1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY – PROPOSED BREWERY AND PUB AT 33192 - 1ST AVENUE

4. DELEGATIONS
   (a) Rick Rake, Mission Community Services Society  
       Re: Activities of the Mission Local Immigration Partnership over 2018

   (b) Roel Coert, Great Northern Engineering Consultants Inc.  
       Re: Telecommunication infrastructure builds in Mission in the coming decades

5. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

6. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE
   (a) North Arena Chiller Replacement  
       RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
       1. That the existing budget for replacement of the north arena chiller be increased by $59,650, from $150,000 to $209,650, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund; and
       2. That the Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

7. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE
   (a) 2019 Water Rates and Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaws  
       On March 6, 2019, Council approved increases to the water flat-rate user fees and the sewer flat-rate user fees. The two bylaws to amend these user rates are listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda for first three readings.
8. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

(a) Liquor Licence Application (LIQ19-001) - 33192 - 1st Avenue

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That Liquor Licence Application LIQ19-001 from Kylan St. Jean for a Lounge Endorsement at 33192 – 1st Avenue be supported, and that the endorsement be forwarded to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch.

(b) Official Community Plan Amendment Application (OCP19-001) - 8924 Cedar Street

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That, upon due consideration of Section 475 of the Local Government Act, referrals go forward for development application file OCP19-001 in accordance with Council Policy LAN 47, and that persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultation referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of the Section.

An Official Community Plan (OCP) amending bylaw, 5829-2019-5670(10), is listed for first reading under the “Bylaws of Consideration” section of the Council Agenda.

(c) Rezoning Application (R18-046) - 32939 Best Avenue

This report details the application for the property located at 32939 Best Avenue to rezone from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone and Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone to facilitate an eight (8) lot urban residential 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 5811-2018-5050(328) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 1, 2019.

(d) Rezoning Application (R18-055) - 8250 Haffner Terrace

This report details the rezoning application to rezone 8250 Haffner Terrace to the Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) 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 5828-2019-5050(336) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 1, 2019.
(e) **Rescind Rezoning Application (R18-032) - 29811 Donatelli Avenue**

This report details the applicant’s request to close the development application to rezone 29811 Donatelli Avenue to the Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s).

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5792-2018-5050(317) is currently sitting at third reading, and all readings need to be rescinded to close the file. Staff have listed the bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

9. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

   (a) **Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Terms of Reference**

   **RECOMMENDATION**: Council consider and resolve:

   That the proposed changes to the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Terms of Reference, as presented in the report from Director of Engineering & Public Works dated March 18, 2019 be adopted.

   (b) **Short Term Extension of Curbside Collection Contract**

   **RECOMMENDATION**: Council consider and resolve:

   That the curbside collection contract with Remple Disposal Ltd. be extended by a period of one year from April 1, 2019, to March 31, 2020, to allow time for procurement documents to be completed, to ensure a smooth transition from blue bags to blue bins, and to allow the successful proponent sufficient time to make the necessary equipment purchases.

   (c) **Curbside Collection Area Expansion**

   **RECOMMENDATIONS**: Council consider and resolve:

   1. That the curbside collection area be expanded to include a proposed townhome development at 8279, 8289, and 8387 Nelson Street, and a proposed single-family subdivision at 8455 Nelson Street;

   2. That the area between the current curbside collection area and the proposed expansion be declared a curbside collection optional area; and

   3. That Plan No. G127E, which shows the current curbside collection and curbside collection optional areas, be amended accordingly.
(d) **Traffic Calming Policy Update**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 be repealed;
2. That Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A), as attached to the report from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic & Transportation dated March 18, 2019 be approved; and

(e) **Traffic Safety Strategy for Mission**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. To endorse the Traffic Safety Strategy for the District of Mission as outlined in this report;
2. To hire a new full-time Engineering Technologist position for traffic safety initiatives in 2019, with one-time funding in the amount of $145,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus in 2019, and an approximately 0.46% tax increase to provide ongoing funding in 2020 and beyond;
3. To establish a new budget in the amount of $425,000 per year for 2019, 2020, and 2021, for a total of $1,275,000, for capital expenditures for traffic safety issues, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund; and
4. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

(f) **Award of Contract for 2019 Sewer CCTV Assessment Program**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That the two year CCTV Inspection Program for sewer and drainage gravity mains contract, in the amount of $269,280 ($134,640 per year) plus GST, be awarded to Dougness Holdings Ltd.;
2. That the existing annual budget of $33,154 for sewer and $31,890 for drainage CCTV be increased by $34,798 for sewer and $34,798 for drainage, funded through a corresponding decrease to the transfers to the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund and Drainage Capital Reserve Fund respectively for 2019, and funded through a core budget increase beginning in 2020, for a total revised two year budget of $269,280 ($134,640 per year) plus GST; and
3. That the District’s Financial Plan be amended accordingly.
(g) Change Order for Welton Common Building Renovation

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That Change Order 1, in the amount of $39,381, for additional work as part of the Welton Common Construction contract be issued, and the contract with Tikal Construction Ltd. amended accordingly; and

2. That notwithstanding Policy FIN.24 Procurement, Stores and Disposition, any future change orders to the contract for construction work at the Welton Common building be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer, provided they are within the $1,100,000 Renovations for Relocation of Staff project capital budget previously approved by Council.

10. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

11. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

12. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

RESOLUTION: That the following minutes and items be received as information:

(a) Mission Community Heritage Commission Meeting – September 12, 2018

(b) Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Meeting – October 4, 2018

(c) Mission Community Heritage Commission Meeting – January 2, 2019

(d) Mission Community Heritage Commission Meeting – February 6, 2019

13. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

RESOLUTION: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Special Council Meeting (School District) – February 26, 2019

(b) Regular Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a closed meeting) – March 4, 2019

(c) Regular Council Meeting – March 4, 2019

14. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

(a) **Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5829-2019-5670(10)**

OCP19-001 (Mangat) – a bylaw to redesignate portions of the property located at 8924 Cedar Street from Environmentally Sensitive Area to Attached Multi-unit Residential and from Attached Multi-unit Residential to Environmentally Sensitive Area

See “Development Services” Section 8(b)
(b) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5811-2018-5050(328)**  
First and Second Readings  
R18-046 (Bate) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32939 Best Avenue from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) and Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone  
See “Development Services” Section 8(c)

(c) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5828-2019-5050(336)**  
First and Second Readings  
R18-055 (Gibson) – a bylaw to rezone property at 8250 Haffner Terrace from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone  
See “Development Services” Section 8(d)

(d) **Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5824-2019-2197-(30)**  
First, Second, and Third Readings  
A bylaw to amend “District of Mission Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990”  
See “Corporate Administration and Finance” Section 7(a)

(e) **Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaw 5825-2019-1922(25)**  
First, Second, and Third Readings  
A bylaw to amend “District of Mission Sewer User Rates and Charges Bylaw 1922-1989”  
See “Corporate Administration and Finance” Section 7(a)

(f) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5792-2018-5050(317)**  
Rescind First, Second, and Third Readings  
R18-032 (Ajia Canadian Building Systems Inc.) – a bylaw to rezone property at 29811 Donatelli Avenue from Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s)  
See “Corporate Administration and Finance” Section 8(e)

15. **CORRESPONDENCE**

(a) Letter dated February 28, 2019 from RCMP Appreciation Day Committee requesting a letter of support from Council  
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16. **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

17. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

Moved by Mayor Alexis,

That staff investigate options to provide non-profit organizations with discounted fees for development applications and permits and report back to Council.

18. **QUESTION PERIOD**

19. **ADJOURNMENT**
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date:       February 5, 2019
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)*

Council Local Immigration Partnership, based at Mission Community Services and coordinated by Rick Rake, updates Council and the public on the state of immigration and the activities the LIP and MCSS settlement team has tackled in the past year. I did this in February last year and it proved to be very informational, and featured feedback from Mission Council members. I would provide a short video and offer just a few slides and present update in a meaningful way.

Preferred meeting date for delegation:   March 18, 2019
Alternative meeting date for delegation: April 1, 2019

Rick Rake                                          Mission Local Immigration Partnership (MCSS)
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 March 18, 2019 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: March 3rd 2019

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*

Next generation wireless (5G), Internet of Things (IoT), Knowledge Economy, Big Data and and the opportunities for Mission

Preferred meeting date for delegation: March 18, 2019

Alternative meeting date for delegation: April 1, 2019

Roel Coert
Name(s) of presenter(s)

Great Northern Engineering Consultants
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 March 18, 2019 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.*
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Jason Horton - Manager of Parks and Facilities
SUBJECT: North Arena Chiller Replacement

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the existing budget for replacement of the north arena chiller be increased by $59,650, from $150,000 to $209,650, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund; and
2. That the Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to seek approval from Council to increase the budget for the replacement of the north arena chiller from $150,000 to $209,650.

BACKGROUND:
The north refrigeration plant chiller located at the Mission Leisure Centre is scheduled for replacement in 2019. Staff approached Fraser Valley Refrigeration Service earlier this year in order to allow the work to proceed in the off season and requested updated pricing for the replacement of the north chiller. The updated cost of the chiller has exceeded the expected budget in the amount of $59,650 due to the rising cost of titanium and steel used in the construction of the chiller and piping required for the installation.

The contractor on record at the Mission Leisure Centre since 1996 has been Fraser Valley Refrigeration Service. Parks, Recreation and Culture have relied on FVRS for regular service, technical information and emergency response.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Fraser Valley Refrigeration Service has been serving the Fraser Valley since 1969 and has serviced the Parks, Recreation and Culture refrigeration systems since 1996. The Department has relied on FVRS to care for the two ammonia plants. This work has included regular servicing, technical information, design, as well as emergency response in the event of equipment failures of the ammonia plants.

The chiller is a critical part of the ice making equipment and a chiller failure would result in the total loss of ice in the north arena as well as a possible ammonia leak. If the arena is to continue to operate the District is obligated under WorkSafe and Technical Safety BC to operate the plant in a safe and responsible fashion. The chiller replacement is required in order to ensure the continued safe operation of the plant.
COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The replacement of mechanical equipment ensures the protection of infrastructure and public safety.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

This project currently has an approved budget of $150,000. The addition of $59,650 is requested to make up the budget shortfall, which would allow this project to proceed. Staff recommend funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund, which potentially has an uncommitted balance of approximately $700,000, depending on other pending requests to utilize these reserve funds (such as the traffic safety strategy). The uncommitted balance of $700,000 is compared to the minimum recommended balance per District policy of $6 million. While the uncommitted balance in the General Capital Reserve Fund is much lower than the minimum recommended balance, replacement of the North Arena chiller is critical to ensure current service levels at the Mission Leisure Centre can be maintained.

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

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Parks, Recreation & Culture requests that the project budget be amended and increased by $59,650 for the replacement of the north chiller.

Staff recommends entering into an agreement with the Fraser Valley Refrigeration Service to supply and replace the north chiller at the Mission Leisure Centre.
SIGN-OFFS:

J. Horton Manager of Parks and Facilities

Ilsa Foster, Manager of Purchasing and Stores

Reviewed by:
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
SUBJECT: 2019 Water Rates and Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaws
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A - Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5824-2019-2197(30)
Appendix B - Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaw 5825-2019-1922(25)

On March 6, 2019, Council approved increases to the water flat-rate user fees and the sewer flat-rate user fees. The two Bylaws to amend these user rates are listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda for first three readings.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to present the Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5824-2019-2197(30), and the Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaw 5825-2019-1922(25) to Council for consideration of first three readings.

BACKGROUND:

The following recommendations were approved by Council at the March 6, 2019 Special Council Meeting:

1. “That the 2019 Water Utility Financial Plan, capital and operating, including a $5.28 increase to the water flat-rate user fees, a $3.96 increase to the water flat-rate user fees for more than 4 dwelling units and a 1% increase in the remaining water utility fees in Schedule A of the Water Rates Bylaw, be approved; and

2. That the 2019 Sewer Utility Financial Plan, capital and operating, including a $21 increase in sewer flat-rate user fees, a $17.04 increase to the sewer flat-rate user fees for more than 4 dwelling units and a 5% increase in sewer user rates, be approved.”

The next step in the bylaw amendment process is to incorporate the above fee amendments into the two utility amending bylaws and bring these bylaws forward to Council for consideration of first three readings.

Council also approved a 9.75% increase to the drainage utility levy at the March 6, 2019 Special Council Meeting. This increase, along with the property tax increase, will be reflected within the District’s Tax Rate Bylaw that is prepared in April of 2019.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report as any projected increase in revenue has been included in the 2019 Financial Plan.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5824-2019-2197(30), and the Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaw 5825-2019-1922(25) are listed under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda for first three readings.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5824-2019-2197(30)

A Bylaw to amend "District of Mission
Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990"


AND WHEREAS, the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to amend "District of Mission Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990";

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 Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5824-2019-2197(30)".

2. "District of Mission Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990", as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   (a) deleting Schedule “A” in its entirety; and

   (b) replacing it with the new amended Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this xxx day of xx, 2019

READ A SECOND TIME this xxx day of xx, 2019

READ A THIRD TIME this xx day of xx, 2019

ADOPTED this xx day of xx, 2019

PAMELA ALEXIS, MAYOR

JENNIFER RUSSELL, CORPORATE OFFICER
Schedule "A"

WATER UTILITY FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of Consumer</th>
<th>Rates Payable Effective January 1, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 One and Two Unit Residential (Unmetered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Residential Use, One Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Two Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Multi-Unit Residential (Unmetered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Residential Mobile Home Park Use - per pad</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Apartment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) more than 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.00 per month $ 432 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Residential Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Commercial/Industrial/Institutional (Unmetered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Per account</td>
<td>$ 42.00 per month $ 504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Commercial/Industrial/Institutional and Multi-Unit Residential (Metered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Quarterly Metered Water User Rates (subject to minimum charge per quarter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$ 1.0968 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On next 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$ 0.8993 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On next 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$ 0.8148 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On next 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$ 0.7310 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On balance</td>
<td>$ 0.5616 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter Size</td>
<td>Minimum Charge per Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 19mm</td>
<td>$ 119.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>$ 119.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32mm</td>
<td>$ 119.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38mm</td>
<td>$ 119.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>$ 132.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75mm</td>
<td>$ 132.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100mm</td>
<td>$ 432.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150mm</td>
<td>$ 432.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 One and Two Unit Residential (Metered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Annual Water User Rate: $1.27 per cubic meter of water consumed annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Annual Meter Rental Rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter Size</td>
<td>Annual Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 19 mm</td>
<td>$13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mm</td>
<td>$18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 mm</td>
<td>$32.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND WHEREAS, the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to amend "District of Mission Sewer User Rates and Charges Bylaw 1922-1989";

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 Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaw 5825-2019-1922(25)".

2. "District of Mission Sewer User Rates and Charges Bylaw 1922-1989", as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   
   (a) deleting Schedule “A” in its entirety; and
   
   (b) replacing it with the new amended Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this XX day of xx, 2019

READ A SECOND TIME this XX day of xx, 2019

READ A THIRD TIME this XX day of xx, 2019

ADOPTED this XX day of xx, 2019
### Schedule "A"

**SEWER UTILITY FEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of Consumer</th>
<th>Rates Payable Effective January 1, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Residential Use, One Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Two Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mobile Home Park Use - per pad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Apartment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) more than 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 31.00 per month, $ 372 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Residential Use, Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Commercial/Industrial/Institutional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 36.25 per month, $ 435 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Institutional and Multi-Unit Residential customers that are metered for water purposes shall pay the following quarterly sewer rates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 87.00% of the quarterly water user charges imposed and levied against the owner of real property for the use of water pursuant to District of Mission Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5601-2016-2197 (27) and amendments thereto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One and Two Unit Residential that are metered for water purposes shall pay the following annual sewer rates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 87.00% of the annual water user charges imposed and levied against the owner of real property for the use of water pursuant to District of Mission Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5601-2016-2197 (27) and amendments thereto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Hardeep Atwal, Planner
SUBJECT: Liquor Licence Application (LIQ19-001) for proposed Lounge
Endorsement on the property located at 33192 1st Avenue

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Location Map
- Appendix 3 – Liquor Licensing Procedures Policy LIC.15
- Appendix 4 – Proposed Floor Plan
- Appendix 5 – Lounge and Special Event Area Application to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB)

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 33192 1st Avenue
APPLICANT: Kylan St. Jean
OCP: Mission City Downtown
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 1, 2019
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve

That Liquor Licence Application LIQ19-001 from Kylan St. Jean for a Lounge Endorsement at 33192 – 1st Avenue be supported, and that the endorsement be forwarded to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch.

SUMMARY

A liquor licence application was received from Kylan St. Jean for the proposed lounge endorsement on the property located at 33192 - 1st Avenue (Appendix 2). An application has been made for a lounge endorsement (Appendix 5) and for a manufacturing licence with the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Board (LCRB) for a proposed brewery at 33192 - 1st Avenue. The manufacturing licence is approved by LCRB and does not require local government input.

LIQUOR LICENSING PROCEDURES POLICY LIC.15

Policy LIC.15 (Appendix 3) outlines general guidelines, timing, process, and community consultation for a liquor licence application. The current policy only speaks to liquor-primary and food-primary applications, and not to lounge endorsement applications. Staff have reviewed the possible implication of a lounge endorsement for a brewery and have determined that a conservative approach is to consider and process this application as equivalent to a liquor-primary establishment.

General Guidelines

The proposed hours meet the general guidelines provided in the Policy. The applicant proposes the hours of liquor service be from 10:00 am to 11:00 pm on Sunday through Thursday and 10:00 am to 1:00 am on Fridays and Saturdays.

Timing & Process

To comply with the LCRB process and the District Policy, the application is to be processed within 90 days of receiving the full application.

Community Consultation

In accordance with District Policy, a community consultation shall be undertaken by means of Public Input meeting at the March 18th Council meeting. A Notice of Public Input Meeting was mailed out on February 20th to properties within a radius of 400 metres (1312 feet) and an advertisement was placed in the newspaper for the March 8th and March 15th publications.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

While the public has the opportunity to speak directly to Council on March 18th, staff also accepted comments until March 15th. Three (3) comments of support were received by Development Services as of March 8th.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

While Council may resolve to support or not support the application without further consideration or conditions, staff are recommending that Council support the application (LIQ19-001) for the proposed lounge endorsement. Staff will inform the LCRB of Council’s decision.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES

1. Approval of the Development Permit (DP18-039) Area I: Mission Downtown, for a façade improvement, has been delegated to staff.
SIGN-OFFS

Hardeep Atwal, Planner

Reviewed by:
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1: Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 33192 1st Avenue

PID: 000-681-245

Legal: Lot 230 District Lot 411 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 34664
Appendix 2: Location Map

Subject Property: 33192 1st Avenue
Owner: Ronald Stefanucci
Applicant: Kylan St. Jean
Zoning: CCD1
OCP Designation: Mission City Downtown
Appendix 3: Liquor Licensing Procedures Policy LIC.15

LICENSING AND PERMITS
LIQUOR LICENSING PROCEDURES POLICY
LIC.15

Date Policy Implemented: January 20, 2003
Council Resolution 03/056

APPLICATIONS GENERAL

1. Consideration of Liquor Licensing proposals will generally be initiated by the receipt of a Summary Report prepared by the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Branch. A Summary Report is a report prepared by the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Branch as a processing requirement for an application for a Liquor Licence or amendment thereto, which requires consultation with Local Government.

2. Council will consider Liquor Licence inquiries from applicants without prior application to the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch (to gain an understanding of Council’s position with regards to the proposal) subject to payment of the prescribed fee, completion of the relevant application form (see Schedule 1) and submission of all relevant information. Where an applicant chooses to apply to Council as an inquiry, the process for assessment will be the same as for an application referred to Council as a Summary Report from the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch.

3. The applicant should refer to the Zoning Bylaw and Official Community Plan Bylaw (available for purchase or reference in the Community Development Department) for the development restrictions applicable to the site. The licensing proposal will have to clearly show that the proposed use meets the restrictions of the applicable zone or must be accompanied by a completed Rezoning Application. A Development Permit Application may also be required.

4. The information that is required to accompany the Liquor Licensing Proposal includes:

(a) a recent copy of the title of the property dated within 30 days of the date of the application;
(b) consent of the property owner;
(c) legal description of the property;
(d) a written outline of the type of Liquor Licence being sought together with details of entertainment, hours of operation, anticipated clientele etc.;
Liquor Licensing Procedures Policy
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(e) written details of the applicant's relevant experience in the entertainment/hospitality industry;

(f) one full size set and one set of reduced and readable to 8.5" x 11" professionally prepared site and landscaping plans depicting existing and proposed improvements including:

(i) the civic address and full legal description of the property;
(ii) the name and extent of streets and lanes adