval.

SIGN-OFFS:

Hardeep Sidhu, Planning Technician

Reviewed by:
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32053 Trembath Avenue

PID: 010-264-795

Legal: Lot 3 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 21102
Appendix 2
Location Map

Subject Property: 32053 Trembath Avenue
Owner: Saroj Takkar
Applicant: D & D Design
Zoning: R558
OCP Designation: Attached Multi-unit Residential
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

April 12, 2018

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32053 Trembath Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: R568  PROPOSED ZONE: R568 (Subdivision into two lots)

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Trembath Avenue.
No upgrades required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
The residence is currently receiving sanitary service from Trembath Avenue.
No upgrades required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is not available on Trembath Avenue. The existing storm main shall be extended from Wren Street to the applicant’s frontage and will include all appurtenances including CB’s. Connection to the municipal system will be required at the time of subdivision. Refer to the District’s Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw 5650-2017, Sections 1, 2, 4 & 5.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Trembath Avenue currently has curb, gutter and sidewalk about 60 lineal meters west of the west property line. At the time of Subdivision the developer will have to extend the curb and gutter east to the east property line of the subject property. Refer to the District’s Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw 5650-2017, Sections 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to adoption once the Storm Sewer and Road Work requirements have been met.

Prepared by:
Rob Racine, Engineering Technologist

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

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Subdivision Proposal in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) at 9537 Manzer Street
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4 – Land Capability Assessment

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 9537 Manzer Street

APPLICANT: JB Marko Development Corp.
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Agriculture OCP designation.

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: March 12, 2018
LOCATION: Silverhill
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application for a subdivision in the Agricultural Land Reserve at the property located at 9537 Manzer Street.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That Agricultural Land Reserve Application ALR18-003 for a subdivision within the ALR be supported; and
2. That the resolution of support be forwarded to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC).

SUMMARY:

An application seeking Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) approval for subdivision has been submitted by JB Marko Development Corp. for the property at 9537 Manzer Street. The application proposes to subdivide the subject property under the existing Rural 16 (RU16) Zone. The proposed subdivision would create a total of two lots that are 1.77 hectares (4.37 acres) and 3.59 hectares (8.87 acres) in size (Appendix 3).

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject site is approximately 5.36 hectares (13.25 acres) in size and is located in the Silverhill neighbourhood south of Silverhill Avenue and west side of Manzer Street. The subject property is developed with a single family dwelling and various accessory buildings on the north portion of the site. Significant tree stands exist at the north, west and south property lines. A large wetland is located at the northwest portion of the property and a Class A watercourse running east to west bisects the property. The bisecting watercourse makes the south side of the property inaccessible as the existing driveway access is located on the north side of the property where the dwelling is located. Although not indicated on District mapping, a second watercourse is located near the southern property line as indicated by the draft plan of subdivision. The land gently slopes upward from east to west. Since much of the usable farmland is inaccessible, the land is not being actively farmed at this time.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Agriculture in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is zoned RU16, which allows for general agriculture as a permitted use.

The OCP supports growth and enhancement of the agriculture industry as the significance of such uses goes beyond economics and has broader implications for the community’s wildlife habitat, lifestyle, community character, local food security, and the environment. The proposed subdivision application to the ALC does not remove lands from the ALR. As such, it meets the District’s OCP Policy 4.3.6 to Support the ALC’s mandate to maintain the farming integrity of lands designated as ALR.

The proposed subdivision splits the property into two lots using the watercourse as the general location of the property line (Appendix 3). Proposed Lot 1 is 1.77 hectares (4.37 acres) in size and is located on the north side of the watercourse. Proposed Lot 2 is 3.59 hectares (8.87 acres) in size and is located on the south side of the watercourse. Both proposed lots conform to the existing RU16 Zone and as such, no rezoning is required. General agriculture uses are permitted within the Zoning Bylaw under the RU16 Zone as it allows for a wide range of agricultural uses such as the growing,
rearing, and harvesting of agricultural products. Manufacturing, processing, storage and repairs are specifically excluded under the general agriculture use.

Should the ALR application for subdivision on the subject lands be supported by the ALC, the applicant will still need to apply for a subdivision with the District at a later date.

**Land Capability Assessment**

A Land Capability Assessment (Appendix 4) was completed by Madrone Environmental Services and submitted with the application. The report identifies the main barrier to optimal use of the land as the watercourse which divides the lot into two pieces. The report suggests that the subdivision of land may enable more intensive use of both parcels of land providing an overall benefit for the agricultural production of land. The report also identifies various techniques to improve the drainage across the property for agricultural purposes.

**Neighbourhood Character:**

The subject property is located in the Silverhill neighbourhood north of the Silverdale Comprehensive Planning Area. Surrounding lands to the north, east, west and south are all within the RU16 Zone, designated as Agriculture in the OCP, and within the ALR. Although few properties are actively used for farming, some small scale hobby farming exists.

**COMMUNICATION:**

The Agricultural Land Commission Act does not require that the District send a mail notice, post a newspaper notification or hold a public hearing prior to decision on ALR subdivision applications.

In accordance with the District’s Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, no notification is required for an ALC subdivision application.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Wesley Woo, Planner  
Reviewed by:  
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer  
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 9537 Manzer Street

PID: 006-741-967

Legal: Lot 5 Section 35 Township 14 New Westminster District Plan 32696
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 9537 Manzer Street
Owner: David Friesen
Applicant: J. Brad Marko
Zoning: RU16
OCP Designation: Agriculture
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision Plan
LAND CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

9537 Manzer Street
Mission, B.C.

FOR:
Mr. J. Brad Marko
JB Marko Development Corporation
903 – 290 Newport Drive
Port Moody, B.C., V2H 5N2

BY:
Sharon Podesta, B.Sc., P.Ag.
Madrone Environmental Services Ltd.

SENIOR REVIEW BY:
Gordon Butt, M.Sc., P.Ag.
Madrone Environmental Services Ltd.

February 7, 2018
Executive Summary

Madrone Environmental Services Ltd. (Madrone) was retained by Mr. J. Brad Marko (the ‘client’) to conduct a soil survey and land capability assessment of the property located at 9537 Manzer Street in Mission, B.C. (the ‘Site’). This report is provided to Mr. Marko, who represents the owner, Mr. David Friesen, in conjunction with his application to subdivide the property.

This Land Capability Assessment (LCA) included a desktop review of published soil survey and land capability information for the Site, as well as an on-Site inspection. The key findings for this report are as follows:

1. Seven test pits were excavated across the Site, and revealed three distinct soil types: Orthic Dystric Brunisols, Orthic Humic Gleysols, and Gleyed Sombric Brunisols, generally consisting of sandy loam with little gravel content.
2. Based on our on-Site inspection, the Site ranges between a Class 3W to 4W, with excess moisture observed throughout the northern to western sides of the property. Slopes in some areas of the Site resulted in LCA ratings of Class 5 to 7T.
3. We conclude that the limitations for agricultural capability at this Site include the following:
   i. Excess moisture observed in some areas of the Site will cause crop damage or crop loss, based on the level of soil saturation we observed. This may be improved through the addition of drainage ditches or levelling.
   ii. Slopes along the watercourse which bisect the Site, and slopes at the southern end of the Site, present topographic limitations which cannot be improved upon.
   iii. The watercourse itself, which bisects the property to the south of the existing dwelling, presents the greatest physical limitation to optimal agricultural use of this Site. Access to the southern field is impossible without travelling on Manzer Road in order to cross the watercourse. This barrier would be difficult to overcome without costly measures, such as clearing trees and constructing a bridge on-Site.
4. It is our opinion that the barriers that exist on this property prevent intensive, optimal use of the land for agricultural purposes. While excess moisture may be improved in some areas, the physical topographic limitations will still present access barriers to the southern portion of the Site.
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1 Introduction

Madrone Environmental Services Ltd. (Madrone) was retained by Mr. J. Brad Marko (the ‘client’) to conduct a soil survey and land capability assessment of the property located at 9537 Manzer Street in Mission, B.C. (the ‘Site’). This report is provided to Mr. Marko, who represents the owner, Mr. David Friesen, in conjunction with his application to subdivide the property.

This report includes a desktop review of published government documentation, including soil surveys, climatic capability ratings, and land capability ratings, for the Site and surrounding area, and a review of limited aerial imagery (2004 to 2017). The desktop review is followed a summary of results for Madrone’s on-Site inspection, completed on December 22, 2017. A discussion of agricultural suitability and conclusions are presented at the end of the report.
2 Site Conditions and Land Use

2.1 Site Information

The following table provides general information about the Site with regards to its legal description and zoning details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Summary of Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel Identifier (PID)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Agricultural Land Reserve?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area (in hectares)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general location of the Site is shown in Figure 1 (Appendix A).

2.2 Land Use: Site and Surrounding Area

Aerial imagery for the Site and surrounding area dating back to 2004\(^1\) was reviewed, and shows no active farming on the Site during that time. The property is bisected by a watercourse, which runs east to west. In the 2004 imagery, the land to the north of the watercourse was occupied by the dwelling and out buildings, a grassy lawn, and a stand of trees. The land to the south of the watercourse was occupied by a former pasture, and a stand of trees along the western side of the property. There is no apparent change between this and the newest 2017 imagery. The following table summarizes the aerial imagery review for the surrounding area:

\(^{1}\) Available from Google Earth Pro
Table 2. Review of Aerial Imagery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Dwelling, Silverhill Ave., dwelling and cleared field, and fire hall and trees to the northwest.</td>
<td>Dwelling with barn and livestock paddocks, trees, cleared/cultivated field (tracks visible from tractor).</td>
<td>Dwelling with cleared grassy lawns and vehicles parked. Some shrubby vegetation cover to the southwest.</td>
<td>A grassy field, a dwelling with several cars parked on the lot, and trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The cleared field across Silverhill Ave. is covered in trees. The dwelling is partly visible. No other changes visible.</td>
<td>A structure has been built behind the existing dwelling, and several cars are parked throughout the property.</td>
<td>Much of the grass lawn cover around the property has been covered by gravel or similar material.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007, 2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013*, 2014, 2015, 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The field appears to have been cultivated, with visible rows arranged north-south. No obvious crops or shrubs are visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Across Silverhill Ave., the trees have been largely cleared again. The dwelling is still present in the southeast corner of the property.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Imagery from 2013 was observed to be very dark. Fine details were not visible, but no apparent changes in land use for the Site or surrounding properties were observed.

In general, the surrounding use has consisted of hobby farming, including some small-scale livestock and horse rearing. There are no large-scale commercial agricultural activities taking place in the surrounding area. Historic aerial imagery of the Site is attached in Appendix B.

The Site is presently not in use for farming purposes; however, we understand that historically it has been used for livestock grazing. The property is bisected by the watercourse “UNC 27”, which is identified on DoM’s webmap as a “permanent fish-bearing watercourse”. The present configuration of the Site matches that which was observed in the aerial imagery. A single dwelling and some out buildings (a work shop and
a firewood storage structure) are located to the north of UNC 27, and the former pasture is located to the south of the watercourse. The banks of the watercourse and the southern, northern and western perimeters of the Site are treed. These areas consist largely of Western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*), Western Hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), Red Alder (*Alnus rubra*), and Bigleaf Maple (*Acer macrophyllum*). Other vegetation observed on the Site included Himalayan Blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), and Western Sword Fern (*Polystichum munitum*).

No drainage ditches are located on the Site or along Manzer Street. Based on the topography of the Site, groundwater and surface water is inferred to flow to the west, toward Silvermere Lake. Localized drainage may flow into UNC 27, as it is approximately 5 m lower than the surrounding grade on the Site. iMap BC\(^2\) shows two groundwater wells on the north side of the Site, for the purpose of private domestic use. The well summary for “Well Tag No. 1192” is registered to Herman Suttorp, and does not show any construction details for the well.\(^3\) “Well Tag No. 9593” is registered to R. Sparrow, and has a recorded finished well depth of 4.8 m, with a water level of 2.4 m. The lithology is limited for this well, recorded as “Glacial gravel and hardpan”.\(^4\) Both wells are listed as unlicensed. We understand that the Site obtains its water from one of these water wells. A water well identified as Tag No. 58022\(^5\), located approximately 480 m to the south and at similar elevation to the Site, was drilled to a finished depth of 68.6 m, and shows interbedded bedrock sandstone, black shale, and gray sandstone throughout the lithology record. Its static water level is recorded at 20.7 m depth, and an estimated well yield of 1 gallon per minute (0.06 litres per second).

The land to the north of the Site is used for a private residence, followed by Silverhill Avenue, followed by a fire hall and a house, which appears to be vacant, and an abandoned field or pasture. The adjacent eastern property is occupied by a house and livestock paddocks for horses. To the south are more dwellings, with potential livestock paddocks

---

\(^2\) iMap BC webmap layer “Fresh Water Wells”: https://maps.gov.bc.ca/ess/sv/imapbc/, accessed January 11, 2018

\(^3\) Well Summary for Well Tag No. 1192: https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/gwells/well/1192, accessed January 11, 2018

\(^4\) Well Summary for Well Tag No. 9593: https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/gwells/well/9593, accessed January 11, 2018

\(^5\) Well Summary for Well Tag No. 58022: https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/gwells/well/58022, accessed January 11, 2018
(though no livestock was observed). The property to the west of the Site is occupied by a dwelling and a cultivated field, though no crops were observed.

2.3 Surficial Geology and Topography

Armstrong (1980) mapped the surficial geology of this area on a coarse scale, which may not be accurate at the local scale and was verified on Site. Mission, B.C. is covered on map sheet number 1485A, at a scale of 1:50,000. According to the map, the Site and surrounding area is underlain by Sumas Drift recessional glaciofluvial deposits, including recessional channels and floodplain deposits from proglacial streams. The deposits are described as having gravel and sand up to 40 m thick, with an average range of 5 to 25 m thickness.

The Site is situated in Silverhill within the District of Mission (DoM), located to the east of Silvermere Lake and southeast of Hayward Lake. The regional topography slopes down toward Silvermere Lake, and the approximate elevation of the Site is 110 m, based on municipal topographic data6. The former pasture and the areas surrounding the existing buildings are generally flat or gently sloped. Steep slopes were observed around the watercourse, and at the southern end of the Site. We observed no bedrock exposures on the property or adjacent areas.

2.4 Review of Published Maps and Information

This section includes a review of available published government studies including soil surveys, regional agricultural capability ratings, and climatic capability ratings based strictly on regional climate data (primarily precipitation and temperature).

Soil survey and land capability data was obtained from the BC Ministry of Environment (MOE) Report No. 15 Soil Survey, Soil of the Langley-Vancouver Map Area, (1980): Volumes 2, 3, 5, and 6; and the accompanying mapping at a scale of 1:25,000 and 1:50,000. These maps were based on reconnaissance-level soil surveys and air photo interpretation, and represent a broad interpretation of soils and agricultural capability. The Site is captured on map sheet 92 G/1e (“Whonnock”) at a scale of 1:25,000 (Luttmelring, 1986). The characteristics of the surveyed soils and the LCA ratings for the Site and surrounding area are summarized below. It should be noted that the broad interpretation of agricultural land

---

6 District of Mission webmap layer “Contours 2013”: [https://map.mission.ca/Html5Viewer/?Viewer=External](https://map.mission.ca/Html5Viewer/?Viewer=External), accessed January 10, 2018
capability recorded in this series of map does not take precedence over the site-specific assessment in this report.

The existing soil resource information indicates that the Site is underlain by Duric and Orthic Humo-Ferric Podzols, within the Keystone and Stave soil series (70% and 30%, respectively) (Luttmerding, 1981). These soil series have developed on well to rapidly drained, silty loess material overlying gravelly outwash or glacial till at depths of 20 to 100 cm. This information aligns with Armstrong (1980), which shows the underlying surficial geology as Sumas Drift glaciofluvial deposits, as discussed in Section 2.2.

The climatic capability rating for the Site and surrounding area, as mapped by Coligado (1981), is Class 1(1), which indicates a Climate Moisture Surplus of <0.34 mm during the growing season when compared against the potential evapotranspiration for the area.

A system for rating agricultural capability is provided in Land Capability Classification for Agriculture in British Columbia, MOE Manual 1 (Kenk and Cotic, 1983), which was used in the published LCA map series. LCA ratings are assigned, dependent upon soil and site conditions, according to specific criteria presented by Kenk and Cotic. The rating system includes a numerical classification, Classes 1 through 7, and an alphabetical subclass rating based upon existing limitations for agricultural activities. Class 1 is the best rating for land capability, and well suited to a variety of crops and activities, whereas Class 7 is considered incapable of supporting crop cultivation or sustained livestock grazing. Numerical ratings preceded by an ‘O’ indicate organic soil, rather than mineral soil.

The limitation subclasses include soil moisture deficiency or aridity (A), adverse climate (C), undesirable soil structure and/or low perviousness (D), erosion (E), fertility (F), inundation (I), stoniness (P), depth to solid bedrock and/or rockiness (R), topography (T), excess water (W), and permafrost (Z). An unimproved rating indicates the land capability of an area without any inputs; improved ratings indicate the land capability of the same area following inputs such as fertilizer, irrigation, tillage, and other land improvements. Adverse topography cannot be improved.

The published LCA rating for the Site is 60% Class 4T, 40% Class 3TAP (Luttmerding, 1986). This rating is based on agricultural restrictions related to the local topography (T), which will create access limitations for agricultural machinery, decrease the growth and maturity of crops, and potentially increasing water erosion on slopes. The lesser

---

limitations of seasonal aridity (A) and stoniness (P) will restrict the range of crops and
require moderately intensive management practices at a Class 3 rating; with irrigation and
stone removal or placement of topsoil, the LCA rating may be improved to 60% Class 4T,
40% Class 3T, as topography cannot be improved.

3 On-Site Inspection and Observations
Madrone completed an on-Site inspection of the Site on December 22, 2017, which
included a Site walk-about to observe the environmental conditions, such as general local
topography, conditions around the watercourse UNC 27, configuration of Site buildings,
and general types of vegetation around the Site. The weather was clear and dry, and a
previous snowfall event had resulted in approximately 15 cm of snow covering most of the
Site’s ground surface. Seven test pits (‘TP1’ through ‘TP7’) were excavated across the
property, in order to observe and characterize the subsurface soil conditions to a
maximum depth of 85 cm below ground surface (bgs). The methods and results of our test
pit inspections are summarized in this section.

3.1 Methods for on-Site Inspection
Seven soil test pits (‘TP1’ through ‘TP7’) were excavated at depths between 60 and 85 cm
bgs, using a small tractor-excavator and a shovel, on December 22, 2017. The soil test pits
and Site features were mapped and photographed (Appendix A, Figure 2; and Appendix
D). The soil profiles were inspected and characterized according to the Canadian System of
Soil Classification, Third Edition (Soil Classification Working Group, 1998). The soil colours
were described by comparing moist soil samples to the Munsell Soil Colour Charts. A total
of six soil samples were collected in lab-supplied ziplock bags and submitted to AGAT
Laboratories in Burnaby, B.C., for analysis of available nitrates (NO3-N), phosphorus (P),
potassium (K), sulfur (SO4-S), pH, electrical conductivity, and organic matter content.
The laboratory analytical results are attached in Appendix E, and may be used for fertilizer
recommendations.

3.2 Soil Descriptions
Test pit soil profiles for TP1 through TP7 are included in Appendix C. It should be noted
that the soils encountered during our field investigation differed from those identified in
existing published literature; we attribute this to the large scale of those published studies
between 1:25,000 and 1:50,000, a scale too broad to capture the subtle variations in site
conditions that were observed during our test pit excavations. Our on-Site investigation
provides a fine-scale (approximately 1:5,000) study of the soils present on the property.
TP1 was excavated in the northeastern corner of the property, which is part of the residence’s lawn. Aerial imagery dating back to 2004 shows the Site in its current configuration, with the northwestern portion of the Site being used as a lawn for the residence. It remains a part of the lawn at present, with a predominant surface cover of lawn grasses such as Kentucky bluegrass. At the time of the excavation, approximately 10 cm of snow covered the ground, and the top 10 to 15 cm of soil was somewhat frozen. The test pit was excavated to a final depth of approximately 60 cm bgs, and water was observed entering the pit at approximately 55 cm. The soil was characterized as two Bm mineral horizons, consisting of dark brown sandy loam throughout the soil profile, and an estimated 5% fine gravel and 2% coarse gravel below 50 cm. Madrone determined that the soil was fill material, likely placed on the Site during the initial development of the property, and was not a native soil profile. Based on the observed characteristics of this test pit, we determine this to be an Orthic Dystric Brunisol (O.DYB.).

TP2 was located to the northwest of the house on the property, to the south of a stand of trees. Similar to TP1, the surface cover was grassy lawn, predominantly consisting of Kentucky bluegrass; however, TP2 was located approximately 4 m lower in elevation. TP2 had a well-developed Ah horizon consisting of sandy loam. The underlying Bg horizon contained an estimated 5% fine gravel and coarse gravel (each), and approximately 2% cobbles. We determine this to be an Orthic Humic Gleysol (O.HG.).

TP3 was situated in the stand of trees at the north end of the Site, to the west of a very wet area around two groundwater wells belonging to the Site and the neighbouring property. Though TP3 had significantly more organic overlying material, due to forest litter in varying stages of decay, the stratigraphy proved to be similar to that of TP2 and we determined this to also be an Orthic Humic Gleysol. TP2 and TP3 comprise a second distinct soil group from the initial fill material profile observed in TP1.

TP4 through TP7 were all located to the south of the watercourse on the Site; TP4, 5, and 6 were all located in the disused field area, which was seen to be very gently sloping to the west. TP7 was excavated in the stand of trees at the west side of the property. All showed a general progression from a sandy loam Ah horizon, into a loamy sand Bmgj horizon, followed by an underlying sand Bg horizon, with the exception of TP7 which had a Bg horizon consisting of sandy loam to sandy clay loam. All four test pits had between 5 and 20% fine to coarse gravels. TP4, TP6, and TP7 were identified as an Orthic Humic Gleysols, and TP4 showed characteristics nearing a Gleyed Sombric Brunisol (G.SB.) classification. TP5 was identified as a Gleyed Sombric Brunisol due to the Bg horizon being greater than 50 cm from the surface.
Site photographs are attached in Appendix D.

4 Discussion of Agricultural Suitability

The soils on the Site consist of Orthic Dystric Brunisols, Orthic Humic Gleysols, and Gleyed Sombric Brunisols. The majority of the test pits consisted mostly of sandy loam with little gravel content. We believe that the parent material for these soils are glaciomarine sediments, deposited when this area was beneath a shallow marine sea. This is consistent with the available published literature for the area. As the majority of the Site is covered by grass, the amount of organic material was greatest in test pits excavated in the treed areas of the Site. We infer from TP1 that the area around the building structures on the northern portion of the property was filled at some point, and that the soil profile observed there was disturbed.

In addition to the soil groups identified during test pitting, topography also varied across the Site. Topographic boundaries, coupled with results from the soil inspections, were used to define eight land Soil Map Units which were rated based on the Land Capability Classification for Agriculture in British Columbia, MOE Manual 1 characteristics. These polygons are shown on Figure 2 in Appendix A. The following table summarizes the land capability polygons identified by this assessment, including their Unimproved and Improved Capability ratings:

Table 3. Soil Map Units and LCA Ratings on-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Map Unit</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>% of total area</th>
<th>Soil Classification</th>
<th>Unimproved Capability</th>
<th>Improved Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>O.HG.</td>
<td>4W</td>
<td>3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>O.HG.</td>
<td>4W</td>
<td>3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C and E*</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>O.HG.</td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>O.DyB.</td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Inferred to be O.HG.</td>
<td>5T</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>G.SB., O.HG.</td>
<td>3 to 4W</td>
<td>3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>G.SB.</td>
<td>4W</td>
<td>3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>O.HG.</td>
<td>7T</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Polypgons C and E are discontiguous polygons which are likely of the same classification, but were disturbed by filling for the construction of the dwelling, driveway and other structures.

These Unimproved and Improved Capability ratings are discussed in further detail below.
4.1 Topography

Watercourse UNC 27 is deeply incised, and bisects the Site running east-to-west. It has created steep side walls on its north and south banks, giving it a 5T classification, which encompasses simple slopes between 21 to 30% and complex slopes between 16 to 30%. Slopes at the south end of the Site are classified as 7T, which encompasses all slopes greater than 30%. Our classifications are based on several clinometer readings in the field, as well as measurements based on available topographic data from the DoM. These topographic limitations cannot be improved upon.

Moderately to steeply sloped areas of the Site are susceptible to erosion without sufficient tree and shrub ground cover, or artificial erosion and sediment control measures in place. The sloped areas at or above a 5T classification are unsuitable for cultivation of crops.

Furthermore, the watercourse presents a physical obstruction between the two sides of the property, which would be costly to address (by way of clearing trees, constructing a bridge). The only access to the former pasture located to the south of watercourse UNC 27 is by exiting the northern portion of the property, driving southbound on Manzer Street, and accessing the field through a gate.

4.2 Excess Moisture and Drainage

At the time of the field investigation in December, there was snow covering the ground and frost was observed in the top 10 to 15 cm of the soil profiles. Madrone observed that the northern portion of the Site is extremely wet and poorly drained; the ground was saturated and standing water was observed in several areas. Most of the test pits began filling with groundwater and surface water percolation within minutes of excavation.

Based on these observations, the Site is deemed to range between a Class 3 to Class 4W, with the greatest excess moisture limitations being observed in the northern portion of the property. Class 3W indicates an “occasional occurrence of excess water during the growing period, which can cause minor crop damage, but no crop loss, or the occurrence of excess moisture in the winter months causing damage to perennial crops” (Kenk and Cotic, 1983). Class 4W indicates more frequent occurrences of excess moisture which may result in crop damage and loss. With improvements to drainage, such as ditches or subsurface measures, the rating may be improved to a Class 2 to 3W.

These gentler sloping areas (5-10%) may be suitable for cultivating climatically adapted crops such as legumes, blueberries, cereals, cole crops, corn, nursery and Christmas trees,
perennial forage crops, root crops, shallow rooted annual vegetables, strawberries and tree fruits. Irrigation and/or drainage measures may be required to account for seasonal wetness and moisture deficit limitations (Bertrand et al. 1991).

### Conclusion

While the Site has some topographic limitations which cannot be improved upon, and are considered unsuitable for crop cultivation, these areas comprise only approximately 12 to 13% of the total area of the property. Approximately 75% of the Site is rated as a Class 4W, which indicates frequent excess water which may damage or destroy crops during the growing season, or during the winter months for perennial crops. However, this may be improved upon via improvements to drainage across the Site, using ditching and leveling to relieve some of the excess moisture from low-lying areas. Class 3W, which comprises the remainder of the property, indicates only occasional excess moisture, and can be improved to a Class 2W with drainage mitigation measures.

The main barrier to optimal use of this land is the watercourse which divides the lot into two pieces. It creates an obstacle for accessing the southern portion of the property, which historically has never been used for large-scale agriculture or crop production. A subdivision of the land may enable more intensive use of both parcels of land, separately, providing an overall benefit for the agricultural production of the land.

Yours Truly,

Prepared by: Sharon Podesta, P.Ag.  
Reviewed by: Gordon Butt, P.Ag.  
Environmental Scientist  
Senior Agrologist  
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Limitations

The evaluations contained in this report are based on professional judgment, calculations, and experience. They are inherently imprecise. Soil, agricultural, hydrological, and drainage conditions other than those indicated above may exist on the site. If such conditions are observed, Madrone should be contacted so that this report may be reviewed and amended accordingly.

The recommendations contained in this report pertain only to the site conditions observed by Madrone at the time of the inspection. This report was prepared considering circumstances applying specifically to the client. It is intended only for internal use by the client for the purposes for which it was commissioned and for use by government agencies regulating the specific activities to which it pertains. It is not reasonable for other parties to rely on the observations or conclusions contained herein.

Madrone completed the field survey and prepared the report in a manner consistent with current provincial standards and on par or better than the level of care normally exercised by Professional Agrologists currently practicing in the area under similar conditions and budgetary constraints. Madrone offers no other warranties, either express or implied.
FIGURE 2: Land Capability Assessment

Inferred to have the same properties as TP2

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
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*SITE BOUNDARIES ARE APPROXIMATE*

2004 Google Earth Pro Imagery
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**TP1 - Soil Profile Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 - 0</td>
<td>Grass and moss (lawn).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bm1</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>Sandy loam, dark brown, moist, very weak sub-angular blocky, non-stony. Dense fine roots 0 to 3 cm, plentiful fine to medium roots below 3 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bm2</td>
<td>10 - 50</td>
<td>As Bm1, but with few fine to medium roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>As above, with an estimated 5% fine gravel, 2% coarse gravel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample collected at 15 - 25 cm.  
Classification: Orthic Dystric Brunisol (O,DYB.)

**TP2 - Soil Profile Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 - 0</td>
<td>Grass and moss (lawn).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>Sandy loam, dark brown to brown, moist, very weak sub-angular blocky structure, friable, non-stony. Plentiful fine to medium roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bmgj</td>
<td>40 - 85+</td>
<td>Brown, with 5% fine gravel, 5% coarse gravel, 2% cobbles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample collected at 15 - 25 cm.  
Classification: Orthic Humic Gleysol (O,HG.)

**TP3 - Soil Profile Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFH</td>
<td>5 - 0</td>
<td>Moss, decomposing organic material (wood, leaves, plant matter).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>0 - 18</td>
<td>Sandy loam+, very dark brown with mottles of brown, moist, weak sub-angular blocky structure, friable. Abundant fine to medium roots, plentiful coarse roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg</td>
<td>18 - 50+</td>
<td>Very fine Sandy Loam, brown, wet, with few roots. Standing water in the test pit below 45 cm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample collected at 20 - 30 cm.  
Classification: Orthic Humic Gleysol (O,HG.)

**TP4 - Soil Profile Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFH</td>
<td>5 - 0</td>
<td>Grass and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>0 - 24</td>
<td>Sandy loam, dark brown, moist, friable. Abundant fine to medium roots to 10 cm depth. Plentiful roots between 10 and 24 cm depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bmgj</td>
<td>24 - 48</td>
<td>Loamy sand with 5% fine gravel, 80% fine to medium sand. Brown, faint coarse motting. Few fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg</td>
<td>48 - 75+</td>
<td>Sand with 10% fine gravel, 5% coarse gravel. Brown, firm, no roots. Distinct upper boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample collected at 15 - 22 cm.  
Classification: Orthic Humic Gleysol (O,HG.) (approaching Gleyed Sombric Brunisol, G,SB.)
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#### TP5 – Soil Profile Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFH</td>
<td>5 - 0</td>
<td>Grass and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>0 - 15</td>
<td>Sandy loam, dark brown, moist, friable. Plentiful fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bmgj</td>
<td>15 - 60</td>
<td>Loamy sand, 20% fine gravel, 5% coarse gravel. Brown, moist, friable. Very few fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg</td>
<td>60 - 85+</td>
<td>Sand, 20% fine gravel, 10% coarse gravel, brown, wet, single-grained structure, firm to slightly cemented. No roots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample collected at 20 - 30 cm.
Classification: Gleyed Sombric Brunisol (G.SB.)

#### TP6 – Soil Profile Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFH</td>
<td>5 - 0</td>
<td>Grass and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>0 - 26</td>
<td>Sandy loam, very dark brown, moist, friable, plentiful roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bmgj</td>
<td>26 - 41</td>
<td>Loamy sand, dark brown, moist, friable to loose, no roots, no gravel detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg</td>
<td>41 - 70+</td>
<td>Sandy loam to sandy clay loam with 20% gravels, 10% cobbles, brown to strong brown, moist, firm, coarse angular blocky structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample collected at 15 - 25 cm.
Classification: Orthic Humic Gleysol (O.HG.)

#### TP7 – Soil Profile Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFH</td>
<td>5 - 0</td>
<td>Grass and moss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
<td>Sandy loam, dark brown, moist, friable. No gravel detected. Plentiful medium roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg</td>
<td>41 – 76+</td>
<td>Sandy clay loam with 15% gravel, brown to strong brown, wet, firm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No sample collected.
Classification: Orthic Humic Gleysol (O.HG.)
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Appendix D

Site Photographs
Photo 1: TP1 soil profile.
Photo 2: TP2 soil profile.
Photo 3: Wet conditions to the north side of the Site.
Photo 4: TP3 soil profile.
Photo 5: TP4 soil profile.
Photo 6: TP5 soil profile.
Photo 7: TP6 soil profile.
Photo 8: TP7 soil profile.
Photo 9: Slope down to the watercourse, facing south, from the north bank.
Photo 10: Southern slopes classified as 7T (facing south/southwest).
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AGAT Laboratories Analytical Report
CLIENT NAME: MADRONE ENVIRONMENTAL
202 - 2790 Gladwin Road
ABBOTSFORD, BC   V2T 4S7
(604) 504-1972

ATTENTION TO: Sharon Podesta

PROJECT: 17.0452

AGAT WORK ORDER: 18V299936

SOIL ANALYSIS REVIEWED BY: Krystyna Krauze, Senior Analyst

DATE REPORTED: Jan 15, 2018

PAGES (INCLUDING COVER): 6

VERSION*: 1

Should you require any information regarding this analysis please contact your client services representative at (403) 735-2005

*NOTES

All samples will be disposed of within 30 days following analysis. Please contact the lab if you require additional sample storage time.
## Certificate of Analysis

**AGAT WORK ORDER:** 18V299936  
**PROJECT:** 17.0452  
**CLIENT NAME:** MADRONE ENVIRONMENTAL  
**ATTENTION TO:** Sharon Podesta  
**SAMPLED BY:**

### Nutrients Package 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>TP1-1 (Soil 2017-12-22)</th>
<th>TP2-1 (Soil 2017-12-22)</th>
<th>TP3-1 (Soil 2017-12-22)</th>
<th>TP4-1 (Soil 2017-12-22)</th>
<th>TP5-1 (Soil 2017-12-22)</th>
<th>TP6-1 (Soil 2017-12-22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Nitrate (NO₃-N)</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Phosphorus - P</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Potassium</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Sulfur (SO₄-S)</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (1:1 Extraction)</td>
<td>pH Units</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity (1:1 Extraction)</td>
<td>dS/m</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter (W-B Wet Oxidation)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE RECEIVED:** 2018-01-05  
**DATE REPORTED:** 2018-01-15  

Comments:  
- RDL - Reported Detection Limit  
- G / S - Guideline / Standard  
- Analysis based on dry weight  
- Note: Organic sample  
- Analysis based on dry weight

**Certified By:**

---

Results relate only to the items tested and to all the items tested.
### Soil Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>Sample Id</th>
<th>Dup #1</th>
<th>Dup #2</th>
<th>RPD</th>
<th>Method Blank</th>
<th>Measured Value</th>
<th>Acceptorable Limits Lower</th>
<th>Acceptorable Limits Upper</th>
<th>Acceptorable Limits Recovery</th>
<th>METHOD BLANK SPIKE</th>
<th>MATRIX SPIKE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrients Package 5</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>117% 80% 120%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Nitrate (NO3-N)</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>90% 80% 120%</td>
<td>108% 80% 120%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Phosphorus - P</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>&lt; 8</td>
<td>99% 80% 120%</td>
<td>90% 80% 120%</td>
<td>100% 80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Sulfur (SO4-S)</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>98% 80% 120%</td>
<td>98% 80% 120%</td>
<td>81% 80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (1:1 Extraction)</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>2629</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% 90% 110%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity (1:1</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>2629</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>96% 80% 120%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter (W-B Wet</td>
<td>9002628</td>
<td>9002630</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.30</td>
<td>93% 80% 120%</td>
<td>100% 80% 120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: If Matrix spike value is NA, the spiked analyte concentration was lower than that of the matrix contribution. If the RPD value is NA, the results of the duplicates are under 5X the RDL and will not be calculated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>AGAT S.O.P</th>
<th>Literature Reference</th>
<th>Analytical Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Nitrate (NO₃-N)</td>
<td>SOIL 0110; SOIL 0120; SOIL 0130</td>
<td>SHEPPARD 2007, ALBERTA AGRICULTURE 1988</td>
<td>DISCRETE ANALYZER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Phosphorus - P</td>
<td>SOIL 0110; SOIL 0120; SOIL 0130</td>
<td>SHEPPARD 2007, ALBERTA AGRICULTURE 1988</td>
<td>DISCRETE ANALYZER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Potassium</td>
<td>SOIL 0110; SOIL 0120; SOIL 0131; INST 0140</td>
<td>SHEPPARD 2007, ALBERTA AGRICULTURE 1988</td>
<td>ICP/OES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Sulfur (SO₄-S)</td>
<td>SOIL 0110; SOIL 0120; SOIL 0131; INST 0140</td>
<td>SHEPPARD 2007, KOWALENKO 1993</td>
<td>ICP/OES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (1:1 Extraction)</td>
<td>INST 0111;</td>
<td>HENDERSHOT 2007</td>
<td>PH METER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INST 0140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity (1:1 Extraction)</td>
<td>SOIL 0121</td>
<td>ASA 10 - 2.3</td>
<td>CONDUCTIVITY METER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter (W-B Wet Oxidation)</td>
<td>SOIL 0480; SOIL 0110; SOIL 0120</td>
<td>NELSON 1996; SHEPPARD 2007</td>
<td>SPECTROPHOTOMETER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results relate only to the items tested and to all the items tested.
### Chain of Custody Record

#### Report Information
- **Company:** Madrone Environmental Services
- **Contact:** Sharon Podesta
- **Address:** 202-2790 Gladwin Rd, Abbotsford, V2T 4L7
- **Phone:** 604-504-4932
- **AGAT Quote #:**
- **Client Project #:** 176.045.2

#### Invoice To
- **Company:**
- **Contact:** Lorrance Butt
- **Address:** lorran.butt@madrone.ca
- **Phone:**
- **Fax:**
- **PO/AFE #:**

#### Laboratory Use Only
- **Arrival Temperature:**
- **AGAT Job Number:**
- **Notes:**
- **Turnaround Time Required (TAT):**
- **Regular TAT:** 5 to 7 working days
- **Rush TAT:**
  - Day 2: 100%
  - Day 3: 50%
  - Day 4: 25%
- **Date Required:**

#### Requirements (Please Check)
- **BC CSR Soil**
- **BC CSR - Water**
  - AL
  - IL
  - PL
  - CL
  - RL

#### Sample Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAB ID #</th>
<th>SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>SAMPLE MATRIX</th>
<th>DATE/TIME SAMPLED</th>
<th>COMMENTS - SITE SAMPLE INFO. SAMPLE CONTAINMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900.624</td>
<td>TP1-1</td>
<td>016, Dec. 22, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>TP2-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>TP3-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>TP4-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>TP5-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>TP6-1</td>
<td>016, Dec. 22, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Schedule
- **Schedule 11:**
- **CCME:**
- **Other:**

#### Laboratory Use
- **Number of Containers:**
- **Preserved (Y/N):**

---

**Sharon Podesta**

**Date/Time:**

**Samples Received By:** Ann [Signature]

**Date/Time:**

**Samples Requsted By:** [Signature]

**Date/Time:**

**No:** 022186

---
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## Appendix 4

**AGAT Laboratories**

**SAMPLE INTEGRITY RECEIPT FORM - BURNABY**

Work Order #: 18V299936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIVING BASICS:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received From:</td>
<td>Purlator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE QUANTITIES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coolers:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME SENSITIVE ISSUES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earliest Date Sampled:</td>
<td>Dec 22, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-CONFORMANCE:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 temperatures of samples* and average of each cooler: (record differing temperatures on the CoC next to sample ID’s)*use jars when available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) $T_1 + T_2 + T_3$ $^\circ$C</td>
<td>(2) $\ldots$ $= \ldots$ $^\circ$C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Was ice or ice pack present: | Yes | No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity Issues:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Project Manager:</th>
<th>have they been notified of the above issues:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whom spoken to:</td>
<td>Date and Time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL NOTES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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DATE: May 7, 2018

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician

SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 33234 Whidden Avenue

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Site Plan
- Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33234 Whidden Avenue

APPLICANT: Heather Gherman

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

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: January 31, 2018

LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to rezone 33234 Whidden Avenue to the Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5728-2018-5050(286) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Heather Gherman for the property located at 33234 Whidden Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite within an existing house.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is located in the Mission Core area. The subject property fronts Whidden Avenue and is situated to the west of Cade Barr Street. District mapping does not indicate the presence of a watercourse however the rear of the property slopes considerably down to the south.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Urban Residential in the OCP and is zoned R558. The proposal to rezone to the R558s Zone will allow a secondary dwelling unit.

The proposed rezoning conforms to OCP Policy 5.1.26 which encourages rezoning for secondary dwelling units as a form of infill housing. Secondary dwelling units may be considered on lots that are large enough to accommodate the following associated elements: on-site parking, private outside space, separate entrance that is clearly secondary to the primary dwelling and scale of the secondary dwelling must clearly be ancillary to the primary use.

The subject property is 2,387 m² (25,693 ft²) in size which exceeds the minimum lot size of 558 m² (6,006 ft²) in the proposed R558s Zone.

The proposed secondary suite is 89.9 m² (968 ft²) in area which is less than the maximum allowance of 90.0m² (968.8 ft²) permitted under the Zoning Bylaw. The applicant has supplied a site plan that shows ample parking space and a floor plan that shows a separate entrance for the suite, both of which are requirements of the Zoning Bylaw. A site plan showing the proposed addition location is attached as Appendix 3.

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

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within an urban residential neighbourhood comprised of single family dwellings on larger lots. The proposed secondary dwelling unit will fit within the context of the surrounding properties and is believed to have little impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.
Typically, complaints that arise from secondary suites relate to inadequate off-street parking. As noted, this proposal meets the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

COMMUNICATION:

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

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

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

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

REFERRALS:

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the rezoning application provided servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 4 have been met.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

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

1. Confirmation that the existing municipal water system has the capacity to service both the existing dwelling and proposed secondary suite or, if not, that a new system can be installed;

2. Municipal storm sewer has been extended and connected to the property or an onsite rock pit has been designed (report to be submitted and accepted) by an engineer;

3. Any requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including public hearing.
SIGN-OFFS:

Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 33234 Whidden Avenue
PID: 012-749-028
Legal: Lot 19 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster Plan NWP27849
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 33234 Whidden Avenue
Owner: Terry Gherman
Applicant: Heather Gherman
Zoning: R558
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Appendix 3

Site Plan
Appendix 4

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

April 10, 2016

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33234 Whidden Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: R550 PROPOSED ZONE: R550s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Whidden Avenue and the existing service is a 19mm copper
installed in 1973. The applicant's engineer shall determine the size of service based on the
increased domestic loading and sprinklering requirements.
Engineered design required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
The residence is currently receiving sanitary service from Whidden Avenue.
No upgrades required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is two lots away from the west and three lots away from the east.
Options include extending the existing storm main to the applicant's frontage or retaining an
engineer to design (report to be submitted and accepted) an onsite rock pit.
Engineered design required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Whidden Avenue provides paved access to the parcel.
No upgrades are required.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to adoption once the servicing
requirements have been met.

Prepared by:
Rob Rosine, Engineering Technologist

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

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

FILE: 08-3318-17-064
R17-040 (P3917-064)
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application to allow a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite at the property located at 31712 Bench Avenue

ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Site Plan
Appendix 4 – Proposed Addition
Appendix 5 – Draft Development Variance Permit DV18-004
Appendix 6 – Draft Development Variance Permit DV18-005
Appendix 7 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 31712 Bench Avenue

APPLICANT: Jeremy Sale
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Suburban Residential OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: January 2, 2018
LOCATION: Israel Bench
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the development application to rezone 31712 Bench Avenue to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit, and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw 5729-2018-5050(287) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff also support the Development Variance Permit application which will be listed for Council’s consideration under the “Permits for Consideration” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amending Bylaw.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Jeremy Sale for the property located at 31712 Bench Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling (S36s) Zone to allow the installation of a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite within an existing house.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is located in the Israel Bench neighbourhood area of Mission. The subject property fronts Bench Avenue and is situated to the east of Nelson Street. The subject property is currently developed with a single family dwelling and a detached garage. The applicant has proposed to connect the existing single family dwelling to the detached garage with a new addition. While there is a steep slope situated approximately 30 metres away from the front property line, there remains a small building envelope on the north end of the property.

PLANNING ANALYSIS:

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The proposed rezoning to the S36s Zone conforms to OCP Policy 5.1.26 which encourages rezoning for secondary dwelling units as a form of infill housing. Secondary dwelling units may be considered on lots that are large enough to accommodate the following associated provisions: on-site parking, private outdoor space, separate entrance that is clearly secondary to the primary dwelling and that the scale of the secondary dwelling must clearly be ancillary to the primary use.

The subject property is 4,756 m² (51,193 ft²) in size which exceeds the minimum lot size of 3,600 m² (38,750 ft²) in the proposed S36s Zone.

The proposed secondary suite is 88.6 m² (954 ft²) in area which is less than the maximum allowance of 90.0 m² (968.8 ft²) permitted under the Zoning Bylaw. The applicant has supplied a site plan that shows ample parking space and a floor plan that shows a separate entrance for the suite, both of which are requirements of the Zoning Bylaw. A site plan is attached as Appendix 3. A plan of the proposed addition is attached as Appendix 4.

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

The subject property is located within a suburban residential neighbourhood comprised of single family dwellings on larger lots. The proposed secondary dwelling unit will fit within the context of the surrounding properties and is believed to have little impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. Typically, complaints that arise from secondary suites relate to inadequate off-street parking. As noted, this proposal meets the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

Zoning Bylaw Compliance & Development Variance Permits DV18-004 and DV18-005:

The applicant proposes to vary two sections of the District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009, specifically Section 402.D.1, to facilitate this application. The applicant wishes to connect an existing detached garage to the existing principal dwelling and requests the setbacks of the principal dwelling be reduced to accommodate the proposal.

The first variance, DV18-004, is to reduce the interior side setback of the principal building from 3.0 m to 1.6 m. The second variance, DV18-005, is to reduce the front setback of the principal building from 7.5 m to 6.0 m.

Considering the steep topography of the site and the limited building envelope available, Staff is supportive of the variances.

The Draft Development Variance Permit DV18-004 is attached as Appendix 5. The Draft Development Variance Permit DV18-005 is attached as Appendix 6.

COMMUNICATION:

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

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

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

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

REFERRALS:

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the rezoning application provided servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 7 have been met.
REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

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

1. Confirmation that the existing municipal water system has the capacity to service both the existing dwelling and proposed secondary suite, or, if not, that a new system can be installed.

2. The existing water service connection is replaced and fitted with a water meter by District forces.

3. Municipal storm sewer has been extended and connected to the property from Conley Terrace to the south.

4. Any requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including public hearing.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
## Appendix 1

**Information for Corporate Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Address</th>
<th>31712 Bench Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID:</td>
<td>030-133-955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>Lot 1 Section 30 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan EPP48559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 31712 Bench Avenue
Owner: Tina Sale
Applicant: Jeremy Sale
Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Suburban Residential
Appendix 3

Site Plan
APPENDIX 5
DRAFT DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT – DV18-004

DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV18-004

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: Jeremy Sale
31712 Bench Avenue, Mission, BC V4S 1E6

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: 030-133-955
Lot 1 Section 30 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan EPP46927

1. The said lands are zoned Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling (S36s) Zone pursuant to “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009” as amended.

2. “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw” as amended is hereby varied in respect of the said lands as follows:
   (a) To vary Section 402 Suburban Secondary Dwelling Zone; Part D. Setbacks, subsection 1. – All Buildings and Structures shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum Setbacks:
       Principal Building: Interior Side: from 3.0 m to 1.6 m.

3. This Permit does not constitute a subdivision approval or a building permit.

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

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

___________________________
Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

___________________________
Michael Younie,
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV18-004
APPENDIX 6
DRAFT DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT – DV18-005

DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV18-005

Issued pursuant to Section 498 of the Local Government Act

Issued to: Jeremy Sale
31712 Bench Avenue, Mission, BC V4S 1E6

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: 030-133-955
Lot 1 Section 30 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan EPP46927

4. The said lands are zoned Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling (S36s) Zone pursuant to “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009” as amended.

5. “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw” as amended is hereby varied in respect of the said lands as follows:

   (a) To vary Section 402 Suburban Secondary Dwelling Zone; Part D. Setbacks, subsection 1. – All Buildings and Structures shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum Setbacks:
       Principal Building: Front: from 7.5 m to 6.0 m.

6. This Permit does not constitute a subdivision approval or a building permit.

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

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

___________________________
Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

___________________________
Michael Younie,
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Variance Permit DV18-005
Appendix 7

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

April 24, 2018

CIVIC ADDRESS: 31712 Bench Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: S36          PROPOSED ZONE: S36s

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Bench Avenue.
Connection to the system is required.
The existing water service connection is required to be replaced and fitted with a meter by
District forces at the developer’s sole expense.
The applicant shall engage the services of a qualified engineer to determine the size of the new
service based on increased domestic loading and sprinklering requirements and produce a
report for acceptance by the building department. For more details, contact Mike Rohde, Senior
Building Inspector (604-620-3728).

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is not available on Bench Avenue.
Connection to the system is not required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Conley Terrance via easement through private property.
Connection to the system is required.
No upgrades required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Bench Avenue provides paved access to the parcel.
No upgrades are required.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to adoption once the water
servicing requirements have been met.

Prepared by: Rob Racine, Engineering Technologist
Reviewed by: Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works
Reviewed by: Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects

FILE:09-3310-18-01
R18-001
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 616-1977 and Rezoning of the property located at 33093 7th Avenue to Commercial Local One (CL1) Zone
ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Bill 17, 2014
- Appendix 4 – Official Community Plan (OCP) designation: Commercial
- Appendix 5 – Land Use Contract (LUC) 616-1977
- Appendix 6 – Recommended Zone: Commercial Local One (CL1) Zone

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33093 7th Avenue
APPLICANT: District of Mission under the authority of Section 548 of the Local Government Act (LGA).
OCP: This application is in conformance with the property’s Commercial OCP designation
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 616-1977 and to rezone the property located at 33093 7th 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 support the application moving forward and as such has listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5730-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5731-2018-5050(288) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 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 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.

An 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 an LUC at time of expiry of the LUC (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 LUCs within the District prior to the June 30, 2022 deadline. As a result, Staff have 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, LUC 616-1977, 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 small strip mall comprising of retail uses. The lower floor which is accessed from the rear of the building is being used by municipal Parks and Recreation staff as a workshop, lunch room, and equipment storage. The existing underlying zone of the subject property is Institutional Parks Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone.

The building is currently owned by a third party and is located on District of Mission property. The ownership of the building will revert to the District of Mission in 2027.

Official Community Plan

The subject property is designated Commercial (Appendix 4) in the Official Community Plan (OCP). This designation envisions single or multi-story buildings for commercial retail and residential uses.

Land Use Contract

LUC 616-1977 (Appendix 5) was approved on October 17, 1977 and permits the “construction of a minor neighbourhood shopping centre comprising of parking facilities, a food store and three retail stores on the main floor and on the lower floor storage facilities, a park activity area, concession area, washrooms and change rooms for Municipal park and recreation purposes; a gate with an approved lock shall be provided on the main floor for the use of the Municipality to control access to the park area below.”
Zoning Bylaw

A comparison of the regulations contained within the LUC and proposed CL1 Zone is provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses (Principal Uses)</th>
<th>Land Use Contract: 616-1977</th>
<th>Zoning Bylaw: Commercial Local One (CL1) Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor neighbourhood shopping centre</td>
<td>Convenience commercial uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (Minimum)</td>
<td>1,259 m$^2$ (13,552 ft$^2$)</td>
<td>930 m$^2$ (10,010 ft$^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>7.92 m (26 ft)</td>
<td>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>1.83 m (6 ft)</td>
<td>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>0.30 m (1 ft)</td>
<td>3.0 m (9.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.7 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (Maximum)</td>
<td>59% (Approximately 8,050 ft$^2$)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (Principal Building)</td>
<td>9.45 m (31 ft) from lower floor</td>
<td>11m (36.1 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Maximum)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>One dwelling unit per lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff is not aware of any known implications associated with the recommended zoning of the subject property to CL1 Zone (Appendix 6).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5730-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5731-2018-5050(288) because:

- existing development on the property primarily consists of a small scale commercial shopping centre. This type of development is generally in conformance with the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Commercial. An OCP amendment is not required;
- the existing INRP Zone does not provide similar permitted uses and related land use regulations to those found in LUC 616-1977; and
- the recommended CL1 Zone provides similar permitted uses and regulations to those found in LUC 616-1977.

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 LUC 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.

REFERRALS:
Parks, Recreation & Culture Department

The Parks, Recreation & Culture Department has indicated that they have no objection to the proposed LUC termination and rezoning provided that all Parks, Recreation & Culture operational issues in the lower floor of the existing building remain intact.

COMMUNICATION

Public Information Meeting

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

All property owners and occupiers directly affected by LUC 616-1977 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. At the public information meeting, staff did not identify any property owners and/or occupiers that attended the meeting and staff did not receive any written comments.

Website Communications

The District’s website provides general information on the LUC process. This includes:

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

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages

A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online 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 subject property is within 800m of a controlled access highway. Final Reading of the bylaws will be held until approval from Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) is obtained.
2. The in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5730-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5731-2018-5050(288) 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:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 33093 7th Avenue
PID: 005-165-857
Legal: Block 150, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 955, NWD
Appendix 2

Land Use Contract: 616-1977
Subject Property: 33093 7th Avenue
Owner: Howard Nemitin & Associates
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:
Proposal 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 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>Employment Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Employment Lands</td>
<td>• Future employment opportunities</td>
<td>• To be determined through plan</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>• Small to large format retail centres, with up to 4 storey buildings</td>
<td>• Commercial</td>
<td>Up to 2.0 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Retail, tourist accommodation, automotive, entertainment, light industrial, office, service, indoor recreation and upper level residential uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>• Industrial buildings and structures, with large lots to accommodate circulation, parking and storage</td>
<td>• Industrial</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td>• Sales/showroom space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessory dwelling unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Industrial</td>
<td>• Gravel pits</td>
<td>• Heavy industry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>• Farming with rural residential</td>
<td>• Agriculture</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential with accessory units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

BY-LAW NO. 616 - 1977

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Howard Nemtin & Associates Ltd.,

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the "Municipal Act", the Council may by by-law amend the Zoning By-law to designate areas of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has by "Development Area No. 20 By-Law No. 245 - 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 grocery store and three small commercial shops, with storage, change rooms, and wash rooms;

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 15th 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 No. 616 - 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 Howard Nemtin & Associates to construct a grocery store and three small commercial shops, with storage, change rooms, wash rooms on land known and described as:-

Block 150, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 955, 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 to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

READ A SECOND TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

READ A THIRD TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 17th 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. 616 - 1977."

[Signature]

CLERK
EXHIBIT "A"

LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 77

THIS CONTRACT is dated the _24th_ day of _October_, 1977.

BETWEEN:-

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation, duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, of 8845 Slave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia.

(herinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

AND:

H.P. INVESTMENTS LIMITED
2673 - 595 Burrard Street
Vancouver, B.C.

ROAN HOLDINGS LIMITED
16th Floor, 1030 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, B.C.

TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
16th Floor, 1030 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, B.C.

(herinafter 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 thereafter the use and development of the land shall be in accordance with the land use contract:

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

AND WHEREAS the Developer has presented to the Municipality a scheme for use and development of the within described lands and premises that would be in contravention of a by-law of the Municipality or Sections 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act" or both, and has requested that the Council of the Municipality enter into this contract under the terms, conditions and for the consideration hereinafter set forth:

Substitute for form C

Date: ___________________________ Nature of interest in and to the land
December 1, 1977 Land use contract

Declared value $_____________________ Disposition of C.I.

Please make me aware the above listed person/Applicant is acting as Solicitor/Agent

Tel. No. ____________________

REX D. BLANE
7311 D JAMES ST.
MISSION, B.C. V2V 3V5
AND WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, having given due consideration to the criteria set forth in Section 702 (2) and 702A (1) of the "Municipal Act", have agreed to the terms, conditions and consideration herein contained.

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

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both acknowledge that the Council of the Municipality could not enter into this agreement, until the Council 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 will lease these lands and premises situated, lying and being in the District of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and being more particularly known and described as:

LOT 544, SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 17, PLAN 53763 NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT

(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, thereover or therein shall be used for the purpose specified in Schedule "A" hereto and for none other.

4. No building or structure shall be constructed, reconstructed, altered, moved or expanded upon the land except in compliance with the specifications and the plot plan set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

5. No sign shall be erected upon the land or any building structure thereon except those shown on the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

6. Off street parking and loading spaces shall be provided, located and constructed in accordance with the 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 public and municipal utilities and services for the Development 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 "I" 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,
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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 $800.00 _____ 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 the 16th day of August, A.D. 1977.

This agreement was approved on the 17th day of October, A.D. 1977 by By-law No. 241 of 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

was affixed in the presence of:

[Signature]

[Signature]

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

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 6th day of November, 1977, at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, HOWARD NEUTIN, who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the President of H.F. Investments Ltd. and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed Instrument as President of the said Company and affixed the seal of the said Company to the said Instrument, that he was first duly authorized to subscribe his name as aforesaid and affix the said seal to the said Instrument, and that such corporation is legally entitled to hold and dispose of land in the Province of British Columbia.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 7th day of November, 1977.

[Signature]
A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits for British Columbia
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 17th day of November 1977, at Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, DAVID HUBERMAN who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the Secretary of TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Secretary of the said TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and affixed the seal of TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION 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 Vancouver in the Province of British Columbia, this 17th day of November, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven.

[Signature]
A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 10th day of November, 1977, at Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, ALAN SPIRO who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the Secretary of BOAN HOLDINGS LTD. and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Secretary of the said BOAN HOLDINGS LTD. and affixed the seal of BOAN HOLDINGS LTD. 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 Vancouver in the Province of British Columbia, this 17th day of November one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven

A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 24th day of October 197 ,
at Mission
in the Province of British Columbia, Donald F. West

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 Corporation and affixed the Seal of the said Corporation
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 hereto set my hand
at Mission
in the Province of British Columbia,
this 24th day of October 197 .

[Signature]

A Commissioner for taking affidavits
within British Columbia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the day of 197 ,
at
in the Province of British Columbia,

who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged
to me that he is the

of

and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed
Instrument as

of the said Corporation and affixed the Seal of the said Corporation
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 hereto set my hand
at
in the Province of British Columbia,
this day of 197 .

[Signature]

A Commissioner for taking affidavits
within British Columbia.
Schedule of Permitted Land Use.

The construction of a minor neighbourhood shopping centre, (hereinafter referred to as the Development) comprising of parking facilities, a food store and three retail stores on the main floor and on the lower floor storage facilities, a park activity area, concession area, washrooms and change rooms for Municipal park and recreation purposes (the demised premises as set out in the Sublease); a gate with an approved lock shall be provided on the main floor for the use of the Municipality to control access to the park area below.

It is understood that the food store and the retail stores shall be used only for purposes approved by resolution of Council of the District of Mission from time to time as being suitable for the neighbourhood.

The Development shall conform to the drawings prepared by Lubor Trubka, Architect dated June, 1977, numbered and entitled:

- 77-1 Site Plan
- 77-2 Main Floor Plan
- 77-3 Lower Floor Plan

as noted by the Municipality and in accordance with working drawings to be submitted.

It is understood and agreed that the exact building elevations shall be approved by the Municipal Engineer on the basis of either the existing road grade on 7th Avenue or an adjusted road referred to in Schedule F.
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SCHEDULE "B"

Plot Plan and Specifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>(149 feet x 88 feet) 13,552 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards Front</td>
<td>26 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Minimum 1 foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>8,050 square feet (approximately)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Building Structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>31 feet from lower floor level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Ratio</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Floor Area</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>On Drawing 77-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Off Street Parking:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>2,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Spaces</td>
<td>9 x 20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>To B.C. Hydro and Power Authority specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>To specifications of Municipal Sign By-law No. 451-1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>From 7th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>As Drawing 77-1 and working drawings to be submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Off Street Loading:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>Front of building complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>From 7th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refuse Disposal:**

Screened provision for refuse shall be made to Municipal requirements.
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SCHEDULE "D"

Signs: To specifications of Municipal By-law No. 451-1968.

Number

Types

Location

Design

Size

Plan

Building and Structures:

Plans In general accordance with Drawing 77-1, and working drawings to be submitted to Municipal Building Inspector for approval. It is understood that the building design shall not require sprinklers for fire fighting without the prior approval of the Municipality.

Specifications To National Building Code

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:

Specifications To be maintained in a neat and tidy manner at all times with plant location as shown on Drawing 77-2 and working drawings to be submitted.

The existing chain link fence shall be relocated and reconstructed to prevent access from 7th Avenue to the park area below as required by the Municipality.

The Developer shall regrade the Municipal property adjoining the Lands as necessary to aesthetically blend the Development to the surrounding area. Existing topsoil shall be saved. It is understood and agreed that the Municipality will carry out final grading and seeding or such other improvements as it deems desirable.
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**SCHEDULE "E"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Utilities:</th>
<th>Firehydrant to be relocated by the Municipality at the cost of the Developer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications</td>
<td>Municipal Subdivision Control By-law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Utilities:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Services:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>To usual municipal requirements from existing main on 7th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>To usual municipal requirements from existing manhole on 7th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Connect to municipal system near the south west corner of the Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>As required by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Underground by dip service from an extension of a duct installed by the Municipality from the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority pole on 7th Avenue to a point near the south west corner of the Arena, if so approved by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority. The Developer shall provide the necessary foundation slab and enclosure to the requirements of B.C. Hydro and Power Authority, together with necessary ducts. Electrical requirements for metering shall be determined by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Telephone service shall be from B.C. Telephone at a pull box located near the south west corner of the Arena, or as required by B.C. Telephone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 77**

**Schedule "F"**

***Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways and Drainage:***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paving, Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>Reconstruct sidewalk as required to suit the Development. Reconstruct and extend curb and gutter to the east side of lot 150. Pave 7th Avenue to connect and blend to the existing paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specifications:**

All work to conform to Subdivision Control By-law requirements in accordance with engineering drawings prepared by the Municipality.

It is understood and agreed that the Municipality shall have the right to regrade 7th Avenue between James and Taulbut and that the Developer shall adjust the building grades to suit the revised grades.
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SCHEDULE "B"

Subdivision Plans:

Parcels:

Area

Shape Not applicable

Dimensions

Highways:

Not applicable

Sketch Plan of Leased Area

PLAN

Scale: 1-inch to 200 feet
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SCHEDULE "H"

Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities:

Location: On the lower floor a concession stand, storage area, park activity area, public washrooms and change rooms shall be provided as shown schematically on Drawing 77-3 and working drawings to be submitted and in accordance with the terms of the Sublease by Developer to the Municipality for the use of said lower floor, referred to in the said Sublease as the "demised premises".
Development and Service to be provided or paid for by the Municipality:

The Municipality will install or cause to be installed at no cost to the Developer the necessary substation (including its electrical design) on the foundation and in the enclosure furnished by the Developer to provide electrical service at 240/120 volts 60 Hertz to the Development.

It is understood and agreed that the Developer shall advise the Municipality of his anticipated electrical load. The Developer shall be responsible for the cost of the necessary circuit breakers for the Development and metering facilities for his use in addition to the provision of the pad and enclosure including a separate breaker and service for the demised premises.
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SCHEDULE "J"

Works and Services to be Maintained and Operated by the Developer:

Not applicable
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SCHEDULE "K"

Performance Security:

The performance 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 (but not to exceed $8,000) by the Municipal Engineer for the construction of offsite works referred to in Schedule 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 15 days of the Municipality furnishing the Developer the engineering drawings referred to in Schedule F; 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 released when the said works and services have been accepted by the Municipal Engineer.

Any reduction in the amount of a letter of credit shall be requested in writing by the Developer.

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 is 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.
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SCHEDULE "L"

Times of Development Construction

The Developer shall submit an application for a building permit to the Municipality within 30 days of the signing of this contract by the Mayor and the Clerk; he shall allow not less than 10 days for its issuance.

Construction of the Development shall commence not later than November 1st, 1977, shall be substantially commenced by January 1st, 1978 and shall be completed by April 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 (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 construction of the offsite works and the paving of the parking lot shall be completed by June 30, 1978 in accordance with a schedule approved by the Municipality to permit the installation of a new water main on 7th Avenue and the regrading of the street by the Municipality should it so desire.
LAND USB CONTRACT

B. A. CONTEAU
7311-6 St., Mission, B.C.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 616 - 1977

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a
Land Use Contract with Howard Nemtin & Associates Ltd.

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the "Municipal
Act", the Council may by by-law amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas
of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has by "Development Area 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 grocery store and three small commercial shops, with storage, change rooms,
and wash rooms;

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 15th 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 No. 616 - 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 Howard Nemtin
& Associates to construct a grocery store and three small commercial
shops, with storage, change rooms, wash rooms on land known and
described as:-

Block 150, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 955, 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 to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

READ A SECOND TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

READ A THIRD TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

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

[Signature]  [Signature]
I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "District of Mission Land Use Contract By-Law No. 616 - 1977."

[Signature]
CLERK
EXHIBIT "3"

LOT 544
SECTION 21
TOWNSHIP 17
PLAN 53763
NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT
LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 77

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 24th day of October 1977.

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation, duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, of 8645 Slave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia.

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

OF THE FIRST PART

AND:

H.P. INVESTMENTS LIMITED
22373 - 595 Burrard Street
Vancouver, B.C.

BOAH HOLDINGS LIMITED
16th Floor, 1030 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, B.C.

TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
16th Floor, 1030 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, B.C.

(thereinafter 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 thereafter the use and development of the land shall be in accordance with the land use contract:

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

AND WHEREAS the Developer has presented to the Municipality a scheme for use and development of the within described lands and premises that would be in contravention of a by-law of the Municipality or Sections 712 or 713 of the "Municipal Act" or both, and has requested that the Council of the Municipality enter into this contract under the terms, conditions and for the consideration hereinafter set forth:

Substitute for form C

Date December 1, 1977
Declared value $1,250,000
Disposition of Con.
Please merge
 Applicants
Tel No. 416-452-9222

REX D. BLANE
7311-D JAMES ST.
MISSION, B.C. V2V 3V5
AND WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality, having given due consideration to the criteria set forth in Section 702 (2) and 702A (1) of the "Municipal Act", have agreed to the terms, conditions and consideration herein contained.

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

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both acknowledge that the Council of the Municipality could not enter into this agreement, until the Council 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 will lease these lands and premises situated, lying and being in the District of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and being more particularly known and described as:

Lot 544, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 53763 New Westminster District

(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, thereover or therein shall be used for the purpose specified in Schedule "A" hereto and for none other.

4. No building or structure shall be constructed, reconstructed, altered, moved or expanded upon the land except in compliance with the specifications and the plot plan set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

5. No sign shall be erected upon the land or any building structure thereon except those shown on the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

6. Off street parking and loading spaces shall be provided, located and constructed in accordance with the 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 public and municipal utilities and services for the Development 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 "M" hereto.

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

13. Except as specifically provided in Schedule "I" 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 $800.00 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 the 15th day of August, A.D. 1977.

This agreement was approved on the 17th day of October, A.D. 1977 by By-law No. 611, 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

[Stamp]

was affixed in the presence of:

[Signature]

[Name]

[Signed]

[Date]

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED

by the Developer in the presence of:

Name: [Name]

Address: [Address]

Occupation: [Occupation]

[Signature]

[Date]
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 1st day of November, 1977, at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, HOWARD NEMTIN, who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the President of H.P. Investments Ltd. and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed Instrument as President of the said Company and affixed the seal of the said Company to the said Instrument, that he was first duly authorized to subscribe his name as aforesaid and affix the said seal to the said Instrument, and that such corporation is legally entitled to hold and dispose of land in the Province of British Columbia.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 7th day of November, 1977.

[Signature]

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits for British Columbia
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 17th day of November 1977, at Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, DAVID HUBERMAN who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the Secretary of TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Secretary of the said TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and affixed the seal of TRI-JAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION 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 Vancouver in the Province of British Columbia, this 17th day of November, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven

A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 10th day of November, 1977, at Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, ALAN SPIRO who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the Secretary of BOAN HOLDINGS LTD. and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as Secretary of the said BOAN HOLDINGS LTD. and affixed the seal of BOAN HOLDINGS LTD. 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 Vancouver in the Province of British Columbia, this 17th day of November one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven

A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 24th day of October, 197, at Mission in the Province of British Columbia, DONALD F. WEST 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 Corporation and affixed the Seal of the said Corporation 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 hereto set my hand at Mission in the Province of British Columbia, this 24th day of October, 1977.

[Signature]
A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the day of 197, at
in the Province of British Columbia,
who is personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the
of
and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed Instrument as
of the said Corporation and affixed the Seal of the said Corporation 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 hereto set my hand at
in the Province of British Columbia, this day of 197.

[Signature]
A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.
Schedule of Permitted Land Use.

The construction of a minor neighbourhood shopping centre, (hereinafter referred to as the Development) comprising of parking facilities, a food store and three retail stores on the main floor and on the lower floor storage facilities, a park activity area, concession area, washrooms and change rooms for Municipal park and recreation purposes (the demised premises as set out in the Sublease); a gate with an approved lock shall be provided on the main floor for the use of the Municipality to control access to the park area below.

It is understood that the food store and the retail stores shall be used only for purposes approved by resolution of Council of the District of Mission from time to time as being suitable for the neighbourhood.

The Development shall conform to the drawings prepared by Lubor Trubka, Architect dated June, 1977, numbered and entitled:

77-1 Site Plan
77-2 Main Floor Plan
77-3 Lower Floor Plan

as noted by the Municipality and in accordance with working drawings to be submitted.

It is understood and agreed that the exact building elevations shall be approved by the Municipal Engineer on the basis of either the existing road grade on 7th Avenue or an adjusted road referred to in Schedule F.
**LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 77**

**SCHEDULE "B"**

**Plot Plan and Specifications:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>(149 feet x 88 feet) 13,552 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards Front</td>
<td>26 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Minimum 1 foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>8,050 square feet (approximately)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Height of Building Structures**

- **Maximum**: 31 feet from lower floor level
- **Minimum**: Not applicable

**Floor Space Ratio**

- Not applicable

**Minimum Floor Area**

- Not applicable

**Number of Units**

- Not applicable

**Plan**

- On Drawing 77-1
LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 77

SCHEDULE "C"

**Off Street Parking:**
- **Total Area**: 2,000 square feet
- **Number of Spaces**: 11
- **Size of Spaces**: 9 x 20 feet
- **Surfacing**: Asphalt
- **Lighting**: To B.C. Hydro and Power Authority specifications
- **Signs**: To specifications of Municipal Sign By-law No. 451-1968.
- **Access Plan**: From 7th Avenue

**Access Plan**: As Drawing 721 and working drawings to be submitted.

**Off Street Loading:**
- **Total Area**: 
- **Size of Area**: 
- **Location**: Front of building complex
- **Surfacing**: Asphalt
- **Lighting**: 
- **Signs**: 
- **Access**: From 7th Avenue
- **Plan**: 

**Refuse Disposal:**
- Screened provision for refuse shall be made to Municipal requirements.
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SCHEDULE "D"

Signs: To specifications of Municipal By-law No. 451-1968.
Number
Types
Location
Design
Size
Plan

Building and Structures:

Plans In general accordance with Drawing 77-1, and working drawings to be submitted to Municipal Building Inspector for approval. It is understood that the building design shall not require sprinklers for fire fighting without the prior approval of the Municipality.

Specifications To National Building Code

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:

Specifications To be maintained in a neat and tidy manner at all times with plant location as shown on Drawing 77-2 and working drawings to be submitted.

The existing chain link fence shall be relocated and reconstructed to prevent access from 7th Avenue to the park area below as required by the Municipality.

The Developer shall regrade the Municipal property adjoining the lands as necessary to aesthetically blend the Development to the surrounding area. Existing topsoil shall be saved. It is understood and agreed that the Municipality will carry out final grading and seeding or such other improvements as it deems desirable.
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SCHEDULE "E"

**Municipal Utilities:**
- **Water**: Fire hydrant to be relocated by the Municipality at the cost of the Developer.
- **Sewer**: Not applicable.
- **Specifications**: Municipal Subdivision Control By-law.

**Public Utilities:**
- **Gas**: Not applicable.
- **Electricity**: Not applicable.
- **Telephone**: Not applicable.

**Development Services:**
- **Water**: To usual municipal requirements from existing main on 7th Avenue.
- **Sewer**: To usual municipal requirements from existing manhole on 7th Avenue.
- **Drainage**: Connect to municipal system near the south west corner of the Arena.
- **Gas**: As required by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.
- **Electricity**: Underground by dip service from an extension of a duct installed by the Municipality from the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority pole on 7th Avenue to a point near the south west corner of the Arena, if so approved by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority. The Developer shall provide the necessary foundation slab and enclosure to the requirements of B.C. Hydro and Power Authority, together with necessary ducts. Electrical requirements for metering shall be determined by B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.
- **Telephone**: Telephone service shall be from B.C. Telephone at a pull box located near the south west corner of the Arena, or as required by B.C. Telephone.
Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways and Drainage:

Paving, Curb and Gutter: Reconstruct sidewalk as required to suit the Development. Reconstruct and extend curb and gutter to the east side of lot 150. Pave 7th Avenue to connect and blend to the existing paving.

Street Lighting: Not applicable

Boulevards: Not applicable

Sign: Not applicable

Drainage: Not applicable

Specifications: All work to conform to Subdivision Control By-law requirements in accordance with engineering drawings prepared by the Municipality.

It is understood and agreed that the Municipality shall have the right to regrade 7th Avenue between James and Taullbut and that the Developer shall adjust the building grades to suit the revised grades.
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SCHEDULE "G"

Subdivision Plans:

Parcels:
Area
Shape Not applicable
Dimensions

Highways:

Not applicable

Sketch Plan of Leased Area

PLAN
Scale: 1-inch to 200 feet
Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities:

Location: On the lower floor a concession stand, storage area, park activity area, public washrooms and change rooms shall be provided as shown schematically on Drawing 77-3 and working drawings to be submitted and in accordance with the terms of the Sublease by Developer to the Municipality for the use of said lower floor, referred to in the said Sublease as the "demised premises".
LAND USE CONTRACT NO. 77
SCHEDULE "1"

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

The Municipality will install or cause to be installed at no cost to the Developer the necessary substation (including its electrical design) on the foundation and in the enclosure furnished by the Developer to provide electrical service at 240/120 volts 60 Hertz to the Development.

It is understood and agreed that the Developer shall advise the Municipality of his anticipated electrical load. The Developer shall be responsible for the cost of the necessary circuit breakers for the Development and metering facilities for his use in addition to the provision of the pad and enclosure including a separate breaker and service for the demised premises.
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SCHEDULE "J"

Works and Services to be Maintained and Operated by the Developer:

Not applicable
Performance Security:

The performance 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 (but not to exceed $8,000) by the Municipal Engineer for the construction of offsite works referred to in Schedule 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 15 days of the Municipality furnishing the Developer the engineering drawings referred to in Schedule F; otherwise this contract shall be at an end and the Development Security shall be forfeited, unless the Council of the Municipality be 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 released when the said works and services have been accepted by the Municipal Engineer.

Any reduction in the amount of a letter of credit shall be requested in writing by the Developer.

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 is 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.
The Developer shall submit an application for a building permit to the Municipality within 30 days of the signing of this contract by the Mayor and the Clerk; he shall allow not less than 10 days for its issuance.

Construction of the Development shall commence not later than November 1st, 1977, shall be substantially commenced by January 1st, 1978 and shall be completed by April 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 (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 construction of the offsite works and the paving of the parking lot shall be completed by June 30, 1978 in accordance with a schedule approved by the Municipality to permit the installation of a new water main on 7th Avenue and the regrading of the street by the Municipality should it so desire.
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DISTRIBUTION OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 616 - 1977

A By-law to authorize the Council to enter into a
Land Use Contract with Howard Nemitin & Associates Ltd.

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the "Municipal
Act", the Council may by by-law amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas
of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has by "Development Area 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
grocery store and three small commercial shops, with storage, change rooms,
and wash rooms:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 15th 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 No. 616 - 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 Howard Nemitin
& Associates to construct a grocery store and three small commercial
shops, with storage, change rooms, wash rooms on land known and

described as :-

Block 150, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 955, 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 to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission
thereeto.

READ A FIRST TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.
READ A SECOND TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.
READ A THIRD TIME this 15th day of August, 1977.

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

Mayor

Clerk
I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be
a true and correct copy of "District
of Mission Land Use Contract By-Law
No. 616 - 1977."

CLERK
SUBDIVISION PLAN OF PART OF BLOCK 150 OF EC. 21, TP. 17, PLAN 955, N.W.D.

SCALE: 1:1000

All distances are in metres except where otherwise indicated.
PLAN

Deposited in the Land Registry Office at New Westminster, B.C., this ___ day of ______ 1977.

Registrar

ATHAN

MAYOR

Clerk

J.M.C. Wade, B.C.L.S., a British Columbia Land Surveyor, makes oath and says that I was present at and did personally superintend the survey represented by this plan and that the survey and plan are correct. The said survey was completed on the 14th day of November 1977.

J.M.C. Wade

Sworn before me this 14th day of November 1977.

A commissioner for the province of...
A. Zone Intent

1. The intent of this zone is to provide for local small scale commercial shopping, intended to meet the convenience needs of local residents within the Commercial Area. The CL1 zone shall be located along collector or arterial designated streets and must be located within the water and sewer specified area.

B. Permitted Uses

1. The following Principal Uses and no other shall be permitted in the CL1 zone:
   a. Food and Beverage limited to:
      i. Café,
      ii. Coffee Shop, and
      iii. Restaurant.
   b. Personal Service limited to:
      i. Barber Shop,
      ii. Body Art and Tattoo Parlour,
      iii. Cleaning and Repair of Clothing,
      iv. Hair and Body Salon,
      v. Medical Clinic,
      vi. Medical Offices, and
      vii. Spa.
   c. Retail limited to:
      i. Convenience Store, and
      ii. Video Rental

2. The following Accessory Uses and no other shall be permitted in the CL1 zones:
   a. Residential limited to:
      i. One Dwelling Unit per lot provided the Dwelling Unit is located within the Principal Use Building.
   b. Storage limited to:
      i. Enclosed Storage.
C. Lot Area

1. The minimum Lot Area must not be less than 930 sq m (10,010 sq ft).

2. Notwithstanding Section 802, 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 802, Part C.1 and C.2, where a Lot contains natural slopes greater than or equal to 33%, that sloped area shall not be included in the calculation of minimum Lot Area.

D. Density

1. The maximum density for the residential component of any development is 1 unit per Lot.

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>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
<td>6.0 m (19.7 ft)</td>
<td>3.0 m (9.8 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.7 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building/Structure</td>
<td>7.5 m (24.6 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Notwithstanding Section 802 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>CL1</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Floor Space

1. The floor space should not exceed the following ratios 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>0.60</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>Accessory Building/Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>11.0 m (36.1 ft)</td>
<td>4.5 m (14.8 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Indoor Amenity Space

1. N/A

J. Outdoor Amenity Space

1. N/A

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.
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 168-1972 and Rezoning of the property located at 7365 Alder Street 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) 168-1972
Appendix 6 – Recommended Zone: Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone
CIVIC ADDRESS: 7365 Alder Street
APPLICANT: District of Mission under the authority of Section 548 of the Local Government Act (LGA).
OCP: This application is in conformance with the property’s Attached Multi-unit Residential OCP designation
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 168-1972 for the property located at 7365 Alder Street 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 support the application moving forward and as such have listed the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5732-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5734-2018-5050(290) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 22, 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, areas located within an 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 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.

An 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 an LUC at time of expiry of the LUC (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.

Direction provided by Council on November 20, 2017 states “where possible, apply a zone to the subject property that provides similar land use rights that exist in the LUC” and “[for staff] to recommend a zone in compliance with the Official Community Plan”.

On November 20, 2017, Council directed staff to bring forward bylaws which would terminate LUCs within the District prior to the June 30, 2022 deadline and, to review the suitability of the underlying zoning. As a result, Staff have brought forward a termination bylaw in accordance with the approved process.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

Staff have reviewed the current land uses, LUC 168-1972, 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 two storey apartment building. The existing underlying zone of the subject property is Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone.

**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 168-1972 (*Appendix 5*) was approved on May 9, 1972 and permits the “erection of an eight (8) suite apartment block.”
Zoning Bylaw

A comparison of the regulations contained within the LUC and proposed MA52 Zone is provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses (Principal Uses)</th>
<th>Land Use Contract: 179-1972</th>
<th>Zoning Bylaw: Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (Minimum)</td>
<td>1,103 m² (11,880 sq ft)</td>
<td>0.2 ha (0.5 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>6.1 m (20 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>9.8 m (32 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>9.1 m (29.8 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard Setback (Minimum)</td>
<td>6.1 m (20 ft)</td>
<td>7.5m (24.6 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (Maximum)</td>
<td>29% (3,442 sq ft)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Ratio</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (Principal Building)</td>
<td>6.7 m (22 ft)</td>
<td>11m (36.1 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Maximum)</td>
<td>72.5 units per hectare (29 units per acre)</td>
<td>52 units per hectare (21 units per acre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff is not aware of any known implications associated with the recommended zoning of the subject property to MA52 Zone (Appendix 6).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5732-2018 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 existing RT465 Zone does not provide similar permitted uses and related land use regulations to those found in LUC 168-1972; and
- the recommended MA52 Zone provides similar permitted uses and related land use regulations to those found in LUC 168-1972.

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 LUCs. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to inform affected property owners of the end to LUCs and to consult with affected property owners on the underlying zoning.

All property owners and occupiers directly affected by LUC 168-1972 were sent a notification letter inviting them to the meeting. At the public information meeting, staff did not identify any property owners and/or occupiers that attended the meeting and staff did not receive any written comments.

Website Communications

The District’s website provides general information on the LUC process. This includes:

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

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages

A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online 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 subject property is within 800m of a controlled access highway. Final Reading of the bylaws will be held until approval from Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) is obtained.
2. The in-effect date of the Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5732-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5734-2018-5050(290) 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:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
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Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 7365 Alder Street

PID: 010-466-738

Legal: Lot “A” Except: West 6 Feet, Block 24 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 332
Appendix 2

Land Use Contract: 168-1972

Subject Property: 7365 Alder Street

Owner: Apprime Properties Ltd.

Applicant: District of Mission under the authority of Section 548 of the Local Government Act (LGA)
Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014 (Bill 17, 2014)

Amendments to Local Government Act, Community Charter and Vancouver Charter

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

Proposed Amendments:

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

Removing the requirement for Ministerial approval for Regional District (RD) land use bylaws

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

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

Removing Ministerial approval for soil removal and deposit bylaws that include fees

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

- Provides for the termination of all land use contracts in affected BC municipalities and regional districts on the “sunset” date of June 30, 2024 and requires all local governments to have zoning in place for lands covered by land use contracts by June 30, 2022 (LGA Part 26, Division 7.1, s. 914.1).
- 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 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
### OCP Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attached Multi-unit Residential</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multi storey buildings near commercial nodes and key destinations</td>
<td>• Multi-unit Residential</td>
<td>0.5 to 1.0 FSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes apartments, townhouses, rowhouses, and duplexes</td>
<td>• Accessory commercial (associated with a residential care facility)</td>
<td>20-80 units/ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heights are limited to 3 storeys (taller and varied building heights, and ground floor commercial, may be possible through a neighbourhood plan)</td>
<td>• Home occupation, live/work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Compact</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Small lot residential and infill residential</td>
<td>• Residential</td>
<td>0.5 to 0.75 FSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heights are limited to 2 storeys (3rd storey is possible within the roofline)</td>
<td>• Residential with accessory units with appropriate zoning</td>
<td>20-36 units/ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Home occupation, live/work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Residential</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Traditional single detached residential with provision for accessory units</td>
<td>• Residential</td>
<td>0.5 to 0.75 FSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infill residential</td>
<td>• Residential with accessory units with appropriate zoning</td>
<td>10-22 units/ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heights are limited to 2 storeys (3rd storey is possible within the roofline)</td>
<td>• Home occupation, live/work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refer to DPA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

BY-LAW NO. 168 - 1972

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mr. E. Fabische.

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the "Municipal Act", the Council, may, by by-law, amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas of land within the Municipality as Development Areas;

AND WHEREAS the Council has, by "Development Area By-Law No. 144 - 1972", declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

Lots 13, 14, and 15, Block 24, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 332, New Westminster District

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 (A) (1) of the "Municipal Act", for a Land Use Contract to develop an apartment dwelling within the said Development Area:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 25th day of January, 1972, with respect to the said application:

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

1. This By-Law may be cited for all purposes as "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 168 - 1972".

2. It shall be lawful for and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with Mr. E. Fabische, for the construction of an apartment dwelling upon land known and described as:

Lots 13, 14, and 15, Block 24, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 332, New Westminster District.

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

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

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

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

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

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 9th day of May, 1972.

[Signatures]

MAYOR

CLERK

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 168 - 1972".

[Signature]
AND WHEREAS the Developer has presented to the Municipality a scheme of 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 Sections 702(2) and 702A(1) of the "Municipal Act", have agreed to the terms, conditions and consideration herein contained;

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

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both acknowledge that the Council of the Municipality could not enter into this agreement, until the Council 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
LAND USE CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 1st day of May 1972.

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF MISSION, a Municipal Corporation,

[Legal Description: Lot A of Block 24 of the SE1
of Section 21, Twp. 17, Plan 332, N.W.D., District of Mission]

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

OF THE FIRST PART,

AND:

BERNARD HOLST FABISCH, Builder, c/o L203,

2225 Acadia Road, City of Vancouver,

Province of British Columbia.

(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 thereafter the use and

development of the land shall be in accordance with the land

use contract;

AND WHEREAS the "Municipal Act" requires that the

Municipal Council consider the criteria set out in Section

702(2) and 702A(1) in arriving at the terms, conditions and

consideration contained in a land use contract;
Developer covenant and agree as follows:

1. The Developer is an owner of those lands and premises situate, lying and being in the District of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, and being more particularly known and described as:

   Lot A of Block 24 of the Southwest quarter of Section 21, Township 17, Plan 332, 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 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, thereover or therein shall be used for the purpose specified in Schedule "A" hereto and for none other.

4. No building or structure shall be constructed, reconstructed, altered, moved or expanded upon the land except in compliance with the specifications and the plot plan set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

5. No sign shall be erected upon the land or any building structure thereon except those shown on the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

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

HIGHWAYS

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.

PARKS

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.

SUBDIVISION

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

PAYMENT

13. Except as specifically provided in Schedule "I" hereto, the entire cost of the development of the land including the provision of all services and the provisions and construction of the items set out in paragraphs 6 to 11 heretofore shall be paid for by the Developer.
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14. All works and services, buildings, structures, pipes and fixtures and development constructed, placed or carried out upon property that is now, or by this contract becomes vested in the Municipality or located upon highways required to be dedicated, shall, upon acceptance by the Municipality in writing, become the property of the Municipality free and clear of any claim by the developer or any person claiming through the Developer and the Developer shall save harmless the Municipality from any such claim.

15. Except as provided in Schedule "J" hereto, the Municipality shall, from the date of acceptance, become solely responsible for the operation, upkeep and maintenance of any works and services and any building, structure, pipes and fixtures of development accepted by it pursuant to paragraph 14 hereof, but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to or require the Municipality to operate, maintain or repair such works and services, buildings, structures, pipes, fixtures or development in any manner or to any extent different from its obligations in relation to similar works, services, buildings, structures, pipes, fixtures or developments constructed by it out of its general municipal funds.

16. The Developer shall provide the Municipality with the security set out in Schedule "K" hereto to guarantee performance hereof.

17. The Developer shall carry out the work and construct, locate, provide and develop the structures, buildings, works, services, developments and facilities according to the times set out in Schedule "L" hereto.
17A. The Developer hereby agrees to pay to the Municipality the sum of $\frac{1,000,000}{12}$ 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 $\frac{1,000,000}{12}$ 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, the Municipality may at its option, rectify or attempt to rectify such breach by the Developer and the Developer hereby agrees to pay to the Municipality the Municipality's bill for such rectification or attempt thereof immediately upon receipt of the Municipality's bill and it is understood that the Municipality may, when doing any work, do it by its employees, or by contractors employed by the Municipality.

17D. In the event of any 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. This agreement shall enure to the benefit of and
be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective
heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns.

A public hearing on this agreement was held the

This agreement was approved on the 9th day of
May, A.D. 1972 by by-law No. 168-1972

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

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

[Signature]
MAYOR

[Signature]
CLERK

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
by the Developer in the
presence of:
Name: [Signature]
Address: [Signature]
Occupation: [Signature]
LAND USE CONTRACT

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

FULL NAME | ADDRESS | OCCUPATION | NATURE OF CHARGE
-----------|---------|------------|------------------
NOT APPLICABLE

---

Acknowledgment of Officer of a Corporation

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 16th day of May, 1972, in the Province of British Columbia, whose identity has been proved by the evidence on file, personally known to me, and that he is the person of the said and affixed the seal of the

District of Mission
District of Mission
District of Mission

IN TESTIMONY whereof I have hereunto set my Hand and Seal of Office, at British Columbia, in the Province of British Columbia, this 10th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-two.

LAURENCE A. H. WAINWRIGHT
A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits for British Columbia

Affidavit of Witness

To Wit:

1. Daniel Nischi
   of Mission
   make oath and say:

   1. I was personally present and did see the within instrument duly signed and executed by

   Eckhard Horst Fabische
   the part thereto, for the purposes named therein.

   2. The said instrument was executed at Mission, B.C.

   3. I know the said part , and that he is 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 Mission in the Province of British Columbia, this 13th day of May, 1972.

[Signature]
Daniel Nischi

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NATURE OF CHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LAND USE CONTRACT

CONSENT

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that, ____________

of __________________________
being the holder of a charge by way of ____________
registered at the Land Registry Office at ____________

________________ under number ____________

against all and singular that certain parcel or 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

ERECTION OF AN EIGHT (8) SUITE APARTMENT BLOCK

TO BE COMPLETED WITHIN EIGHTEEN (18) MONTHS FROM MAY 15TH, 1972.
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "B"

PLOT PLAN AND SPECIFICATIONS

Site Area 11,000 sq. ft. = 99' x 120'

Yards front - 20' setback from Alder Street and 2nd Avenue
rear - 29'10" from the rear lot line
side - 32' setback from interior side lot line

Site coverage - 70' x 49' 2" = 34,440 sq. feet

Height of buildings and structures
maximum - 22 feet
minimum - 10 feet

Floor space ratio 3'5 : 12

Minimum floor area 3441 sq. feet

Number of units eight

Plan

Scale: ¼", 5'

Parking Area

Children's Play Area

Building Area

122'

20'

49'2"
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "C"

Off Street Parking

Total area - 20' x 99' = 1980 sq. feet

Number of spaces - eleven (11)

Size of spaces - 9' x 20'

Surfacing - asphalt

Lighting - 1 floodlight attached to north wall of building

Signs - NIL

Access - From back alley north of property

Plan - BELOW

Off Street Loading - NOT APPLICABLE

Total area

Size of area

Location

Surfacing

Lighting

Signs

Access

Plans

Scale: 4' = 5'
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SCHEDULE "D"

SIGN  

Number
Types
Location
Design
Size

Plan

BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES  

Plans
Specification

LANDSCAPING, SURFACE TREATMENT, FENCES AND SCREENS

Plans

Specifications - Area surrounding building to be landscaped and maintained in neat and tidy manner with grass, trees and flowering plants. Concrete slab walkways to be provided from front entrance to sidewalk on Alder Street and from back entrance to parking area.
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LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "E"

UTILITIES

Water
Sewer
Gas
Telephone
Electricity
Plans
Specifications
Locations

NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "F"

NOT APPLICABLE

HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES, LANES, WALKWAYS

Plans
Specifications

STREET LIGHTING

Plans
Specifications

BOULEVARDS

Plans
Specifications

SIGNS

Plans
Specifications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Contract</th>
<th>Schedule &quot;G&quot;</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gradient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "H"

PARKS, PUBLIC SPACE AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Construction - Children play area

Location - West side of building

Size - 30' x 100'

Development - Grassed area

Furnishing - None

Plans - As in Schedule "B"
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "I"

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICE TO BE PROVIDED OR PAID FOR BY MUNICIPALITY

NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "J"

WORKS AND SERVICES TO BE MAINTAINED AND OPERATED BY DEVELOPER

NONE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SECURITY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE BOND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified cheque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other - $1,000.00 letter of credit as security for completion by the developer of all the requirements of this contract.
## LAND USE CONTRACT

### SCHEDULE "L"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM TO BE PROVIDED, CONSTRUCTED</th>
<th>DATE OF COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATED, DEVELOPED</td>
<td>Dec. 31st, 1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A suite apartment block and other items as in this contract stipulated.
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: May 7, 2018  
TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic & Transportation  
SUBJECT: Sidewalk Program Update 2018  
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A – 2016 Transportation Master Plan Sidewalk Priority Map  
Appendix B – 2018 Updated Sidewalk Priority Map  
Appendix C – Hatzic Area Sidewalk Option 1  
Appendix D – Hatzic Area Sidewalk Option 2  
Appendix E – Hatzic Area Sidewalk Option 3  

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the 2018 Updated Sidewalk Priority Map guide the District’s sidewalk program, superseding the Transportation Master Plan Sidewalk priority plan Figure 7.1;
2. That staff proceed with Hatzic sidewalk project Option 2, with funding coming from the annual Walkways and Sidewalk budget; and
3. That 14th Avenue road widening DCC project be included for consideration with the 2019 budget discussions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The 2016 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) assigned a priority to all sidewalk projects based on a weighted formula that took into account proximity to schools, parks, the downtown core and local commercial areas, transit stops, Mission Leisure Centre, and the trail network. Staff has refined the Sidewalk Priority Map criteria to include road classification and capital project coordination. The Updated Sidewalk Priority Plan Map better reflects Council and the public’s concerns regarding sidewalks, specifically as they relate to 14th Avenue. If approved, this Updated Priority Map will guide the District’s short term sidewalk program.

Three options for sidewalks in the vicinity of Hatzic Elementary School are presented in this report to Council for review. Staff is recommending implementation of Option 2. Option 2 is recommended as it provides the best aesthetic appeal, doesn’t negatively affect parking for residents or the school, and is achievable within available annual sidewalk funding. If approved, staff will proceed with the design and construction of this option in 2018.

This report additionally reviewed 14th Avenue Sidewalk priority. The TMP identifies the upgrading of 14th Avenue to the current design standard as a high priority, with a 1 to 5 year timeline. There is also pavement renewal and a major watermain replacement planned on 14th Avenue in 2019/2020. Despite the fact that sidewalk priority along 14th Avenue ranges from medium to high, considering the future capital works planned, staff is recommending that 14th Avenue road upgrade DCC project be included for consideration with the 2019 budget discussions. If budgetary concerns would not allow for the widening of 14th Avenue in 2019, staff recommends proceeding with construction of asphalt sidewalks.
instead on one side of 14th Avenue in 2019.

PURPOSE:
To update Council on the status of the Sidewalk Program, including projects completed in 2017 and upcoming high priority projects.

BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission is committed to enhancing transportation modes by developing and promoting an integrated, multi-modal transportation system. More specifically, the District supports reduced reliance on the private automobile and increased use of walking, cycling and public transit.

Developing a long-term pedestrian plan achieves the District's goals of creating a safer and more comfortable environment to encourage walking trips for recreation, commuting to work or school, and shopping and errands.

In order to achieve this long-term plan, the District has an annual sidewalk program, which aims to increase overall pedestrian infrastructure, address barriers to walking, and fill in gaps in the existing sidewalk and pathway network.

Sidewalk Program
Prior to 2017, Engineering and Public Works utilized the $72,250 walkway and sidewalk budget to complete sidewalk projects, including the replacement of damaged or non-conforming sidewalks, and the construction of new sidewalks. This funding provided for the construction of approximately 200 m of new sidewalks annually.

In 2017 Council approved an increase to the walkway and sidewalk annual budget from $72,250 to $300,000. The 2017 sidewalk budget was utilized to construct 830 m of sidewalk on Taulbut Street from 7th Avenue to 14th Avenue, a 300 m walking path on Cherry Avenue from Cedar Street to the existing sidewalk west of Judith Avenue, and a 200 m enhanced walking strip on Dewdney Trunk Road from Moffat Avenue to Draper Street.

The enhanced walking strip installed in 2017 to the south is experiencing issues with people parking behind the concrete curb, and often times on the paved walking strip. Part of the reason may be that it may not be perceived as a sidewalk; to that end, letters have been sent to the owners of the fronting properties and the Bylaw department can provide enforcement, however, this is a potentially ephemeral fix, and additional measures may be required.

Sidewalk Prioritization
In 2016 the District of Mission completed a Transportation Master Plan (TMP). One of the guiding objectives of the TMP is to encourage walking within the District by providing a safe, convenient and pleasant environment for pedestrians. The TMP identified that Mission had a total of 83 km of sidewalk, with approximately 135 km of prioritized sidewalk projects.

The criteria used to determine the priority of sidewalk projects was based on a weighted formula that took into account proximity to schools, parks, the downtown core and local commercial areas, transit stops, Mission Leisure Centre, and the trail network. The TMP identified approximately 4.1 km of high priority and 9.3 km of medium priority locations based upon these criteria.

Using the TMP sidewalk prioritization as a starting point, staff has refined the prioritization criteria for sidewalks to include additional criteria, including road classification and coordination of other capital works.

After the refinement of the sidewalk prioritization and excluding the recently constructed sidewalks from the sidewalk program list, Mission has a total of 94 km of sidewalk, with approximately 119 km of prioritized sidewalk projects in the sidewalk program. After the refinement there are 3.7 km of high priority and 8.3 km of medium priority locations. With the current annual sidewalk budget, it will take
approximately five years to complete the high priority sidewalk projects in the District.

Appendix A is a map of the sidewalk priority as per the TMP. Appendix B is the updated sidewalk priority map, reflecting the refinement.

The most noticeable difference is that the TMP identifies 14th Avenue as low priority, whereas the updated version prioritizes 14th Avenue from medium to high. This higher prioritization is more in line with Council and resident’s requests for sidewalks on 14th Avenue.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Sidewalk installation is a very expensive endeavor, especially where road widening is required, or in developed areas where driveways, landscaping and utilities must be accommodated.

Sidewalks are generally constructed through three main avenues: with major capital road improvements projects, annual sidewalk funding, or through development. Mission’s Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw 5650-2017 outlines the minimum requirements for the provision of sidewalks or walkways. Sidewalks are required in commercial, waterfront, industrial, institutional, and most urban residential land uses. The bylaw does not currently require sidewalks in suburban areas or urban residential developments of three new lots or less, however this may be amended with the upcoming bylaw revisions.

Construction Options

The District usually constructs sidewalks from either asphalt or concrete.

Asphalt Sidewalks

Asphalt sidewalks are used as temporary measures to provide a smooth surface for pedestrian use. They are raised sidewalks with a concrete curb keyed-in to the roadway. When properties subdivide or when major road improvement projects occur asphalt sidewalks should be removed and replaced with concrete sidewalks.

While this option has an initial lower cost, it has the following disadvantages:

1. Lower useful life than concrete sidewalks;
2. Depending on location there may be a potential loss of parking; and
3. Corners and curb ramps in asphalt are not as precise as in concrete.

Concrete Sidewalks

Concrete sidewalks are considered as permanent infrastructures that should be constructed in their ultimate location, complete with curb and gutter.

The benefits of concrete sidewalks are that:

1. They are providing aesthetically pleasing and finished street looks;
2. Their ultimate locations usually correspond with having upgraded and/or wider roads that provide additional travel or parking capacity;
3. They have a longer service life; and
4. They are capable of accommodating wheel chair ramps.

The disadvantages of concrete sidewalks are mainly due to:

1. Engineering design requirements;
2. Their higher capital cost; and
3. Potential property acquisition requirements as concrete sidewalks should be installed in their ultimate location.
Generally speaking, staff’s preference would be to construct concrete sidewalks in their ultimate location on one side of the road, and widen the paved surface of the road. While this approach is more costly, staff feels that the finished look is superior to asphalt sidewalks, which makes for a more attractive streetscape and encourages walking in Mission.

**Sidewalk Program Priority Updates**

After the refinement process, discrete block-by-block sidewalk projects were aggregated, and five major sidewalk projects emerged with the highest priority:

- Hatzic Area near Hatzic Elementary and Middle Schools
- 14th Avenue from Caribou Street to Cade Barr Street
- Cherry Avenue east of Cade Barr Street, near Christine Morrison School
- Cherry Avenue west of Cade Barr Street, near Albert McMahon School
- Wren Street from 7th Avenue to Sandpiper Drive

**Hatzic Area Project**

Draper Street in Hatzic is a two lane collector roadway which fronts Hatzic Elementary School and Hatzic Park. There are walking strips along both the east and west sides, ranging from 1.5 m to 2.5 m wide.

Draper Street in this location has been identified in the TMP as a bike route with proposed facility type of Wide Shoulder. Wide Shoulder is a bicycle facility typically used in rural areas without curb and gutter. Draper Street in this location is however zoned Urban Residential. As a result, the appropriate bicycle facility for an urban area should be either separated bike lanes or shared road.

This area has a long history of concerns regarding the lack of sidewalks that have been raised by parents of both the elementary and middle schools. The block of Draper Street between Dewdney Trunk Road and Douglas Avenue has been identified in the ten year paving program.

The 2018 sidewalk project will complete the improved pedestrian connectivity from Lougheed Highway to McEwan Avenue. Staff has been in discussions with the School Board to determine the best configuration for the portion fronting the school.

Staff has evaluated three options for sidewalks in this area:

**Option 1:** Install concrete sidewalks on the east side from Dewdney Trunk Road at Fisher Place to Draper Street at McEwan Avenue. (See Appendix C)

This option has the benefit of complete concrete sidewalk continuity from Lougheed Highway to McEwan Avenue on the east side. This option is supported by the school board. This project would take two years to complete with current sidewalk funding. Cost estimate for option 1 is $505,000.

**Option 2:** Install concrete sidewalks on the west side of Draper Street from Dewdney Trunk Road to south property line of the school, and on the east side of Draper Street from Hatzic Park’s north driveway to McEwan Avenue. (See Appendix D)

This option provides a finished looking product and provides for dedicated on-street parking. It satisfies the school board’s preference to maintain the minimal parking available to staff and parents. With the residential area located east of the site, it is expected that most people walking to school would walk on the east side of the road and cross at the south crosswalk, as opposed to crossing at the north crosswalk and walking through the parking area. The cost estimate for this option is $275,000. As part of the design review, staff will investigate if curb extensions could be incorporated at the school crosswalk to shorten the crossing distance and provide a traffic calming effect.

**Option 3:** Install a raised asphalt sidewalk with concrete keyed-in curb on the west side of Draper Street from Dewdney Trunk Road to McEwan Avenue. (See Appendix E)
The exact configuration for the school frontage has yet to be determined, however, an allowance has been included with the cost estimate to account for potential works. While this is the most cost-effective method, it has potential parking issues, if the curb is installed along the right edge of the travel lane, parking will be eliminated on that side. To avoid adversely affecting parking in this location, the raised asphalt sidewalk would need to be located very close to the ultimate location.

Staff recommends Option 2 as the best compromise solution that would provide safe walkways for students and keep the existing parking area for the school staff at the lowest cost. If Council approves, Staff will proceed with the design and construction of this option in 2018. To the extent that it is possible, construction will be scheduled for summer months, aiming for completion before the end of school summer holidays.

14th Avenue Project

The topic of sidewalks on 14th Avenue is very popular, with both the public and Council identifying the installation of sidewalks as high priority. Staff has recently received a petition from the local residents for the installation of sidewalks on 14th Avenue between Cedar Street and Cade Barr Street.

14th Avenue is a two lane collector roadway with full traffic signal at Cedar Street. 14th Avenue fronts Centennial Park. 14th Avenue has a small amount of discontinuous sidewalk, either concrete or asphalt, with the remainder of the roadway having an approximately 2 m wide walking strips generally on both sides of the road.

Both the TMP and the District’s 2018 drafted DCC update identify two 14th Avenue road upgrade projects: from Hurd Street to Grand Street, and from Grand Street to Cade Barr Street. The TMP timeframe for both projects is between 1 and 5 years. The timeline identified in the draft DCC for the Grand Street to Cade Barr Street portion is 16 to 20 years, while the Hurd Street to Grand Street portion is 6 to 10 years. The difference in the projected timeline of the drafted DCC is to meet the District’s road related project priorities and budgetary concerns. The timings and priorities of the road projects will be revisited during the District’s next major DCC upgrade.

Costs identified in the draft DCC update for the two projects are $5.3 million, divided into $1.7 million for the Grand Street to Cade Barr Street portion, and $3.6 million for the Grand Street to Hurd Street portion. These costs originate from the TMP, and have been updated with one year inflation. These costs should be considered a class D estimate only. Detailed design should be completed to hone these costs.

The typical right-of-way along 14th Avenue is 20 m. On the south side there is approximately 400 m where property acquisition would be required to get the 20 m width, for an approximate total of 1600 m².

Coordinated capital works could include paving, AC watermain replacement and minor utility improvements.

The entire length of 14th Avenue has been identified in the 10 year paving plan, which was completed as part of the 2016 pavement condition assessment project. 14th Avenue from Hurd Street to Cedar Street is due for either mill and fill, or overlay paving in the very short term, and 14th Avenue from Cedar Street to Cade Barr Street is due in approximately six years.

In 2013 the District completed the structural condition assessments of its AC watermains. These assessments provided information on the level of pipe degradation, which was used to estimate each pipe’s remaining life. The results suggested that 880 m of the AC watermain on 14th Avenue beginning at Hurd Street extending east, there has currently an average pipe degradation level of 40%. On Hurd Street at 14th Avenue there is 150 m of AC watermain with 55% pipe degradation. These percentages are five years old, and as such are likely worse than indicated here.

Minor improvements to utilities, including hydraulic improvements to a sanitary manhole could be completed in conjunction with this project.

14th Avenue sidewalks are a high priority; however, with the TMP recommended timeframe of 2017 –
2021 for major improvements to 14th Avenue, any sidewalks installed now would be very temporary. Staff will bring forward a detailed report recommending Council consider upgrading 14th Avenue to the current standard, as per the Subdivision and Development Bylaw, for inclusion in 2019 budget discussions. This report will speak to roadway corridor upgrades, watermain replacement, pavement renewal, and funding sources.

If however, the upgrading of 14th Avenue is not approved in the 2019 budget, staff will proceed with construction of asphalt sidewalks on one side of 14th Avenue in 2019 and possibly 2020 utilizing annual sidewalk funding.

Staff completed a Class C cost estimate for temporary asphalt sidewalks on 14th Avenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14th Avenue from / to</th>
<th>Side of road</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribou Street to Cedar Street</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Street to Cade Barr Street</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou Street to Cedar Street</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Street to Horne Street</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific location and side of road for the installation of temporary sidewalks on 14th Avenue will be confirmed at a later date as required.

**Cherry Avenue Project**

Cherry Avenue fronts multiple elementary schools and parks. Similar to 14th Avenue, Cherry Avenue has sections of sidewalks which were constructed as a result of developments completed in the last few years.

Concerns have been raised regarding children’s safety when walking to and from school along Cherry Avenue. As a result, staff has updated the District’s sidewalk plan. This updated plan identifies two distinct high and/or medium priority locations on Cherry Avenue, the first in the area surrounding Albert McMahon Elementary School and Griner Park, and the second in the area surrounding Christine Morrison Elementary School. Coordinated capital works in both areas should include paving as identified in the ten year paving plan.

Cherry Avenue is experiencing fairly high development interest, with one active project, and several others in the review process. Since developers are required to provide sidewalks as part of their development, costs for sidewalks installed by the District could potentially be recuperated through a latecomer’s agreement for benefiting properties where the District has paid the upfront costs. Other sidewalk installation and infill options might be available that could be explored and negotiated with the developers during the application review process.

The District is in the process of retaining consultant services to determine the best conceptual layout for the transitioning of Cherry Avenue from its current state to an arterial standard. It is anticipated that this project will be completed later this year. The Cherry Avenue sidewalk projects can proceed after the conceptual design has been completed and the best sidewalk alignments are determined.

**Wren Street Project**

This high priority sidewalk project along Wren Street fronts West Heights Community Elementary School. For the most part, Wren Street has sidewalks on both sides of the road from Lougheed Highway to 7th Avenue. Within the project location however, there are only sidewalks directly fronting the school, with walking strips constituting the remainder.

Coordinated capital works in the area could include paving (that has been identified by the Pavement Management Program as a project to be done within the next five years), and replacement of 260 m of AC watermain which has an average degradation of 35%.
A conceptual design project, similar to Cherry Avenue, is scheduled to be conducted in 2019.

Of the high priority projects discussed in this report, this location has received the least amount of complaints or concerns regarding sidewalks. The District will likely proceed with the Wren Street sidewalk project once the others listed herein have been completed. Costs for widening will be included as part of the conceptual design project. If development to the west necessitates upgrades to Wren Street, then this timeline may advance.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

Increasing pedestrian facilities furthers the District’s goals of building our community, specifically addressing the objective of improved public safety. Creating a safer and more comfortable pedestrian environment will encourage walking trips for recreation, commuting to work or school, and shopping and errands.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. Funding for the Hatzic sidewalk project will come from the existing $300,000 walkway and sidewalk budget. Staff will bring forward a detailed report recommending Council consider upgrading 14th Avenue to the current design standard, for inclusion in 2019 budget discussions. Future sidewalk projects located on Cherry Avenue, and Wren Street will be funded through the annual walkway and sidewalk budget.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

COMMUNICATION:

Staff will continue to communicate with the School Board as required to determine the configuration of sidewalks fronting the Hatzic Elementary School, and alert them to the construction schedule as appropriate.

SIGN-OFFS:

Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic & Transportation

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
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This report is being provided as information to update Council on the results of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project.

PURPOSE:
This report is being provided as an information to update Council on the results of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project that was undertaken in the 2017/2018 winter snow season.

BACKGROUND:
Throughout the 2016/2017 winter snow season, Council and staff received numerous concerns regarding the accumulation of snow on sidewalks, to the extent that pedestrians were forced to walk on roadways. Although the large majority of sidewalks in the District are fronted by residences or businesses, there are several kilometers that border municipal or provincial property with no direct connection to any local address and therefore deemed to be municipal responsibility.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The District undertook a Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project for the 2017/2018 winter snow season to determine the feasibility of clearing snow from specific sidewalks. This provided staff the ability to initiate some sidewalk clearing while still maintaining all other aspects of the District snow plowing policy. Staff reviewed several options of equipment and methods of sidewalk snow removal, including staff availability, equipment availability and required training. Staff determined that the use of ATVs with front mounted plows and material spreaders would be the most cost effective method.

A contractor, West Coast Snow & Ice Maintenance Ltd. was retained for the pilot project. They provided the service we required at a cost effective method, and within a reasonable amount of time. Staff received positive feedback on the sidewalk snow clearing program, and a minimum amount of complaints. Staff has evaluated the effectiveness of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project and will continue the service for the 2018/2019 winter snow season. This will allow staff to compare the two winter seasons and better determine the cost and effectiveness of the pilot project.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES
As it is always Council’s objective to provide better service to municipal residents, the addition of this function to our snow and ice removal program provides for safer pedestrian traffic movement during snow events.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications associated with this report, as the expenses related to the pilot project fall within the existing budget.

During the 2017/2018 winter snow season, West Coast Maintenance Snow & Ice Maintenance Ltd. provided their service to the District seven times at a total cost of $9,528.75.

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

COMMUNICATION:
No communication is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
In response to concerns about snow accumulations on some sidewalks, a Sidewalk Snow Removal Pilot Project was initiated in the 2018/2019 winter snow season. Staff feel that the pilot was successful and will continue the pilot this coming winter snow season to better determine the cost and effectiveness of the pilot project.

SIGN-OFFS:

Dale Vinnish, Assistant Operations Manager

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
Appendix A
DATE: May 7, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services
SUBJECT: Water Metering Update

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

1. That funding in the amount of $40,000 be approved for additional water and sewer modeling related to the assessment of the potential impact of water metering and conservation on future infrastructure requirements, with $20,000 funded from the Water Capital Reserve Fund and $20,000 funded from the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund; and

2. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide council with an update on findings from the water meter pilot project, results of the water meter grant application, and to request funding for additional water and sewer modeling in relation to the water and sewer master plans.

BACKGROUND:
In order to better understand the water-saving potential of a fully metered system, the District initiated a pilot meter project in 2015. Staff reported back to Council on November 7, 2016 with preliminary findings based on 12 months of data. Since that time, staff have continued to gather water usage information that will help to guide future decisions related to water metering.

A major obstacle to the implementation of a metering program is the initial capital investment that is required. As such, the District has pursued various grant opportunities to lessen the impact, however, no grant funding has been secured to date. An application in 2009 to the Building Canada Fund was unsuccessful. In 2016, Council endorsed the application for a grant under the Clean Water and Wastewater Fund for the implementation of a universal water metering program, including Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI). While this application scored well, it was regarded as too large of a project for the program timeline, and was not accepted. The District’s other application under this program (ie. the sanitary sewer river crossing project) was deemed a higher priority and was granted funding.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Current Status of Water Metering and Conservation

Since 2009, all new developments within the District have required water metering. To date, approximately 1,600 of the 10,500 services are currently metered, representing about 15% of customers. Approximately 500 of the metered customers were part of the pilot meter project. This
project provided details on the typical amount of water usage for flat-rate customers, and offered insight into the scale of leakage that can go undetected without metering. With the pilot project now complete, staff have initiated the transition of these metered customers from a flat-rate fee to a volumetric fee. This process includes education, information on water conservation opportunities, and bi-monthly letters outlining details of the transition and scope of fees that a customer can expect based on previous usage. While the change to a volumetric rate for these properties is scheduled to occur in January 2019, customers were given the option to change over immediately, if requested. As of April 2018, there are over 200 pilot meter services that have changed from a flat-rate to a volumetric-rate.

There are a number of conservation initiatives that Mission continues to participate in through the regional water system, including:

- Toilet and washing machine rebates;
- Irrigation and landscape rebates;
- Sale of indoor and outdoor water saving kits;
- Subsidization of rain barrels;
- Workshops for irrigation systems, landscaping, and rainwater harvesting; and
- School/public education (through presentations, brochures, advertisements, etc.).

Observations in Water Usage

The pilot meter project included the upgrading of approximately 500 water services to radio read meters in 2015. During the project, data was collected on a monthly basis and compared to usage data from the volumetrically billed customers. Monthly data continues to be collected for ongoing analysis, and staff are taking a more active role in notifying customers of potential leaks. A number of interesting observations are noted from the collected data, including:

- Of customers in the pilot meter area, 83% would pay less than the flat rate amount (based on 2017 data):
  - Of those that would pay less than the flat rate, these customers would pay on average $220 less than the flat rate (ie. a 44% reduction in fees);
  - The median of all pilot meter customers would pay $170 less than the flat rate (ie. a 33% reduction in fees), however, the scale of the savings may decrease with time as the unit rate and flat rate are adjusted to ensure an equitable recovery of revenue from metered and un-metered customers;
  - As the higher users consume such a disproportionate amount of water, changing all pilot meter accounts to volumetric billing will only result in a decrease in revenue of about 5%, if usage habits remained the same as 2017;\(^1\)
- The top 25% of users account for over 50% of water usage;
- The average home in the pilot meter area uses about 1 m\(^3\) (1000 litres) of water per day;
  - In comparison, the top 14 customers account for 109 m\(^3\) per day, or the equivalent of 109 average homes worth of usage (based on January/February 2018 data), which works out to an average of almost 8 m\(^3\) per house per day; and
  - In October 2017, two single-family homes had leakage totaling 108 m\(^3\) per day, or the equivalent of 108 average homes worth of usage (note: this leakage would not have been captured by an in-house meter).

Grant Application Update

The District applied for funding under the 2018 Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund, which would

---

\(^1\) This information highlights that, although the flat rate is adequately set for the average customer usage, the median usage is substantially lower than the average, thus indicating that the lower users are subsidizing the higher users.
potentially provide funding up to $6 million. Although feedback from previous grant applications was incorporated into the submission, this application was likewise unsuccessful.

**Impacts of Water Metering on Development**

While the District recognizes the benefits of a universally-metered water system, the timeline for reaching the point of a fully metered system is very uncertain. Improvements in water usage habits has the potential to reduce demands on existing infrastructure, thus freeing up capacity for future development, and reducing the scope of future upgrades that are required. The uncertainty in timing of the meter program can have an impact on infrastructure budgeting, and subsequently the calculation of Development Cost Charges.

Although new development is often expected to pay for any system upgrades or expansions to accommodate the new growth, there are inevitably costs to the District\(^2\). Reduction in demands on the water and sewer systems will allow for additional growth to occur while limiting the amount of expansion or upgrades to existing infrastructure. This will benefit the District and developers by reducing capital costs associated with servicing new sites, and by helping to maintain Development Cost Charges at levels comparable to other communities. Changes to infrastructure upgrade requirements will likewise affect user fees, as decreased future capital costs would have a beneficial impact on the volumetric rates for water and sewer customers. The full scale of these impacts is not known without further computer modeling, but a sensitivity analysis could be incorporated into the modeling for the upcoming water and sewer master plans to assess the magnitude of the upgrade costs with and without universal water metering. Staff recommend that additional funding of $40,000 be approved for the modeling of extra scenarios.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**

The Strategic Plan has a guiding principle that highlights the need to balance environmental, financial, and operational sustainability. Moving towards a water-metering program would incorporate all of these aspects.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Staff recommend that the budget for water and sanitary modeling be increased by $40,000 in order to provide a sensitivity analysis of the effect of universal water metering on infrastructure upgrades. This modeling will inform both the upcoming water and sewer master plans, and the updating of the water and sewer fees, as water usage typically has a direct impact on sanitary sewer infrastructure. The budget increase can be funded from the Water Capital Reserve Fund and the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund.

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

**COMMUNICATION:**

Staff will continue to provide bi-monthly update letters to those customers in the pilot meter area who have not changed over to volumetric-billing. Monthly meter data will be collected from all radio-read meters, and staff will strive to identify possible major leaks and notify customers accordingly. Two environmental students have been retained for the summer months, and will assist with public

---

\(^2\) The District carries some cost of development within the Development Cost Charge program, through such items as the Assist Factor and Benefit Factor.
education related to water conservation programs and watering restrictions.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Although the District has not been successful in obtaining grant funding for the implementation of a universal water metering program, the pilot meter project has successfully demonstrated the benefits of water metering and the potential water savings through the identification of leaks. Additional water modeling should be conducted to better understand the impacts of water metering and reduced usage on future water and sanitary sewer infrastructure requirements.

SIGN-OFFS:

Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: March 27, 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)

Suggesting the development of a stand alone Youth Centre, and full staffing of this centre when it has been completed.

Preferred meeting date for delegation: April 3, 2018

Alternative meeting date for delegation: April 16, 2018

Barry McLeod
Name(s) of presenter(s)

Youth Unlimited
Name of group/organization (if applicable)

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

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

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

If yes, what was the result? Booked for the May 7, 2018 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.
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: April 30, 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 repeal of the section of District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 which forbids the keeping of a few laying hens in our backyard.

Preferred meeting date for delegation: May 7, 2018
Alternative meeting date for delegation: May 22, 2018

Frank Muermann
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):

Have you spoken with District staff about this request? □ Yes □ No
If yes, what was the result? Booked for the May 7th, 2018 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 - May 7, 2018

WHEREAS The Cycling4Diversity Foundation seeks to foster intercultural relationships by encouraging students and citizens to expand their circle of friends and connecting with people from various backgrounds by showing respect for differences and encouraging inclusion in their schools and communities; and

WHEREAS The Cycling4Diversity Foundation offers opportunities for learning and discussions on the benefits of cultural diversity and the importance of eliminating racism through the sharing of personal experiences; and

WHEREAS The Cycling4Diversity Foundation combines the art of cycling and intercultural dialogue.

Be it resolved that the District of Mission hereby proclaims May 20th to May 26th, 2018 as

“Cycling4Diversity Week”

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this 7th day of May, 2018

_____________________________________________  __________________________________________________
MAYOR RANDY HAWES                                  CORPORATE OFFICER
April 20, 2018

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

Re: Proclamation for National Missing Children’s Month and Missing Children’s Day

I write today on behalf of Child Find British Columbia. Child Find BC requests that your local government proclaim May as Missing Children’s Month and May 25th as missing Children’s Day.

Child Find BC provides “ALL ABOUT ME” ID Kits with child fingerprinting and photos, to at no cost to families and Child Find BC hosts these Child Find ID Clinics throughout BC. Child Find BC provides education, including public speakers, literature and tips for families to assist them in keeping all of our children safe.

We hope that you will raise this proclamation for consideration to your Council and your community at your next meeting.

Most recent reporting from the RCMP (2017) show that 7,459 cases of missing children were reported in British Columbia. Through the support of municipal governments like yours we are able to educate and bring awareness to thousands of BC families on this important issue.

Thank you so much for your consideration of this request and your continuing commitment to Community Services in BC and the children and families of BC. If you have any questions regarding this request please contact the Child Find BC office at 1-888-689-3463.

Yours truly,

Crystal Dunahee
President, Child Find BC

If you or your organization would like to host an “All About Me” ID clinic, have an idea for an event in your community or would like literature and information on becoming a member and supporter of Child Find BC, please call us at 1-888-689-3463.
District of Mission

Proclamation

That May, 2018 be proclaimed “Child Find’s Green Ribbon of Hope Month” and May 25, 2018 be proclaimed as “National Missing Children’s Day”

District of Mission Council Resolution - May 7, 2018

WHEREAS Child Find British Columbia, a provincial member of Child Find Canada is a non-profit, registered charitable organization, incorporated in 1984; and

WHEREAS The Mandate of Child Find British Columbia is to educate children and adults about abduction prevention; to promote awareness of the problem of missing children, and to assist in the location of missing children; and

WHEREAS Child Find has recognized Green as the colour of Hope, which symbolizes a light in the darkness for all missing children; and

WHEREAS Child Find’s annual Green Ribbon of Hope Campaign will be held in the month of May and May 25th is National Missing Children’s Day.

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

Child Find’s Green Ribbon of Hope Month

And May 25, 2018 as

National Missing Children’s Day

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this 3rd day of April, 2018

______________________________________________    __________________________________________________

MAYOR RANDY HAWES                                  CORPORATE OFFICER
Notice of Public Hearing

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, May 7, 2018 to consider the following proposed bylaw:

1. DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5722-2018-5050(284) (R17-041 – Central Valley Engineering)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into nine (9) lots of a minimum 465 sq. m. (5,005 sq. ft.) lot size and one (1) lot of a minimum 372 sq. m. (4,004 sq. ft.).

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

Parcel Identifier: 001-998-455
Lot 61 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 58347
Except Plan BC45990
Parcel Identifier: 002-030-063
Lot 1 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 70106
from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone and Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street and are 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, April 27, 2018 to Monday, May 7, 2018. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “Public Meeting Information”. For further information regarding any of these bylaws, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748.

At the Public Hearing, persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by these proposed bylaws will have the opportunity to be heard.

Should you have any comments or concerns you wish to convey to Council and you cannot attend the meeting, please submit in writing to the Corporate Officer by 4:00 pm on Friday, May 4, 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 17th day of April, 2018.
April 25, 2018

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Rezoning Application R17-041 (Central Valley Engineering) – 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject properties located at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 pm on May 7th, 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 5722-2018-5050(284) (R17-041 – Central Valley Engineering)

The purpose of the Bylaw is to enable the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into nine (9) lots of a minimum 465 sq. m. (5,005 sq. ft.) lot size and one (1) lot of a minimum 372 sq. m. (4,004 sq. ft.).

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

Parcel Identifier: 001-998-455
Lot 61 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 58347 Except Plan BCP45990

Parcel Identifier: 002-030-063
Lot 1 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 70106

from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to the Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone and Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone.

The locations of the subject properties are 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street and are 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, April 27, 2018 to Monday, May 7, 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 Michael Younie, Corporate Officer, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 pm on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

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

Yours truly,

For, Rob Publow
MANAGER OF PLANNING
DATE: April 16, 2018
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application and Street Naming to facilitate a 10 lot subdivision
ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning Plan
- Appendix 4 – Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street

APPLICANT: Central Valley Engineering

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

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: December 13, 2017
LOCATION: Cedar Valley
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the street naming and development application to rezone 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street to facilitate a 10 lot subdivision and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed Zoning Amending Bylaw 5722-2018-5050(284) and Street Naming Bylaw 5723-2018 under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 7, 2018.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Central Valley Engineering for the subject properties located at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject properties from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone and Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to facilitate a 10 lot subdivision, as shown in Appendix 3. Under the subdivision draft plan, nine lots are proposed to be rezoned to the RC465 Zone with a minimum lot size of 465 square metres (5,005 square feet) and one lot is proposed to be rezoned to the RC372 Zone with a minimum lot size of 372 square metres (4,004 square feet).

BACKGROUND:

On October 16, 2017, Council granted first and second readings to Bylaw 5677-2017-5050(268), a bylaw to rezone the subject properties at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to the Residential Compact 280 (RC280) and Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zones. A public hearing was held on November 6, 2017. Four letters of opposition were received and eight members of the public spoke in opposition to the proposed bylaw amendment. Many of the comments made during the public hearing pertained to the proposed extension of Sylvia Avenue to Cedar Street. During the public hearing, there were also concerns of the density of the proposed development backing onto Brett Lane. Members of the public believe that the proposed six lots backing onto Brett Lane (three on each side of the lane) should be developed with a maximum of four lots.

While the proposed Bylaw 5677-2017-5050(268) conformed with the Official Community Plan (OCP), Council defeated the application at third reading based on the proposed RC280 Zone being too small for the area. There were no concerns regarding the proposed RC465 Zone which would have seen an additional six lots a minimum 465 square metres (5,005 square feet) fronting onto Sylvia Avenue.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject site is approximately 0.75 hectares (1.85 acres) in size and is located in the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan area on Cedar Street, south of Egglestone Avenue. The two subject properties are developed each with a single family dwelling and various accessory buildings. The applicant has indicated that the existing structures are to be demolished with the development. The land is relatively flat and no watercourses are indicated on the District’s mapping system.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject properties are currently designated Urban Compact in the Official Community Plan and are zoned S36. The proposal for a rezoning to the RC372 Zone and RC465 Zone, as shown in Appendix 4, would accommodate the future subdivision of the land. The proposed RC465 Zone allows for lot sizes of a minimum of 465 square metres (5,005 square feet) without a rear lane, while
the proposed RC372 Zone allows for lot sizes of a minimum 372 square metres (4,004 square feet) with the requirement for a rear lane.

The Urban Compact designation allows for single family residential dwellings with heights limited to two storeys. Three storeys are possible if the third storey is contained entirely within the roofline. The Urban Compact designation permits a density of 20-36 units per hectare (8-14 units per acre). As the proposed subdivision includes many oversized lots ranging from 465 square metres (5,005 square feet) to 561 square metres (6,039 square feet) plus one lot at 372 square feet (4,004 square feet), the overall net density of the proposed development is 15 units per hectare (6 units per acre). This density is typically seen in much of the Urban Residential neighbourhoods in Mission’s core area.

The proposed rezoning application conforms to the OCP objective to encourage and support diverse housing options that cater to different types of households and income levels. Based on the proposed rezoning to the RC372 and RC465 Zones, the proposed development will not allow for any form of secondary dwelling unit including secondary suites.

Staff consider this development as a completion of a development pattern that was initiated with the creation of Brett Lane and see this development as a logical extension.

Compact single family residential lots are considered to be an intensive residential development with the design managed through a Development Permit Area. An Intensive Residential Development Permit will be required for the proposed lots to manage the form and character of the development. The Intensive Residential Development Permit is delegated to staff for approval.

**Neighbourhood Character:**

The subject property is located within the Cedar Valley neighbourhood. The surrounding lands to the east are designated Urban Compact and are developed with single family dwellings. These single family dwellings to the east have been developed under the RC372 Zone which allows for lots with a minimum area of 372 square metres (4,004 square feet).

Lands to the west on the opposite side of Cedar Street are designated Urban Compact and Townhouses. These lands are developed with single family dwellings and a 25-unit townhouse development. The single family dwellings to the west are also developed under the RC372 Zone.

Lands directly to the north are designated Urban Compact and are currently undeveloped. Rezoning (R18-011) and subdivision (S18-005) applications to develop these lands are currently under review by staff.

Lands to the south of the site are designated institutional and is the location of Albert McMahon Elementary School.

**Street Naming (Policy STR.28 Street Naming):**

In accordance with Council Policy STR.28, street naming for extensions to existing roads are required. This includes the north-south extension of Brett Lane, the east-west extension of Sylvia Avenue, and the completion of Trenholm Avenue. The associated Street Naming Bylaw will address the naming of the proposed extensions.

**Servicing:**

Municipal water and storm sewer are available on Cedar Street and Sylvia Avenue. As such, no upgrades are required.

**Tree Retention:**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of 20 trees, two trees for each lot created. This condition will be met as part of
the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater) that will be removed except in the areas defined as building envelope and driveways.

**Parks and Trails:**
The subject properties are located in close proximity to a neighbourhood park. Griner Park is approximately 315 metres to the south of the subject properties.
Pursuant to Section 510 of the Local Government Act, the developer must pay cash-in-lieu of parkland contribution, to be collected at the subdivision stage.

**Community Amenity Contribution** (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities):
In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $22,520 ($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

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

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

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

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

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

**REFERRALS:**

**Fire/Rescue Services**
Fire/Rescue Services has indicated that the proposed road extension of Sylvia Avenue to Cedar Street is preferred and acceptable. The connection of Sylvia Avenue to Cedar Street eliminates the concern for fire truck turnaround.

**Engineering**
The Engineering Department has indicated that the road extension of Sylvia Avenue to Cedar Street is required as part of subdivision and have no objection to the project.

**REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:**
The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve;
2. Substantial completion of subdivision application S17-006; and
3. Any other requirements resulting from Council's consideration of the Bylaw and Public Hearing submissions.

SIGN-OFFS:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 8504 Cedar Street
PID: 001-998-455
Legal: Lot 61 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 58347 Except Plan BCP45990

Civic Address: 8522 Cedar Street
PID: 002-030-063
Legal: Lot 1 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 70106
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 8504 & 8522 Cedar Street
Owner: Hartejpreet Dhaliwal
Applicant: Central Valley Engineering
Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Urban Residential - Compact
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning Plan

Lot 10
Rezoning from the S36 Zone to the RC372 Zone

Lots 1-9
Rezoning from the S36 Zone to the RC465 Zone
Appendix 4

Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan

Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

Shaded area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone
The Minutes of the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee meeting held in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Hall at 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC on Thursday, April 5, 2018 commencing at 1:30 pm.

Members Present:  Councillor Danny Plecas, Chair  
                 Councillor Pam Alexis, Vice-Chair  
                 Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works  
                 Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services  
                 Constable Alyn Beerda, RCMP  
                 Alison McDonald, BC Transit  
                 Jodi Marshall, School District #75  
                 Lisa Trotter, BC Transit  

Members Absent: Ken Collier, Member at Large, resident of the District of Mission  
                Sanjay Gulati, Mission Community Services Society  
                Judith Ray, Mission Association for Seniors Housing  
                James Grant, First Canada  
                Kirsten Hargreaves, Manager of Social Development  
                Representative, Mission Association for Community Living  
                Representative, Mission Seniors Activity Centre  
                Representative, Mission Youth Committee  
                Representative, United Way of the Lower Mainland  
                Dale Vinnish, Assistant Operations Manager  

Others Present: Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Planning and Design  
                Joan Hendriks, BC Old Age Pensioners’ Organization (Branch #28)  
                David Hill, Insurance Corporation of British Columbia  
                Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects  
                Maziar Kazemi, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure  
                Kate Woochuk, Insurance Corporation of British Columbia  
                Shirley Sawers, Administrative Clerk/Dispatcher  

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

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA  
   Moved and seconded,  
   That “Mission Community Cycling Coalition Delegation Presentation” be added to the agenda under New Business as item 5(h); and  
   That the agenda for the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee meeting held on Thursday, April 5, 2018 be approved, as amended.  
   CARRIED
3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved and seconded,
That the minutes of the Thursday, February 1, 2018 meeting of the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee be adopted.
CARRIED

4. OLD BUSINESS

(a) MOTI Projects Updates

Maziar Kazemi provided the following updates to the Committee:

Bus Stop in front of West Coast Express

Mr. Kazemi advised that he has met on site with Dale Vinnish, Assistant Operations Manager in regards to the issue of the bus stop in front of the West Coast Express station. He stated that no formal recommendations were discussed at that time. Mr. Kazemi advised that there may be an opportunity to move the bus stop further west on Railway Avenue by removing existing parking stalls. Mr. Kazemi felt that this should be discussed further with District staff for comment.

Councillor Alexis advised that she had thought that this process had been further along than mentioned and that due to the number of complaints that are received, this relocated of the bus stop has to be done.

Mr. Kazemi explained the sensitivity of relocating the bus stop due to the reserved parking stalls that would be affected.

It was agreed that Mr. Kazemi would discuss this issue further with staff and report back to Committee.

Pedestrian Crossing at Welton Street and Railway Avenue

The construction of the pedestrian crossing has been completed however MOTI is waiting on BC Hydro to complete the electrical connection for lighting.

Highway 7 and Highway 11

There are no updates at this time, the capacity enhancement project is still at the 90% design stage and there are no funding commitments yet.

Highway 7 and Dewdney Trunk Road

As a result of a review of the intersection located at Highway 7 and Dewdney Trunk Road, a draft report has been prepared and is presently being reviewed by the District of Mission Engineering Staff and MOTI. This review looked at the corridor for design and safety enhancements and if a traffic signal was warranted.

Councillor Alexis advised that this intersection is a concern for the school bus driver’s especially at peak times. Mr. Kazemi confirmed that it was determined through the review that a traffic signal was not warranted at this intersection, however that the report does provide other options and recommendations identifying prioritization and funding availability.
After further discussion in regards to what enhancements will be completed at this intersection, it was agreed that Mr. Kazemi will provide an update to the Committee at the next meeting.

**Highway 7 – Silverdale Avenue to Nelson Street Widening**

The project was awarded in early March to Stuart Olson Construction. Construction will be taking place early to mid-May and during the night with single lane closure. Night shift hours usually run from 8:30 pm to 6:00 pm based on volume of traffic. Mr. Kazemi advised that any works performed off the highway will be during daytime hours.

Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works stated that she had noticed that contractors were on site the night before and single lane closure was in effect.

Mr. Kazemi advised that if the Committee receives any complaints or have any concerns to contact him and MOTI will address it.

**1st Avenue Streetscape Improvements**

A letter of agreement between the Ministry and the District is being finalized regarding funding for roadworks related to the 1st Avenue streetscape improvements.

Mr. Kazemi advised that he has just received a report in regards to the traffic impact within the Highways right-of-way from the contractor. He will review it and update the Committee at the next meeting.

Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering and Projects will provide further updates in regards to the commencement of works.

**Mission Bridge**

Mr. Kazemi advised that MOTI have received funding for the asphalt resurfacing of the main span of the Mission Bridge. The MOTI is in process of having further discussion with the District of Mission in regards to further improvements of the Bridge.

In regards to questions raised regarding the time of day and when the works will commence, Mr. Kazemi advised that the work will commence early spring into the summer and done during the night, weather permitting.

**Murray Street Overpass**

No update information available. Mr. Kazemi advised that MOTI had completed patching of the overpass and that this location is on their annual maintenance program.

Further discussion took place in regards to the design plan that MOTI had for the Murray Street Overpass. Mr. Kazemi advised that this plan was deferred due to re-prioritizing projects. He stated that this plan is still on the list of projects however unsure when the design plan will be completed.

**Glasgow Street at Horne Street Crosswalk**

Pouring of the sidewalk was scheduled for April 5, 2018 however was delayed due to the weather. Once the sidewalk is poured MOTI will activate the signalized right turn for pedestrian crossing. There will be signs placed by MOTI advising of the traffic pattern change and that this change will be monitor.

**(b) ICBC Road Safety Updates**
Kate Woochuk introduced David Hill, Engineer for ICBC Road Improvement Program. A brief overview of past and upcoming campaigns to the Committee.

**Community Grant Fund**

ICBC’s Community Grant Funds are still available in this new fiscal year, and organizations are encouraged to review the funding criteria and put forward to her any requests for consideration.

**ICBC Rate Fairness Public Survey**

Ms. Woochuk mentioned that she had forward onto the Committee via email the link to Government’s invitation to the public to participate in survey. She stated that the survey closes at 4:00 pm today and encouraged everyone if possible to go online and participate.

**Auto Crime Awareness – April 2018**

ICBC Road Safety is working in partnership with the District of Mission Crime Prevention Office and Mission RCMP Detachment at an Auto Crime Awareness event. The event will be held on April 21, 2018 between 12:00 pm to 4:00 pm at the Mission Save On Foods and is being led by James Nokes, Mission Crime Prevention Coordinator. Volunteers, Police and ICBC will be handing out steering wheel locks/clubs to vulnerable vehicles that are not immobilized and are older than 2007, if they produce insurance documents while supplies last.

**High Risk Driving – May 2018**

ICBC will be working supporting police and volunteer partners on activities and tactics.

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

(a) **First Avenue Improvements Updates**

Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects, provided the Committee with an overview of the 1st Avenue Improvement Project.

He stated that the contract has been awarded to Eurovia BC. Notice of Construction was distributed to downtown tenants in late March and early April by both the District of Mission and Eurovia BC. Also the District of Mission has placed a half page advertisement in the Mission City Record Paper for the last two weeks. Mr. Jackman further stated that the District staff has built a project landing page for the District web site which will contain project information and updates.

The Contractor has deployed road-side project notification signage as of April 10, 2018. Removal of trees for all three blocks is scheduled for April 16, 2018. Mobilization has been delayed due to vacation schedules and the need for a lane closure permit from the MOTI. A copy of the Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to MOTI for review and comments.

The Contractor will be using CP land south of the James/Grand Street block for the storage of equipment and materials.

Discussion ensued regarding disruptions during construction and when the construction will take place. Mr. Jackman advised that the Contractor would prefer to work during daytime hours with minimal night work and some weekend work when required. There
will be no overflow parking available and all affected bus stops will be temporarily relocated. All stores will be accessible during this time and the highway will have at least one lane of traffic open at all times. Bus service, loading zones, and handicapped parking will be maintained during this time, and there will be signage to direct riders and drivers.

Works are scheduled to commence on April 16, 2018 Monday to Friday between the hours of 7:00 am and 5:00 pm.

(b) Crosswalk Removal on Cedar Street at 10th Avenue

A memo from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport regarding removal of crosswalk located on Cedar Street at 10th Avenue was provided to the Committee for information.

The District will be removing the existing marked crosswalk, including the signs and pavement markings, as weather and schedules permit. Removing the marked crosswalk will not prohibit pedestrians from crossing at this location, as it will then be considered an unmarked crosswalk.

(c) Traffic Calming Policy Amendment

A memo from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport regarding the need for a review of the Neighbourhood Traffic Calming (NTC) Policy STR.32 was provided to the Committee for information.

All traffic calming requests are currently on hold pending the outcome of the Policy review and amendments.

Councillor Alexis questioned Cst. Beerda in regards to the number of traffic violations that RCMP have been given out within residential areas. Cst. Beerda advised that the RCMP is not seeing too many violations and that people are driving within the speed limit.

Councillor Alexis advised that there may be a perception that people are speeding but in fact they are driving the posted speed limit but not any slower.

Cst. Beerda advised that driving 50 km/h within corridors (ie. 11th Avenue and Stave Lake Street) verses residential streets (ie. Hatzic area, Egglestone Avenue) does give a different perception due to narrower streets; vehicles parked on streets, and have more children travelling to and from school.

Councillor Plecas then questioned Cst. Beerda in regards to the effectiveness of the speed reader boards. Cst. Beerda advised that statistically reader boards are most effective within the first three months. He further advised that the reader board located at the top of Cedar Street is still effective; however he suggests that the reader boards be relocated.

Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering suggested that Cst. Beerda meet with Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport to discuss the relocation of speed reader boards.

Kate Woochuk, ICBC questioned whether we had used the ‘dark mode’ method on the speed reader boards. Cst. Beerda advised we had not, and explained that ‘dark mode’ method is where the lantern is turned off and the recorded speed is not visible to the driver but still gathers data.
After further discussion, it was suggested that before relocating the speed reader boards that the 'dark mode' method be activated for a two month period.

(d) Intersection of 11th Avenue and Horne Street Safety Review
A memo from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transport regarding review of the intersection of 11th Avenue and Horne Street for safety concerns, was provided to the Committee for information.

Staff will be conducting a traffic study and safety review and will report back to the committee at the June 7, 2018 meeting with any findings and recommendations.

(e) BC Transit’s Public Engagement Event held on March 6 and the Central Fraser Valley Transit Future Action Plan
A copy of the Central Fraser Valley Transit Future Action Plan was provided to the Committee for information.

Alison McDonald provided an update of the BC Transit hosted two Open House events held on March 6, 2018. The events took place at the Mission Library and at the West Coast Express station. An online survey was also open for three weeks, ending one week after the Open House events.

There were approximately 100 attendees at the two Open House events combined with 162 online survey respondents.

Survey results as follows:
- 75% of respondents were adults
- 75% were residents of Mission (majority were regular transit users)
- 40% state they use transit five or more days per week
- Frequently ridden routes were:
  - 31 Abbotsford-Mission Connector
  - 33 Cedar Valley
  - 32 West Heights
  - 34 East Side, Mission’s main transit routes

In terms of the 2019 expansion proposal presented, all Open House attendees who voted were in support of dedicated evening service for the 33 Cedar Valley and 34 East Side and statutory holiday service. Online survey responses also indicated high levels of approval for these options as well.

People were asked for their top three priorities for transit service improvements over the next five years and the following results were received:
- More Sunday and evening services, and statutory holidays
- Increase service frequency in general
- More service between Mission and Maple Ridge
- Improvements to on-time performance, bus stops
- Better connections with the West Coast Express (especially the first two morning departures)

Ms. McDonald advised that these public engagement results will be incorporated into the BC Transit’s Central Fraser Valley Transit Future Action Plan currently underway.

Councillor Places questioned whether BC Transit had any statistics as to how many people take Route 66. Lisa Trotter advised that she will have to report back to the Committee.

Councillor Alexis address Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services in regards to any updated information regarding increasing the TransLink 701 bus service. Mr. Sommer advised that he would have to discuss this with Mike Younie, Deputy CAO and report back to the Committee.

**ACTION ITEM:** Dan Sommer will report back to the Committee at the next meeting scheduled for June 7, 2018 in regards to where discussions are at with increasing TransLink 701 bus services, to include weekends.

**(f)** MOTI Update of 4 Lane Construction on the Lougheed Highway

This information was provided under Section 4. Old Business subsection (a) MOTI Project Updates.

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence to the District regarding traffic and/or transit-related issues, were received by the Committee for information.

7. **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, June 7, 2018 at 1:30 pm in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Hall.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved and seconded,
That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting adjourned at 2:41 pm.
The Minutes of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting held in Multi-Purpose Room #4 at the Mission Leisure Centre on Tuesday, March 13, 2018 commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Members Present:  Paul Hockridge, Chair  
                  Ed Hodson  
                  Dan Schubert  
                  Laura Wilson  
                  Rich Vigurs

Members Absent:  Manpreet Brar  
                  Danica Stene

Others Present:  Rachel Kleindienst, Booking Clerk  
                  Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by E. Hodson and seconded by D. Schubert,

That the agenda of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting held on March 13, 2018 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by L. Wilson and seconded by R. Vigurs,

That the minutes of the February 13, 2018 meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee be approved.

CARRIED

4. BUSINESS ARISING

(a) Master Plan Open House

M. Sinclair reviewed with the Committee results of the Community Open House that was held at the Leisure Centre on March 10, 2018 from 11:00am – 2:00pm. Approximately
25 questionnaires were completed by the public and have been given to the consultant to include in the next draft plan.

(b) Trails Workshop Results

A workshop was held on March 1, 2018 with staff and organizations that have involvement or association with the trail systems in the District. Discussion at the workshop included:

- How the current trail systems should progress
- Experience the Fraser project
- The Trans-Canada Trail
- Review of the Cedar Valley neighbourhood plan
- BC Hydro property access (Rolley Lake, Hayward lake)

M. Sinclair suggested that David Urban, Manager of Outdoor Recreation Planning for the Fraser Valley Regional District, be invited to the April meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee.

(c) Council Report Updates

M. Sinclair provided the Committee information on three reports to be presented to Council.

1. Emma’s Acres - L.I.N.C License for Use Agreement

M. Sinclair requested feedback from the Committee regarding a request from L.I.N.C to construct a sweat lodge on the leased property located at 34980 Cemetery Avenue. Discussion ensued and the Committee decided to invite L.I.N.C to present their mandate. The lease is proposed to be renewed for a five-year term. The property will need to be returned to the District for cemetery operations after this time.

2. Lawn Bowling License Renewal

The New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society constructed the building in 1973 and has been operating it ever since. The Society did not receive a Fee for Service Grant and the District has assumed all utility costs for the building. A recommendation for a five-year renewal will be presented to Council.

3. Parks Improvement Projects

M. Sinclair prepared a report to Council to clarify how the $409,000.00 previously approved for park improvements will be spent. These projects were prioritized and approved by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee in 2017.
(d) Seniors Housing/Community Centre Update

M. Sinclair provided the Committee with an update on the progress of the Community Centre to be constructed. Council and MASH have met and continue to work together to develop a cohesive plan. The same architect that drafted the Mission Community Activity Centre renovation has been hired to draft plans for the new building.

5. NEXT MEETING

April 13, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in room #2 at the Mission Leisure Centre.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by E. Hodson and seconded by R. Vigurs,

That the meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5728-2018-5050(286)

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 5728-2018-5050(286)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 33234 Whidden Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier:  012-749-028
      Lot 19 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
      NWP27849
      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 5729-2018-5050(287)

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
5729-2018-5050(287)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended
by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 31712 Bench Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 030-133-955
      Lot 1 Section 30 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
      EPP48559
      from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling (S36s) 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 5730-2018

A Bylaw to terminate “District of Mission
Land Use Contract Bylaw 616-1977”

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. 616-1977”;

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 5730-2018”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and Howard Nemtin & Associates Ltd., for the property legally described as:

   Parcel Identifier: 005-165-857
   Legal Description: Block 150, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 955, NWD

   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
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED THIS ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES   MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR  CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5731-2018-5050(288)

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 5731-2018-5050(288)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the property located at 33093 7th Avenue and legally described as:

        Parcel Identifier: 005-165-857
        Block 150, Section 21, Township 17, Plan 955, NWD
        From Institutional Parks Recreation and Civic (IPRC) Zone to Commercial Local One (CL1) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES  MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR    CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5732-2018

A Bylaw to terminate “District of Mission Land Use Contract Bylaw 168-1972”

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 9th day of May, 1972 enact a bylaw cited as “District of Mission Land Use Contract By-law No. 168-1972”;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5732-2018”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and Eckhard Horst Fabische, for the property legally described as:

   Parcel Identifier: 010-466-738
   Legal Description: Lot “A” Except: West 6 Feet, Block 24 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 332

   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
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this __ day of __, 2018
ADOPTED THIS __ day of __, 2018

RANDY HAWES MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5733-2018-5050(289)

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 5733-2018-5050(289)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 32053 Trembath Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 010-264-795
      Lot 3 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 21102
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone;
      and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
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 5734-2018-5050(290)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the property located at 7365 Alder Street and legally described as:
       Parcel Identifier: 010-466-738
       Lot “A” Except: West 6 Feet, Block 24 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 332
       from Residential Two Unit (RT465) Zone to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this ___ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2018
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5723-2018

A Bylaw to name three road extensions within the District of Mission

WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Charter, may assign the name of any highway;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to name certain streets within the Municipality;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “District of Mission Street Naming (Brett Lane, Sylvia Avenue and Trenholm Avenue Extensions) Bylaw 5723-2018”.

2. Three road extensions over portions of property located at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street and legally described as:
   - Parcel Identifier: 001-998-455
     Lot 61 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
     58347 Except Plan BCP45990
   - Parcel Identifier: 002-030-063
     Lot 1 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
     70106

   shall be named as shown on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of _____, 2018

READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of _____, 2018

READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of _____, 2018

ADOPTED this __ day of _____, 2018

______________________________  ________________________________
RANDY HAWES, MAYOR          MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE "A"

Brett Lane (Extension)

Trenholm Avenue (Extension)

Sylvia Avenue (Extension)
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5727-2018

A bylaw to impose property tax rates for the year 2018

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 197 of the Community Charter, the Council shall, before the 15th day of May in each year, establish tax rates for municipal revenue and for amounts collected for the year by means of rates established by the municipality to meet its taxing obligations in relation to another local government or other public body, based on the assessed value of taxable land and improvements;

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 Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5727-2018".

2. The following rates are hereby imposed and levied for the year 2018:
   (a) for general municipal purposes, including debt, of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “A” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (b) for policing purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “B” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (c) for drainage purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “C” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (d) for library purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “D” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (e) for purposes of the Fraser Valley Regional District, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “F” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (f) for purposes of the Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for regional hospital district purposes, those rates appearing in column “G” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (g) for purposes of the Mission Diking District, on the assessed value of land and improvements within the said District and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “J” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
   (h) for purposes of the Silverdale Diking District, on the assessed value of land and improvements within the said District and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “K” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw; and
(i) for purposes of the Downtown Mission Business Improvement Area (BIA), on the assessed value of land and improvements for Class 5 and 6 only within the said BIA area and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column “L” of Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw.

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  
MICHAEL YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
### 2018 Tax Rates (Dollars of Tax per $1000 Taxable Value)

#### Tax Rates for Municipal Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E = A to D Municipal Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.8755</td>
<td>1.05716</td>
<td>0.15941</td>
<td>0.13047</td>
<td>3.22259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>23.28429</td>
<td>13.12358</td>
<td>1.97892</td>
<td>1.61965</td>
<td>40.00644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>1.8755</td>
<td>1.05716</td>
<td>0.15941</td>
<td>0.13047</td>
<td>3.22259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industry</td>
<td>6.35713</td>
<td>3.58377</td>
<td>0.54040</td>
<td>0.44229</td>
<td>10.92359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>6.35713</td>
<td>3.58377</td>
<td>0.54040</td>
<td>0.44229</td>
<td>10.92359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Other</td>
<td>7.50902</td>
<td>4.23287</td>
<td>0.63828</td>
<td>0.52240</td>
<td>12.90257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Forest</td>
<td>6.62911</td>
<td>3.73706</td>
<td>0.56351</td>
<td>0.46121</td>
<td>11.39089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Nonprofit</td>
<td>5.56411</td>
<td>3.13659</td>
<td>0.47297</td>
<td>0.38710</td>
<td>9.56077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>12.67937</td>
<td>7.14640</td>
<td>1.07761</td>
<td>0.88198</td>
<td>21.78536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Taxes Rates on Behalf of Other Taxing Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>F Fraser Valley Regional District</th>
<th>G Fraser Valley Regional Hospital</th>
<th>H = F + G Subtotal Other Authorities</th>
<th>I = E + H Total Municipal &amp; Other Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.22024</td>
<td>3.44283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>0.91566</td>
<td>0.51268</td>
<td>1.42834</td>
<td>41.43478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.22024</td>
<td>3.44283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industry</td>
<td>0.25005</td>
<td>0.49803</td>
<td>0.74808</td>
<td>11.67167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>0.25005</td>
<td>0.49803</td>
<td>0.74808</td>
<td>11.67167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Other</td>
<td>0.29534</td>
<td>0.35888</td>
<td>0.65422</td>
<td>13.55679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Forest</td>
<td>0.26074</td>
<td>0.43944</td>
<td>0.70018</td>
<td>12.09107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Nonprofit</td>
<td>0.21885</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.36533</td>
<td>9.92610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>0.49862</td>
<td>0.14648</td>
<td>0.64510</td>
<td>22.43046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Special Area Municipal Levies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>J Mission Diking District</th>
<th>K Silverdale Diking District</th>
<th>L Business Improvement Area (BIA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>0.59987</td>
<td>0.41808</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industry</td>
<td>0.58273</td>
<td>0.40613</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>0.58273</td>
<td>0.40613</td>
<td>1.52849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Other</td>
<td>0.41991</td>
<td>0.29265</td>
<td>1.52849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Forest</td>
<td>0.51417</td>
<td>0.35835</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Nonprofit</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>0.17139</td>
<td>0.11945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5722-2018-5050(284)

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 5722-2018-5050(284)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the following properties:

   Civic Address: 8504 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 001-998-455
   Legal Description: Lot 61, Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster
   District Plan 58347 Except Plan BCP45990

   Civic Address: 8522 Cedar Street
   Parcel Identifier: 002-030-063
   Legal Description: Lot 1, Section 28, Township 17, New Westminster
   District Plan 70106

   as shown on Schedule 1 attached to and forming part of this Bylaw, from Surburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) and Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone;

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 16th day of April, 2018

READ A SECOND TIME this 16th day of April, 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
SCHEDULE 1

Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

Shaded area to be rezoned from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5689-2017-5050(269)

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 5689-2017-5050(269)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 32270 Lougheed Highway and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 010-095-047
      Lot 5: Except Part Dedicated Road on Plan LMP1007; Section 17
      Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 20947
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 4th day of December, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 4th day of December, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING held this 18th day of December, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this 18th day of December, 2017
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this 13th day of April, 2017
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2017

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
1. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5690-2017

A bylaw to discharge the Land Use Contract for the property at 32270 Lougheed Highway

-AND-

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5689-2017-5050(269)

R15-022 (Oberoi) – a bylaw to rezone property located at 32270 Lougheed Highway from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5689-2017-5050(269) is to discharge Land Use Contract (LUC) 171-1972 and to rezone the subject property to a Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 010-095-047
Lot 5: Except Part Dedicated Road on Plan LMP1007; Section 17 Township 17
New Westminster District Plan 20947

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

The Manager of Planning showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. Background information on the Land Use Contract.
2. Information on the Temporary Use Permit.
3. Information on the property’s underlying zone.
4. 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 Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5690-2017 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5689-2017-5050(269) (R15-022 - Oberoi) closed.
DATE: December 4, 2017
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bourdeau, Planner
SUBJECT: Discharge of Land Use Contract (LUC) 171-1972 and the Rezoning of the property at 32270 Lougheed Highway to Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 - Engineering Department Comments
Appendix 4 – Land Use Contract 171-1972

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32270 Lougheed Highway
APPLICANT: Manu Oberoi
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Commercial OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: 
LOCATION: Mission Core (Lougheed Highway Commercial Area)
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the development application to discharge Land Use Contract (LUC) 171-1972 and to rezone the subject properties to Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone, and identifies the necessary Zoning Bylaw amendment.

Staff supports the application moving forward and as such has listed the Zoning Bylaw amendment under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

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

SUMMARY

A development application has been received from Manu Oberai, on behalf of the property owner Baljinder Gill, for the property located at 32270 Lougheed Highway (Appendix 2).

The application includes the proposal to rezone the property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone and to discharge Land Use Contract (LUC) 171-1972.

No development is complemented at this time and any development of the site in the future would require further development applications, including a development permit for building form and character.

BACKGROUND

The property is currently subject to Temporary Use Permit TP15-002, which permits a temporary warehouse facility use limited to the storage and shipment of post-consumer plastic. TP15-002 was renewed for a term of 12 months on October 16, 2017.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Site Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>32270 Lougheed Highway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Uses</td>
<td>Commercial Building (Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>2.06 hectares (5.1 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official Community Plan

| Future Land Use | Commercial |

Zoning Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Commercial Vehicle Dealership (CVD) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose

To allow a vehicle dealership as the principal use and allow future development potential in the Commercial designation.

Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>Hotel (across Lougheed Highway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Light Manufacturing (Truss manufacturing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Commercial development (Superstore, Gas Station &amp; Auto Glass Repair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is approximately 2.06 hectares (5.1 acres) in area and is located in the Lougheed Highway Commercial Area. The subject property fronts Rai Avenue to the north and the Canadian Pacific Railway right-of-way to the south. The northern portion of the lot is relatively flat and is developed with a commercial building that is currently vacant, but was previously used as a garden centre.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan (OCP)

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the property’s Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Commercial.

The intention of the OCP’s Commercial designation is to encourage a wide range of commercial businesses and maintain a diversity of commercial retail, office and service sector locations in Mission to provide for local, neighbourhood, community-wide and regional needs.

The proposed rezoning to CVD conforms to the OCP, specifically Policy 3.2.3 which provide[s] for commercial uses that serve the local and regional population in regional shopping centre locations and in highway commercial areas on a site-by site basis, and to limit strip retail and large warehouse retail businesses to existing commercial use areas.

Land Use Contract (LUC) 171-1972 and Zoning Bylaw Compliance

From 1973 to 1979, provincial legislation allowed the District to enter into Land Use Contracts with property owners. LUCs were zoning, development permits, subdivision layout approval and servicing agreements all contained within one document. In a case where a property is the subject to an LUC, the LUC supersedes the underlying zoning, if any exists.

In May 2014, the Province adopted legislation to terminate all LUCs by no later than June 30, 2024 and directed Municipalities to have underlying zoning in place by June 30, 2022.

If the LUC 171-1972 was to expire in 2024, the underlying R558 Zone would come into effect. If the property were to become vacant for a period of more than 6 months, the property would not be deemed a non-conforming use and as a result, the existing permitted uses (Christmas Tree Farm,
Nursery, Farm and Garden Supplies, Tool and Equipment Rental, Office, Ship Rental and Cabinet Manufacturing) would not be entitled to legally non-conforming status.

**Ministry of Environment (MoE) Comments**

Correspondence received from MoE advises a detailed site investigation is required to determine the extent of possible contamination on the site; however, the proponent received a release from MoE that delays this requirement for a site investigation. In part, the MoE release states “the Ministry is prepared to provide the necessary release so that the District of Mission may proceed with approval of the zoning application the requirement for a site investigation is not extinguished by this release and this outstanding requirement will suspend the approval of future applications for the site identified in section 40 of the *Environmental Management Act*.”

Council may proceed with the Rezoning application with the understanding that the MoE requirement for a detailed site investigation, required under section 7(1) of the Contaminated Site Regulation, is not required at this time; however, any further development applications may not proceed until the MoE detailed site investigation requirements have been satisfied.

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

Correspondence received from MoTI advises a complete Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) is not required at this time as the property owner is not contemplating development; however, MoTI does advise that the “the Ministry is willing to approve the Zoning [Bylaw] provided the owner is willing to enter into a Restrictive Covenant tied to existing trip generation. The owner will need to have trips counted in the am and pm peak hours in order to establish a baseline for the Covenant.”

The purpose of the Restrictive Covenant is to ensure a TIA is conducted when the property is redeveloped in the future.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends discharging the LUC and rezoning the properties to CVD Zone because:

- the LUC limits the property to a limited number of uses which is contrary to the Commercial OCP designation which calls for a wider variety of uses.

- the property may become vacant for a period of more than 6 months, as a result if the LUC was to expire in 2024 without any action by the District, the property would not be eligible for non-conforming status, as per Section 528 of the *Local Government Act*, and the R558 zone would apply. This means the only permitted use would be one Single Family Dwelling and various accessory uses.

- the property has been used for commercial purposes for over 40 years, and could be considered a historic use.

- the purpose of the CVD Zone is to provide for a broad range of businesses to serve the general retail, office, service and auto-oriented shopping needs of the community that are located along the Provincial Highway corridors (Highway #7 and Highway #11) and located within the Commercial [OCP designation] area only.
COMMUNICATION

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, as there is no development proposed at this time. Engineering comments are available in Appendix 4.

REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING

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

1. Approval from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI), including the registration of a Restrictive Covenant related to existing trip generation.

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

SIGN-OFFS:

Ken Bourdeau, Planner

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32270 Lougheed Highway

PID: 010-095-047

Legal: Lot 5: Except Part Dedicated Road on Plan LMP1007; Section 17 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 20947
Appendix 2

Location Map
CIVIC ADDRESS: 32270 Lougheed Highway

CURRENT ZONES: Land Use Contract

PROPOSED ZONES: CVD (Commercial Vehicle Dealership Zone)

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Rai Avenue. Modeling and/or upgrades may be required at the time of future subdivision and/or development permit stages.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available via District-owned sanitary main infrastructure that bisects the property. No upgrades are required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Rai Avenue. No upgrades required. Onsite upgrades may be required at the time of future subdivision and/or development permit stages.

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

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

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Brent Schmitt, Director of Engineering & Public Works (Acting)

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
Appendix 4

DISTRICT OF MISSION

BY-LAW NO. 171 - 1972

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Donald Hudson Duncan and Clarice Monica Duncan.

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the "Municipal Act", the Council, may by by-law, amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has, by "Development Area By-Law No. 108 - 1971", declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

Commencing at the NW corner of Parcel "A" (EP 37493) of Lots 24 & 25, NW 1/4 Section 17, Township 17, thence easterly along the south boundary of the Lougheed Highway to the eastern boundary of Lot "H", District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 12788, thence southerly to the northern boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway, thence westerly along the northern boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the southwest corner of the Remainder of Lot 1, Block B, N.W. 1/4, Section 17, Township 17, Plan 33475 and Plan 9579, thence northerly along the eastern boundary of Wren Road to the point of commencement.

And commencing at the Southwest corner of Lot 16, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, thence north westerly along the western boundary of said Lot 16 to a point 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across Lot 16 and Lot 14, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, to a point on the easterly boundary of said Lot 14, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across Mail Road to a point on the westerly boundary of Lot 13, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across Park Road to a point on the westerly boundary of Lot 11, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across said Lot 11 and Lot 10, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880 and Lot 23, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 951, to a point on the easterly boundary of said Lot 23, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence southerly along the easterly boundary of said Lot 23 and 24, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 951, to the interception of the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence westerly along the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway to the point of commencement.

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the "Municipal Act", for a Land Use Contract to develop a garden supplies store and nursery and containing a furniture manufacturing shop within the said Development Area:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 10th day of April, 1972 with respect to the said application for a garden supplies store and nursery, and a Public Hearing was held on the 23rd day of April, 1973 with respect to the said application for a furniture manufacturing shop:

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

1. This By-Law may be cited for all purposes as "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 171 - 1972".
2. It shall be lawful for and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with Donald Hudson Duncan and Clarice Monica Duncan for the construction of a garden supplies store and nursery and a furniture manufacturing shop upon land described as:

Lot 5 of Lot 2, Block B, North West 1/4 Section 17, Township 17, Plan 20947, New Westminster District.

3. The Mayor and the Clerk of the District of Mission are hereby authorized to sign, seal and deliver a Land Use Contract on behalf of the District of Mission, and to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

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

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

READ A THIRD TIME THIS 7th day of May, 1973.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 4th day of June, 1973.

[Signature]
MAYOR

[Signature]
CLERK

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 171 - 1972".

[Signature]
CLERK
Appendix 4

BY-LAW NO. 171 - 1972

A By-Law to authorize the Council to enter into a Land Use Contract with Donald Hudson Duncan and Clarice Monica Duncan.

WHEREAS under the provisions of Section 702 A (2) of the "Municipal Act", the Council, may by by-law, amend the Zoning By-Law to designate areas of land within the Municipality as Development Areas:

AND WHEREAS the Council has, by "Development Area By-Law No. 108 - 1971", declared the following described land to be a Development Area:

Commencing at the NW corner of Parcel "A" (EP 37493) of Lots 24 & 25, NE 1/4 Section 17, Township 17, thence easterly along the south boundary of the Lougheed Highway to the eastern boundary of Lot "I", District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 12788, thence southerly to the northern boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway, thence westerly along the northern boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the southwest corner of the Remainder of Lot 1, Block 8, N.W. 1/4, Section 17, Township 17, Plan 35475 and Plan 9579, thence northerly along the eastern boundary of Klen Road to the point of commencement.

And commencing at the Southwest corner of Lot 15, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, thence north westerly along the western boundary of said lot 16 to a point 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across Lot 16 and Lot 14, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, to a point on the easterly boundary of said Lot 14, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across Haig Road to a point on the westerly boundary of Lot 13, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across Park Road to a point on the westerly boundary of Lot 11, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence easterly across said Lot 11 and Lot 10, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 9880 and Lot 23, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 951, to a point on the easterly boundary of said Lot 23, 225 feet perpendicularly distant north of the north boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence southerly along the easterly boundary of said Lot 23 and 24, District Lot 165, Group 3, Plan 951, to the interception of the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway, thence westerly along the northern boundary of the Lougheed Highway to the point of commencement.

AND WHEREAS the Council has received an application under the provisions of Section 702 A (3) of the "Municipal Act", for a Land Use Contract to develop a garden supplies store and nursery and containing a furniture manufacturing shop within the said Development Area:

AND WHEREAS a Public Hearing was held on the 10th day of April, 1972 with respect to the said application for a garden supplies store and nursery, and a Public Hearing was held on the 23rd day of April, 1973 with respect to the said application for a furniture manufacturing shop:

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

1. This By-Law may be cited for all purposes as "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 171 - 1972".
2. It shall be lawful for and the Council of the District of Mission is hereby empowered to enter into a Land Use Contract with Donald Hudson Duncan and Clarice Monica Duncan for the construction of a garden supplies store and nursery and a furniture manufacturing shop upon land described as:

Lot 5 of Lot 2, Block B, North West 1/4 Section 17, Township 17, Plan 20947, New Westminster District.

3. The Mayor and the Clerk of the District of Mission are hereby authorized to sign, seal and deliver a Land Use Contract on behalf of the District of Mission, and to apply the Corporate Seal of the District of Mission thereto.

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

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

READ A THIRD TIME THIS 7th day of May, 1973.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 4th day of June, 1973.

[Signatures]

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of "Mission District Land Use Contract By-Law No. 171 - 1972".

[Signature]
LAND USE CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is dated the 4th day of June, 1973.

BETWEEN:

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

(hereinafter called "THE MUNICIPALITY")

OF THE FIRST PART

AND:

DONALD HUDSON DUNCAN and
CLARICE MUNICA DUNCAN,
662 Ioco Road,
Port Moody, B. C.

(hereinafter called "THE DEVELOPER")

OF THE SECOND PART

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

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

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

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

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and the Developer both acknowledge that the Council of the Municipality could not enter into this agreement, until the Council 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 an owner of those lands and premises situated, lying and being in the DISTRICT of MISSION, in the Province of British Columbia, and being more particularly known and described as:

   LAND

   Lot 5, of Lot 2, Blk B - NW4, Sec 17, Twp 17,
   Plan 20947, N.W.D.
   (hereinafter called "THE LAND")

2. The Developer has obtained the consent of all persons having a registered interest in the land as set out in the schedule 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, thereover or therein shall be used for the purpose specified in Schedule "A" hereto and for none other.

4. No building or structure shall be constructed, reconstructed, altered, moved or expanded upon the land except in compliance with the specifications and the plot plan set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

5. No sign shall be erected upon the land or any building structure thereon except those shown on the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "D" hereto.

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

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

8. All landscaping, surface treatments; fences and screens shall be constructed, located, provided and maintained in compliance with and according to the plans and specifications set out in Schedule "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 "F" 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.
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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 "I" hereto, the entire cost of the development of the land including the provision of all services and the provisions and construction of the items set out in paragraphs 6 to 11 hereof shall be paid for by the Developer.

14. All works and services, buildings, structures, pipes and fixtures and development constructed, placed or carried out upon property that is now, or by this contract becomes vested in the Municipality or located upon highways required to be dedicated, shall, upon acceptance by the Municipality in writing, become the property of the Municipality free and clear of any claim by the Developer or any person claiming through the Developer and the Developer shall save harmless the Municipality from any such claim.

15. Except as provided in Schedule "J" hereto, the Municipality shall, from the date of acceptance, become solely responsible for the operation, upkeep and maintenance of any works and services and any building, structure, pipes and fixtures of development accepted by it pursuant to paragraph 14 hereof, but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to or require the Municipality to operate, maintain or repair such works and services, buildings, structures, pipes, fixtures or development in any manner or to any extent different from its obligations in relation to similar works, services, buildings, structures, pipes, fixtures or development constructed by it out of its general municipal funds.
16. The Developer shall provide the Municipality with the security set out in Schedule "K" hereto to guarantee performance hereof.

17. The Developer shall carry out the work and construct, locate, provide and develop the structures, buildings, works, services, developments and facilities according to the times set out in Schedule "L" hereto.

17A. The Developer hereby agrees to pay to the Municipality the sum of $___ at the time the Developer makes application for a building permit on the said land for the Municipality's own use absolutely which amount or any part thereof is not refundable.

17B. Upon execution of this contract by the Developer, the Developer shall pay the sum of $350.00 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".
INTERPRETATION

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

BINDING

20. This agreement shall assure 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. ______

and on the 23rd day of April, 1973.

This agreement was approved on the ______ day of

_____________, A.D. ______ 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 the
District of Mission
was affixed in the presence of

___________________________
Mayor

___________________________
Clerk

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED

by the Developer in the presence of:

Name: ________________
Address: ________________
Occupation: ________________

___________________________
Claude A. Duncan

AS TO BOTH SIGNATURES.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICER OF A CORPORATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, on the 8th day of January, 1974, at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, HAROLD HARNETT, (whose identity has been proved by the evidence on oath of ) personally known to me, appeared before me and acknowledged to me that he is the CLERK of the District of Mission, B.C., and that he is the person who subscribed his name to the annexed instrument as CLERK of the said District of Mission and affixed the seal of the District of Mission to the said instrument, that he was first duly authorized to subscribe his name as aforesaid, and affix the said seal to the said instrument, and that such corporation is legally entitled to hold and dispose of land in the Province of British Columbia.

IN TESTIMONY whereof I have hereunto set my Hand and Seal of Office, at Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, this 8th day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-four.

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

A Commissioner for taking affidavits within British Columbia.

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

AFFIDAVIT OF WITNESS

Province of British Columbia

To Wit:

I, MARGARET WAINWRIGHT of the District of Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, make oath and say:

1. I was personally present and did see the within instrument duly signed and executed by DONALD HUDSON DUNCAN and CLARICE MONICA DUNCAN the parties thereto, for the purposes named therein.

2. The said instrument was executed at Mission, B.C.

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 Mission, in the Province of British Columbia, this 21st day of December, 1974.

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

LAURENCE A. H. WAINWRIGHT
A Notary Public in and for the Province of British Columbia
Appendix 4

NOT APPLICABLE

LAND USE CONTRACT

CONSENT

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that, ____________

of __________________, being the holder of a charge by way of __________________
registered at the Land Registry Office at __________________

under number __________________

against all and singular that certain parcel of tract of land
and premises being in the __________________
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:

Fare __________________
Address __________________
Occupation __________________
LAND USE CONTRACT

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NATURE OF CHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "A"

Schedule of permitted land use.

Construction and planting of the following:-

1. Christmas tree farm.
2. Nursery.
3. Farm and Garden Supplies: Sales and Service.
4. Tool and Equipment Rental.
5. Office and shop rental building.
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "B"

Plot Plan and Specifications:

Site Area - 5.1 acres = 2,221,560 sq. ft.

Yards front - Nil as existing site

rear - 40' x 60' service yard = 2400 sq. ft.

side - 6000 sq. ft. 150' x 40' East side of concrete building
- 1200 sq. ft. 40' x 30' West side of concrete building

Site Coverage - 4,250 sq. ft. (Existing structures)
- 65' x 40', 30' x 20', 35' x 30' (Including portable sheds)

Height of Building and Structures

maximum - 25 feet (Existing structures)

minimum - 10 feet (Existing structures)

Floor space ratio

Minimum floor area

Number of units

NOT APPLICABLE

LOUGHEED HWY

FRONTAGE RD.

299'

STORE

FUTURE COVERS

MACHINE

XMAS TREES
4 SEEDLINGS
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "C"

Off Street Parking:

Total area = 40' x 150'
Number of Spaces = 10 plus provision for expansion
Size of Spaces = 10' x 20'
Surfacing = Asphalt - To be completed to approved standards by June 30, 1974
Lighting = Floodlighting on exterior wall facing Lougheed Highway and parking area
Signs = Nil
Access = Level access from frontage access road running parallel to Lougheed Highway

Plan

Off Street Loading:

Total area = 2000 sq. ft.
Size of Area = 40' x 50'
Location = West side of lot
Surfacing = Gravel
Lighting = Nil
Signs = Nil
Access = Level access from frontage road as above

Plan
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "D"

Signs:
Number - three
Types - painted on wood panels
Location - two on concrete building 64' x 30'
Design - THE MILE 44
GARDEN CENTRE
Size - 10 feet x 2 feet

Plan

Buildings & Structures:

Plans  Existing structures (building)

Specifications - Chain link fencing - pipe or treated wood posts
Plastic panels and lath for covered display areas.

Landscaping, Surface Treatment, Fences and Screens:

Plans

Specifications - area surrounding building to be landscaped
and maintained in neat and tidy manner, with
grass, trees, and flowering plants.
 LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "E"

Utilities:  NOT APPLICABLE

Water
Sewer
Gas
Telephone
Electricity
Plans
Specifications
Locations
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LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "F"

Highways, Bridges, Lanes, Walkways:

Plans
Specifications

Street Lighting:

Plans
Specifications

Boulevards:

Plans
Specifications

Signs:

Plans
Specifications
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "G"

Subdivision Plans: NOT APPLICABLE

Parcels:

Area
Shape
Dimensions

Highways:
Dimensions
Location
Alignment
Gradient
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "H"

Parks, Public Space and Recreational Facilities:

Construction
Location
Size
Development
Furnishing
Plans

NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "T"

Development and Service to be provided or paid for by the

Municipality NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "J"

Works and Services to be Maintained and Operated by the Developer

NOT APPLICABLE
LAND USE CONTRACT

SCHEDULE "K"

Performance Security:  
Performance Bond:  
Mortgage:  
Certified Cheque:

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

SCHEDULE "L"

Item to be Provided Constructed
Located, Developed:

Date of Completion:

June 30th, 1974.

Garden Supplies Store, and Nursery, and a Furniture
Manufacturing Shop, and other items as in the contract
stipulated.
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Land Use Contract

Donald Hudson Duncan, et ux

— and —

District of Mission
WHEREAS Council of the District of Mission, under Section 137 of the Community Charter, has the power to amend or repeal bylaws;

AND WHEREAS Council of the District of Mission, under Section 546 of the Local Government Act, has the power to amend, modify or discharge Land Use Contracts;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission did, on the 4th day of June, 1973 enact a bylaw cited as “Mission District Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 171-1972”;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5690-2017”.

2. The Land Use Contract between the District of Mission and Donald Hudson Duncan and Clarice Monica Duncan, for the property legally described as:
   Parcel Identifier: 010-095-047
   Lot 5: Except Part Dedicated Road on Plan LMP1007; Section 17 Township 17
   New Westminster District Plan 20947

   is hereby discharged.

3. “Mission District Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 171-1972” is hereby repealed.

READ A FIRST TIME this 4th day of December, 2017
READ A SECOND TIME this 4th day of December, 2017
PUBLIC HEARING HELD this 18th day of December, 2017
READ A THIRD TIME this 18th day of December, 2017
APPROVED BY THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE this 13th day of April, 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 5705-2018-5050(278)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 34884 Moffat Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 008-629-943
      Lot 71 District Lot 6 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan 39517
      from Urban Residential 930 (R930) Zone to Urban Residential 930 Secondary Dwelling (R930s) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 5th day of February, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this 5th day of February, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this 19th day of February, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this 19th day of February, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this 11th day of April, 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 5th day of March, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this 5th day of March, 2018
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this __ day of ___, 2018
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES    MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR    CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 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 5th day of March, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME this 5th day of March, 2018
PUBLIC HEARING held this 19th day of March, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME this 19th day of March, 2018
APPROVED BY THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE this 5th day of April, 2018
ADOPTED THIS ___ day of ___, 2018

RANDY HAWES MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on April 3, 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  
*Marcy Bond, Senior Planner  
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives  
*Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Design and Planning  
*Jay Hazzard, Planning Technician  
Dave Heyes, Manager of Forestry Business  
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant  
*Jason Horton, Manager of Parks & Facilities  
*Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering and Projects  
*Stephanie Key, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture  
*Jason Kinch, Engineering Technologist II  
*Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works  
*Peter Lyon, Health and Safety Advisor  
*Bob O’Neal, Director of Forestry  
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector  
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning  
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer  
*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 Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of April 3, 2018 be adopted.
CARRIED

3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Nicolson, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.
CARRIED
4. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Councillor Hinds assumed the Chair.

Highway 7 Four-Laning Project Update #1

A report from the Director of Engineering & Public Works dated April 3, 2018 providing an update on the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI)’s project of four-laning Highway 7, from Silverdale Avenue to Nelson Street was provided for the Committee’s information. Jennifer Davis, project manager for the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, was in attendance to answer questions.

Discussion ensued and concerns were noted regarding the impact of truck turnarounds with the future build out of Silverdale and the dissemination of information about the project to the public.

Annual Asset Management Program Update

A report from the Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management dated April 3, 2018 providing an update on the Asset Management Program was provided for the Committee’s information.

Penitentiary Pump Station Upgrade Requirement

A report from the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design dated April 3, 2018 summarizing the Penitentiary Pump Station operational issues and the need for upgrading it to accommodate growth in the pump station’s catchment area was provided for the Committee’s information/consideration.

It was noted that staff would follow up with Corrections Canada about past and future expansions.

5. FORESTRY

Councillor Stevens assumed the Chair.

Forestry Operations 2017 Quarter 4 (Q4) Report

A report from the Manager of Forestry Business dated April 3, 2018 detailing the fourth quarter financial results for the forestry operation, with additional information on forestry reserves, strategies, plans, activities, and challenges for 2018, was provided for the Committee’s information.

6. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

Councillor Hamilton assumed the Chair.

Ammonia Plants - WorksafeBC Inspection

A report from the Manager of Parks and Facilities dated April 3, 2018 advising of the recent WorksafeBC orders which resulted from the November 22, 2017 inspection of the ammonia plant operations was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, and
RECOMMENDED:

1. That the request from the Manager of Parks and Facilities included in the April 3, 2018 report to Council to perform the work resulting from the WorksafeBC inspection at the Mission Leisure Centre be approved;

2. That a budget in the amount of $106,816 be established for 2018 to implement the work required and noted in the November 22, 2017 WorksafeBC inspection, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund;

3. That the MLC operating budget be increased by $5,700 for 2019 to include operating costs associated with additional testing of the ammonia system and personal alarms required to meet WorksafeBC compliance; and

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

CARRIED

7. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Councillor Nicholson assumed the Chair.

Development Variance Permit application to reduce the interior side setback requirement for an agricultural building from 15 m to 7.5 m. – 34159 Kirkpatrick Avenue

A report from the Planning Technician dated April 3, 2018 detailing the Development Variance Permit application requesting a reduction to the minimum interior side setback requirement for an agricultural building from 15 m to 7.5 m on the subject property located at 34159 Kirkpatrick Avenue was provided for the Committee’s information.

Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 560-1977 and Land Use Contract (LUC) Amendment 1275-1983 and Rezoning of the property located at 7365 Cedar Street to Multiple Family 30 Townhouse (MT30) Zone

A report from the Planner dated April 3, 2018 detailing the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 560-1977 and a related LUC Amendment Bylaw 1275-1983, and to rezone the property located at 7365 Cedar Street, 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 was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for April 16, 2018, subject to Council granting first and second readings to the related zoning amending bylaw.

Termination of Land Use Contract (LUC) 179-1972 and Rezoning of the property located at 33561-3rd Avenue to Multiple Family 52 Apartment (MA52) Zone

A report from the Planner dated April 3, 2018 detailing the District initiated development application to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) 179-1972 and to rezone the property located at 33561-3rd 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 was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for April 16, 2018, subject to Council granting first and second readings to the related zoning amending bylaw.
Follow up report to Council for DV17-026, which proposed to vary lot width for proposed Lots 21-25 for the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street, as part of Rezoning Application R16-010 to facilitate the subdivision of up to thirty-four (34) compact residential lots.

A report from the Senior Planner dated April 3, 2018 providing additional options for DV17-026, which proposed to vary lot width for proposed Lots 21-25 for the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street, as part of Rezoning Application R16-010 to facilitate the subdivision of up to thirty-four (34) compact residential lots, was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was noted that the road in front of proposed lots 21-25 would be 8.5 metres wide, there would be no parking on the east side of the street in front of those lots, and the overall plan was negotiated long ago and there are other benefits to the proposal.

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, and

RECOMMENDED:

That Development Variance Permit Application DV17-026 for the properties located at 8540, 8554 and 8590 Nottman Street, requesting a variance to Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 to reduce the lot widths from:

1. from 16.0 metres to 14.0 metres for proposed Lots 21-24 and
2. from 16.0 metres to 14.25 metres for proposed Lot 25
be supported.

OPPOSED: Councillor Plecas
CARRIED

8. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

Adobe Cloud

A report from the Manager of Information Services dated April 3, 2018 providing the rationale for centralizing purchasing and maintenance of Adobe Acrobat Pro software was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the District move to a centralized cloud-based Adobe Acrobat software for the organization at a cost of $7,200 per year with funding in 2018 from the District’s Stabilization Reserve and a core increase to the general operating budget for 2019; and
2. That the District’s 2018 to 2022 Financial Plan be amended accordingly.
CARRIED

Quarterly Financial Reporting – December 31, 2017

A report from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector dated April 3, 2018 providing the current status of the 2017 year-end results and explanations for results that have a budget variance of +/- $10,000 or +/- 10% was provided for the Committee’s information.
Canada Pacific Trials Association Events in Mission

A report from the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer dated April 3, 2018 outlining Canada Pacific Trials Association (CPTA) desire to enter into a longer term Licence of Occupation that would permit a trials event to be held annually for five years was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the Licence of Occupation between the District and Canada Pacific Trials Association provided in Appendix 1 of the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer’s report dated April 3, 2018 be approved; and

2. That the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the Licence of Occupation.

CARRIED

Road Use Agreement with Delta Force Properties Canada Ltd.

A report from the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer dated April 3, 2018 recommending that Council enter into a five year Road Use Agreement (Agreement) with Delta Force Properties Canada Ltd. (DFP) to permit access to DFP’s proposed paintball operation on adjacent private property was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Hinds, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the Road Use Agreement attached to the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer’s report dated April 3, 2018 be approved; and

2. That the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the Road Use Agreement.

CARRIED

9. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mayor Hawes resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, 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 Nicolson, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED:

1. That pursuant to Section 90 of the Community Charter, the public be excluded from this portion of the meeting as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:

   - Section 90(1)(a) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;
   - Section 90(1)(b) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who is being considered for a municipal award or honour, or who has offered to provide a gift to the municipality on condition of anonymity;
   - Section 90(1)(c) of the Community Charter – labour relations or other employee relations;
   - Section 90(1)(e) of the Community Charter – the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;
   - Section 90(1)(i) of the Community Charter – the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;

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 2:43 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 Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Danny Plecas
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Brenda Formosa, Administrative Assistant
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
12. **RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Hinds, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the April 3, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in item RC18/185 (Nottman Street Development Variance Permit) be adopted.

OPPOSED: Councillor Plecas

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the April 3, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC18/177 to RC18/189, except item RC18/185 (Nottman Street Development Variance Permit) be adopted.

CARRIED

13. **DELEGATIONS**

**Ron Coreau and Wendy Wilson, Mission Community Cycling Coalition**

Ron Coreau and Wendy Wilson of the Mission Community Cycling Coalition, appeared before Council to discuss the purpose and goals of the Coalition, and the future of cycling in Mission. They discussed the health and safety aspects of cycling, community programs, engaging the school district and utilizing the District’s dykes for cycling. They advised they are willing to work with the District towards an active transportation plan, and would like to see a five-year plan implemented which is also communicated to the community.

14. **PROCLAMATIONS**

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That May 2018 be proclaimed “MS Awareness Month” within the District of Mission.

CARRIED

15. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5719-2018-5670(2)**

OCP16-002 (OTG Development) – a bylaw to redesignate the property located at 9429 Wiebe Street and a portion of the property located at 32193 Mingo Avenue from Parks and Open Space to Suburban Residential

-AND-

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5668-2017-5050(262)

R16-014 (OTG Development) – a bylaw to rezone the properties located at 9429 Wiebe Street and 32370 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36S), and to rezone a portion of the property located at 32193 Mingo Avenue from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic Zone (IPRC)

The purpose of the proposed Official Community Plan bylaw amendment is to redesignate the property located at 9429 Wiebe Street and a portion of the property
located at 32193 Mingo Avenue from Parks and Open Space to Suburban Residential to allow for Suburban Residential lots. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 011-341-203
Lot B Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 9853; Section 32 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8766

Parcel Identifier: 013-381-067
Legal Subdivision 11 Section 32 Township 17 New Westminster District

The purpose of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone 9429 Wiebe Street, 32370 Dewdney Trunk Road and a portion of 32193 Mingo Avenue from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s) to allow lots of a minimum 0.36 hectares (0.88 acres) lot size that would allow a secondary dwelling unit on each lot, and to rezone a portion of 32193 Mingo Avenue from RU16 to Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic Zone (IPRC) to create 1 park parcel. The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 011-341-203
Lot B Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 9853; Section 32 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8766

Parcel Identifier: 013-381-067
Legal Subdivision 11 Section 32 Township 17 New Westminster District

Parcel Identifier: 000-583-260
Lot 13 Section 32 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 67854

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. Proposed rezoning map.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

- Letter from Gillian Blanchette dated March 26, 2018 in opposition to the application stating she would like the area to remain as parks and open space.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Ryan Anderson, OTG Development Concepts, appeared as a representative for the owner and developer. He provided a visual presentation showing the name of the proposed development, logo and three photographs of proposed house types.

Peter Kingma, Owner and developer, provided his personal history and vision for the proposed development. He described the park land that would be donated to the District, and noted that the flat, developable land to the north was previously known as the ‘Adrian Farm’.

Randy Cairns, Mission, stated his main concern with the development was public safety on Wiebe Street and that he was not happy with how the trees are being cleared next to his property. He asked for clarification on the proposal showing Weibe Street being a secondary access to the subdivision. He expressed concern about the fish bearing streams running through the development.
The Manager of Planning confirmed that secondary access would be a locked gate accessible by emergency vehicles and personnel only.

**Evelyn Johnston**, Mission, expressed the following summarized concerns:

- Protection of the fish bearing streams running through the development;
- Erosion and storm water runoff;
- Access to her property which is currently through an easement over the subject property;
- Where the houses would be built; and
- Whether the developer would provide fencing along the back side of her property.

In response, the Manager of Planning stated the stream in question is one of a number of watercourses located within the development and accordingly the Provincial Riparian Area Regulations will need to be met. He confirmed that the existing access to the adjacent properties would be retained and built into the development. The exact details would be worked out at the subdivision stage. He explained where the developable areas of the property were and where the parkland development would likely be.

Discussion ensued regarding fencing and the Manager of Planning advised that although the developer or the strata corporation may have a plan for fencing, private owners typically work out fence issues between them.

**Scott Dutkewich**, Mission, stated he is not necessarily opposed to the development, however was concerned about:

- Where the water supply for the development would come from;
- If properties would be on septic or sewer;
- Stream setbacks; and
- If anyone was monitoring the property as there is currently an issue with motorcycles and recreational vehicles using the property and disturbing the neighbourhood.

The Manager of Planning confirmed the development would be connected to the Cedar Valley water supply and would use septic fields. He noted that the Riparian Areas Regulation report had not yet been submitted however all appropriate setbacks would be addressed during the subdivision stage.

**David Rodenhizer**, Mission, asked for further clarification on changes to Wiebe Street, specifically if it would remain one lane or become a two-lane road. He stated the road currently encroaches onto his property and he would like that addressed.

The Manager of Planning advised that the required size for a secondary access (emergency access) road is 6 metres which the road currently is. He confirmed that a suitable solution to the encroachment issue would need to be found, either by the developer’s engineer moving the road or by the developer purchasing that portion of his property.

Ryan Anderson returned to the podium to address comments of Council and the public. He stated:

- The developer was prepared to move the road to address the encroachment on private property;
- The developer has hired biologists to assess the watercourses and has been in contact with the Ministry of Environment about creek crossings;
- The properties which received their access by way of easement would not see change to their current arrangement;
The developer was not aware of the motor cycles and four-wheel vehicles causing a disturbance on the property but would take steps to ensure the property is monitored; and

The plan for fencing was not finalized, and details about property boundary delineation and buffering can still be worked out.

Council expressed the following concerns:

- The current condition of Dewdney Trunk Road, and how much upgrading would be required to accommodate future development;
- Whether the District will receive useable and safe land for parks and trails and not just a steep ravine; and
- Whether this development could be included in the Development Cost Charges Program.

The Director of Engineering and Public Works advised the developer is required to retain the services of a transportation engineer to determine the road improvements needed and to work with the District to address those needs. She stated this development could not be a DCC project because the current Master Plan was already in place, however it would get picked up as part of the next Master Plan Update.

The Director of Development Services clarified that Development Cost Charges have been applied to this development however Development Cost Charges in relation to upgrades to Dewdney Trunk Road and Cedar Valley will be looked at as part of the Cedar Valley review and will be put forward for future developments.

The Mayor stated that the donated park land is an important piece toward completion of the Silvercreek Parkway, a trail that will run from the Fraser River to Dewdney Trunk Road.

Dave Richards, Mission, asked for clarification about the water line and what kind of upgrades would be made to Dewdney Trunk Road.

The Manager of Planning stated that an engineering report would be forthcoming that would make recommendations on the development and water plan for Cedar Valley and Ferndale.

The Mayor added that the area has been designated a “study area” which means the District will be looking at the potential for development as well as what can be serviced by our water system.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5719-2018-5670(2) OCP16-002 (OTG Development) and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5668-2017-5050(262) R16-014 (OTG Development) closed.

16. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be received as information:

(a) Mission Community Wellness Committee meeting – December 12, 2017
(b) Mission Traffic and Transit Committee meeting (Draft) – February 1, 2018
(c) Economic Development Select Committee meeting (Draft) – March 14, 2018

CARRIED
17. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED:


2. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5716-2018-5050(282) (LUC 18-005 DOM), a bylaw to rezone property at 7365 Cedar Street from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 30 townhouse Zone (MT30), be read a first and second time.

3. That Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5717-2018, a bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 179-1972 for property located at 33561 - 3rd Avenue, be read a first and second time.

4. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5718-2018-5050(283) (LUC 18-006 DOM), a bylaw to rezone property at 33561 – 3rd Avenue from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone (MA52), be read a first and second time.

5. That Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5719-2018-5670(2) (OCP16-002 OTG Development), a bylaw to redesignate the property located at 9429 Wiebe Street and a portion of the property located at 32193 Mingo Avenue from Parks and Open Space to Suburban Residential, be read a third time.

6. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5668-2017-5050(262) (R16-014 OTG Development), a bylaw to rezone the properties located at 9429 Wiebe Street and 32370 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36S), and to rezone a portion of the property located at 32193 Mingo Avenue from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Institutional Parks, Recreation and Civic Zone (IPRC), be read a third time.

7. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5637-2017-5050(242) (R16-044 OTG Development Concepts), a bylaw to rezone the properties at 11408 and 11496 Dewdney Trunk Road from Industrial Resource Extraction (INR) Zone to Industrial Resource Extraction and Processing (INRP) Zone, be adopted.

8. That Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5711-2018 (LUC 18-003 (DOM), a bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 611-1977 for property located at 33333-12th Avenue, be adopted.

9. That 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), be adopted.

CARRIED

Council discussed the origin and intent of Solid Waste Management Amending Bylaw 5721-2018-5526(3). It was noted that rural residents make weekly trips to the landfill to drop off compost, and there are other more effective ways to address traffic congestion and safety issues at the landfill site. It was further noted that staff are working with the Fraser Valley Regional District on ways to reduce garbage and increase diversion rates.
Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED:

That Solid Waste Management Amending Bylaw 5721-2018-5526(3), a bylaw to amend Solid Waste Management Bylaw 5526-2015 by increasing the minimum load charges, be adopted.

OPPOSED: Mayor Hawes
Councillor Alexis
Councillor Hamilton
Councillor Hinds
Councillor Nicholson
Councillor Plecas
Councillor Stevens

DEFEATED

18. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR CONSIDERATION

Development Variance Permit DV18-006 (34159 Kirkpatrick Avenue)

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED: That Development Variance Permit DV18-006 (34159 Kirkpatrick Avenue) to reduce the minimum interior side setback requirement for an agricultural building from 15 m to 7.5 m on the subject property located at 34159 Kirkpatrick Avenue to facilitate the development of an agricultural building located 7.5 m away from the eastern interior side property line, be approved.

CARRIED

19. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:
(a) Special Council Meeting – March 12, 2018
(b) Regular Council Meeting – March 19, 2018

CARRIED

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 Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED
The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR

MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
Minutes of the SPECIAL MEETING of the DISTRICT OF MISSION COUNCIL held in the Training Room of Fire Station No. 1, 33330 – 7th Avenue, Mission, British Columbia on Monday, April 9, 2018 commencing at 8:30 a.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes
Councilor Pam Alexis
Councilor Carol Hamilton
Councilor Jim Hinds
Councilor Rhett Nicholson
Councilor Danny Plecas
Councilor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Ken Bourdau, Manager of Long Range Planning
Jenny Hill, Administrative Assistant
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Debbie Sanderson, Administrative Assistant
Steve Simmonds, Manager of Inspection Services
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
Dale Unrau, Fire Chief

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and
RESOLVED: That the April 9, 2018 Special Council Agenda be adopted.
CARRIED

3. NEW BUSINESS

Secondary Suites Program – Recommended Approach

Presentation by Staff

The Director of Development Services gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled “Exploring Options for a Secondary Suites Program”, which provided a brief overview of the current situation and possible options for the District’s secondary suite program. This presentation included the following information:
As there are several direct and indirect issues surrounding secondary suites, several of the District’s bylaws may need to be amended and new policies written. Due to the increase in price of houses and diminishing rental vacancies, secondary suites are vital to provide affordable rental units within the District. Currently, the District’s Zoning Bylaw identifies secondary suites under a “secondary dwelling use” which includes coach houses, garden cottages and secondary family dwellings. The Zoning Bylaw further stipulates restrictions with respect to parking requirements and suite size. There are challenges with the current definition of a suite that will need to be addressed when moving forward with a new secondary suite program.

The current issues directly related to secondary suites are as follows:

- an inconsistent and difficult application process, and difficulties in the administration and enforcement of the bylaws and policies;
- inequity in the current approach;
- the issue of utility consumption in regards to double-billing, revenue, and cost recovery;
- life safety and BC Building Code issues, as an acceptable threshold has not yet been established; and
- the issue of illegal suites, (i.e. multiple suites in one residence).

The current issues that are indirectly related to secondary suites, in that these issues are not only related to suites, are as follows:

- parking and traffic issues in regards to congestion, lack of on and off street parking, and challenges with first responder and garbage services;
- noise and unsightly premises; and
- vacation rentals, which have not yet become a concern within the District.

The objectives of a secondary suite program were identified as follows:

- registration of all secondary suites in regards to tracking and cost recovery;
- suites only being allowed in areas that could accommodate for the required parking, service capacity, and lot configuration;
- having some properties and neighbourhoods set aside exclusively for single-family dwellings with no secondary suites being allowed;
- ensuring everyone pays their fair share in regards to utilities, roads, parks, policing, etc.;
- a program that is easy to comply with;
- an amnesty period for unauthorized suites to provide time to comply;
- no displacement of renters unless absolutely necessary; and
- ensuring life safety and Building Code compliance when practical and reasonable.
Based on tax roll records, there are approximately 13,000 residential properties within the District. Of those, approximately 1,500 are zoned to allow for a secondary dwelling which are concentrated within Mission’s core, whereas the others were specifically rezoned to accommodate for secondary suites. Of the 1,500 properties, 360 are currently being double billed for a secondary suite. These residences are designated as “authorized suites” as they meet both the zoning bylaw and utility billing requirements. There are currently 1,668 double-billed suites that do not have the proper zoning to allow a secondary suite. There are 96 properties which have been identified as either having several secondary suites or have serious safety and BC Building Code concerns. Staff in Bylaw Enforcement are actively working to gain compliance on these properties. These are referred to as “unauthorized suites” because they have been granted tacit or implied approval by way of double-billing.

As the tracking of secondary suites is currently done by cross-referencing various information such as ads in the local paper and online, a program that requires the registration of any secondary dwelling would provide a better database. Staff are aware that there are numerous residences which contain secondary suites which have not yet been identified.

The current zoning bylaw approach to secondary suites results in approximately 21 percent compliance rate due to non-enforcement of the zoning bylaw and allowing double-billing as an alternative to rezoning. An option for the District’s secondary suite program is to accommodate for the existing unauthorized suites by changing the zoning to allow every residential property to have a suite, provided certain criteria are met such as registration, parking, water meter installation, etc. Any conditions imposed would be directly related to the overall objectives of the program.

Discussion, Comments, Questions

Discussion ensued on the following points:

- double-billing and other fees;
- a thorough assessment of the proposed fee structure;
- where the revenue from the secondary suite program will be allocated;
- liability issues and legal ramifications;
- ensuring the District will be complying with all rules and regulations;
- ensuring equity with the program;
- best practices for obtaining compliance;
- timelines for implementation;
- amnesty periods for homeowners;
- preparing an objective and clear definition of a secondary suite; and
- water meters.

Staff will utilize the feedback received from Council to prepare secondary suite program options for Council’s consideration.
4. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and
RESOLVED: That the Special Council meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting was adjourned at 10:31 a.m.

_________________________        _____________________________________
RANDY HAWES      MIKE YOUNIE
MAYOR             CORPORATE OFFICER
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on April 16, 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 Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Danny Plecas
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Council Member Absent: Councillor Jim Hinds

Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Kris Boland, Director of Finance
*Marcy Bond, Senior Planner
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
*Ken Bourdeau, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects
Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer
*Mike Dickinson, Planner
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering and Projects
*Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
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
*Wesley Woo, Planner

*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 Plecas, and
RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of April 16, 2018 be adopted.
CARRIED

3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and
RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.
CARRIED
4. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

Councillor Hamilton assumed the Chair.

Heritage Park Centre Clarke Theatre and Community Gym - Funding Agreement

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture dated April 16, 2018 requesting support to provide additional funding to support the operation of the Clarke Foundation Theatre and the community gymnasium located at Heritage Park Centre was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Discussion ensued in regards to areas of responsibility for infrastructure and capital expenses, and the coordination of grant requests.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That an additional $65,000 be provided to the Mission School District in 2018 (for the 2017-2018 school year) and an additional $65,000 in 2019 (for the 2018-2019 school year) to offset the operating costs of the Clarke Foundation Theatre and the community gymnasium;

2. That funding be taken from the Financial Stabilization Reserve in both years;

3. That the Clarke Theatre and Community Gymnasium Funding Agreement be approved and executed by the Mayor and Corporate Officer; and

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

CARRIED

Special Occasion License Requests

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture dated April 16, 2018 seeking support for several community groups’ applications to host beer gardens at various venues throughout the District was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Discussion ensued in regards to a process for other large scale events which are held on private property.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

That the events noted in Appendix A, in the report from the Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture dated April 16, 2018, be declared Community Special Events for the purposes of securing a Special Event Permit from the BC Liquor Control and Licensing Branch.

CARRIED

5. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Councillor Nicholson assumed the Chair.

Update on the Downtown Plaza Project

A report from the Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated April 16, 2018 regarding the possible development of a downtown public space was provided for the Committee’s information and consideration.

Discussion ensued in regards to viable site location options, community green spaces and connectivity. It was noted that staff would monitor emergent issues and timing and bring the matter back before Council at a later date.
Official Community Plan Amendment (OCP 17-006) for the property located at 32643 Tunbridge Avenue

A report from the Senior Planner dated April 16, 2018 seeking a resolution to initiate referrals to outside agencies with respect to the OCP Amending Bylaw for a portion of the property at 32643 Tunbridge Avenue was provided for the Committee's consideration.

Moved by Councillor Alexis, and

RECOMMENDED:

That upon due consideration of Section 475 of the Local Government Act, consultations go forward for development application file P2017-030 (32643 Tunbridge Avenue) in accordance with Official Community Plan Referral Policy LAN. 47, that the persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultations referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of this Section.

CARRIED

Rezoning Application and Street Naming to facilitate a 10 lot subdivision – 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street

A report from the Planner dated April 16, 2018 detailing the development application to rezone 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street to facilitate a 10 lot subdivision was provided for the Committee's information.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for May 7, 2018, subject to Council granting first, second and third readings to the related zoning amending bylaw.

Subject to Council's approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for May 7, 2018.

OCP Amendment and Rezoning to facilitate Commercial Development of a portion of 29684 Dewdney Trunk Road

A report from the Planner dated April 16, 2018 detailing the Official Community Plan amendment and rezoning application was provided for the Committee's information.

Staff supports the application moving forward and will schedule the Public Hearing for May 7, 2018, subject to Council granting first reading to the related OCP and zoning amending bylaws.

Discussion ensued and Council noted concerns in regards to traffic safety and the significant change to the neighbourhood character.

6. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

Proposed 2019 Budget Schedule

A report from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector dated April 16, 2018 seeking approval for the proposed 2019 budget schedule to allow for the adoption of the District’s 2019 to 2023 Financial Plan/Budget by April 15, 2019 was provided for the Committee's consideration.
Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

That the proposed 2019 budget schedule, attached as Appendix A to the report dated April 16, 2018 from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector, be approved.

CARRIED

7. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mayor Hawes resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That Council rise from Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

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

Moved by Councillor Nicolson, seconded by Councillor Plecas, 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)(g) of the Community Charter – litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality;
   
   • Section 90(1)(i) of the Community Charter – the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;
   
   • 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;
   
   • Section 90(2)(b) of the Community Charter – the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party;

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

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

CARRIED

The meeting recessed at 2:07 p.m.

9. RECONVENE

Mayor Hawes reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes  
Councillor Pam Alexis  
Councillor Carol Hamilton  
Councillor Rhett Nicholson
Council Member Absent: Councillor Jim Hinds
Staff Members Present: Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Brenda Formosa, Administrative Assistant
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering and Projects
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

10. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and
RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the April 16, 2018 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC18/206 to RC18/212, be adopted.
CARRIED

11. DELEGATIONS

Dick Brodie and Janet Chalmers, Mission Optimist Club

Dick Brodie and Janet Chalmers, of the Optimist Club of Mission, appeared before Council and presented the history of the club, the Optimist Creed, and an overview of the club’s activities in Mission. They requested that Council provide the Mission Optimist Club with a $3,500 grant to host Missionfest 2018 on August 11th at the Leisure Centre.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Alexis and
RESOLVED: That the Optimist Club of Mission receive a municipally funded grant in the amount of $3,500 for Missionfest subject to the receipt of a satisfactory budget, to be funded from the existing 2018 grant budgets.
CARRIED

Wade Usborne, University of the Fraser Valley and Kirsten Hargreaves, District of Mission

Kirsten Hargreaves, the District’s Manager of Social Development, introduced Jennifer Ortman, Community Navigator, who will be working with the District for one year to assist with projects that address housing, homelessness and outreach initiatives.
Wade Usborne, a Master of Social Work practicum student at the University of the Fraser Valley, provided a summary of the “Mission Social Housing Needs Study” which was conducted within the District of Mission from the summer of 2017 to April, 2018. The presentation summarized the study’s findings in regards to the current urgency of housing requirements, the percentage of children affected by homelessness, and the particular characteristics of the housing that is required.

12. PROCLAMATIONS

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That May 1st to May 7th, 2018 be proclaimed “Youth Week” within the District of Mission.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That June 1st to June 8th, 2018 be proclaimed “Seniors’ Week” within the District of Mission.

CARRIED

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5715-2018

A bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 560-1977 and the related Land Use Contract Amendment Bylaw 1275-1983 for property located at 7365 Cedar Street

-AND-

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5716-2018-5050(282)

LUC 18-005 (DOM) – a bylaw to rezone property at 7365 Cedar Street from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 30 townhouse Zone (MT30)

The purpose of the proposed Land Use Contract Repeal bylaw is to terminate Land Use Contract 560-1977 and the related Land Use Contract Amendment Bylaw 1275-1983 registered to the property located at 7365 Cedar Street.

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 7365 Cedar Street from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 30 townhouse Zone (MT30). The subject property is legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 014-268-418
Lot “D” District Lot 165 Group 3 and of Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 9783

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. He stated that there are no proposed changes to the existing building or land use.
Diane Hammond – manager of St. Andrews Place Co-operative Housing, thanked Council for the reassurance that the building will remain a seniors’ complex. She advised that the District’s notification letter had caused confusion and concern among many of the residents in the complex. She also expressed concerns if approval of the proposed application would affect their land lease with the provincial government which was due to expire in six years. Mayor Hawes assured Ms. Hammond that no housing would be taken away and Council would strongly support their lease with BC Housing.

Gerald LaPointe – Mission, advised that he has lived in Mission for 18 years and the proximity to the complex was a major factor in his decision to purchase his property. He was relieved to hear there will be no change to the complex, however he did express concerns in regards to the zone’s height allowance and the preservation of the view from his property.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5715-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5716-2018-5050(282) LUC 18-005 (DOM) closed.

**Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5717-2018**

A bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 179-1972 for property located at 33561 - 3rd Avenue

-AND-

**Zoning Amending Bylaw 5718-2018-5050(283)**

LUC 18-006 (DOM) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33561 – 3rd Avenue from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone (MA52)

The purpose of the proposed Land Use Contract Repeal bylaw is to terminate the Land Use Contract 179-1972 for property located at 33561 - 3rd Avenue.

The purpose of the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 33561 – 3rd Avenue from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone (MA52). The subject property is legally described as:

- Parcel Identifier: 000-534-412
- Lot “A” District Lot 1 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan 12910

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:

- Email from Gurshan Sidhu, dated April 7, 2018, requesting further analysis of the target zone of MA52 and suggesting that the zone of MA135 would be more appropriate.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Gurshan Sidhu - Richmond, spoke in regards to his April 7, 2018 email. He expressed concerns that the proposed zoning of MA52 would change the number of units from 57 to 32, and therefore feels that the MA135 zone would be more appropriate as it would allow for a few more units than the current number. He questioned why the District would propose zoning that would require a future development application to bring it up to the
number of units that are already there. Staff advised that, although the MA52 zoning would render the property legally non-conforming in some aspects, they believe the MA52 zone is still the most appropriate for other reasons such as the potential height of future buildings, maintaining property owners rights, and ensuring consistency with the District’s Official Community Plan.

Betty Nelson - Mission, expressed concerns in regards to any future buildings being taller than the current building and thereby obstructing her view. She also expressed concerns in regards to increased density. She advised that she would prefer the MA52 zoning designation.

Terry Hamilton for Elizabeth Kelly - Mission, advised that before the complex was built, residents fought to keep it at its current height. He expressed concerns in regards to the potential height of any future buildings on the site, but said otherwise he is satisfied with the MA52 designation.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5717-2018 and Zoning Amending Bylaw 5718-2018-5050(283) LUC 18-006 (DOM) closed.

14. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be received as information:

(a) Joint Shared Services Committee Meeting – January 11, 2018
(b) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Meeting – February 13, 2018
(c) Cultural Resources Commission Meeting – February 21, 2018

CARRIED

15. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5726-2018-5670(4) (OCP17-006 Bowins), a bylaw to redesignate a portion of the property located at 32643 Tunbridge Avenue from Urban Residential to Urban Compact, be read a first time.

2. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5722-2018-5050(284) (R17-041 Central Valley Engineering), a bylaw to rezone properties at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372) and Residential Compact 465 Zone (RC465), be read a first and second time.

3. That first reading of Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5680-2017-4052(53) (OCP17-003 CHP Architects), a bylaw to redesignate a portion of property at 29684 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural Residential to Commercial, be rescinded.


5. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5716-2018-5050(282) (LUC 18-005 DOM), a bylaw to rezone property at 7365 Cedar Street from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 30 townhouse Zone (MT30), be read a third time.

6. That Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5717-2018, a bylaw to terminate the Land Use Contract 179-1972 for property located at 33561 - 3rd Avenue, be read a third time.
7. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5718-2018-5050(283) (LUC 18-006 DOM), a bylaw to rezone property at 33561 – 3rd Avenue from Residential Two Unit Zone (RT465) to Multiple Family 52 Apartment Zone (MA52), be **read a third time**.

8. 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 **adopted**.

9. 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 **adopted**.

10. 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 **adopted**.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5724-2018-5670(3) (OCP17-003 CHP Architects), a bylaw to redesignate a portion of the property located at 29684 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural Residential to Commercial, be **read a first and second time**.

2. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5725-2018-5050(285) (R17-017 CHP Architects), a bylaw to rezone a portion of the property at 29684 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Comprehensive Development 39 Zone (CD39), be **read a first and second time**.

OPPOSED:  Mayor Hawes
Councillor Alexis
Councillor Hamilton
Councillor Plecas
Councillor Stevens

DEFEATED

16. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Special Council Meeting – March 26, 2018

CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS RELEASED FROM CLOSED

Resolutions Released from Closed Council – January 22, 2018 and April 3, 2018

Closed Meetings

The following resolutions were released from the Closed Council meeting held on January 22, 2018:
Mission Sports Hall of Fame Nomination

1. That Council supports and approves the nomination of Sean LaForest into the Mission Sports Hall of Fame - Silver Category in recognition of his achievement in track and field hammer throw; and

2. That Council supports and approves the nomination of Charles Hugh Harrington into the Mission Sports Hall of Fame - Builder Category in recognition of his many years of service to the sports community.

The following resolution was released from the Closed Council meeting held on April 3, 2018:

Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Appointments

Anastasia Hurcum, Ken Herar, and Lynn Strange were appointed as new members to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee for a three year term (to December 30, 2020).

18. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no new/other business.

19. NOTICES OF MOTION

Councillor Plecas stated that he is giving notice to Council that he will be bringing a motion to the May 7, 2018 regular meeting that will speak to taking a broader approach to biking in the community including delaying the current direction to staff on the 7th Avenue bike lane construction and grant application until a holistic approach is developed.

20. QUESTION PERIOD

Randy Schmidt - the applicant for a development application to amend the OCP and Zoning bylaw and obtain a development permit for the north-east 0.48 ha (1.18 acre) portion of property at 29684 Dewdney Trunk Road in Stave Falls to accommodate a rural mixed-use commercial development that includes a service station with one residential unit on the second floor (P2017-022), expressed concerns and dissatisfaction with the District’s development application process. Council noted Mr. Schmidt’s concerns and advised him that staff will be made aware of his comments.

Ken Collier - Mission, noted concerns in regards to the proposed development at 8504 and 8522 Cedar Street (P2017-021). Mr. Collier was invited to attend the Public Hearing that will be held on May 7, 2018.

21. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER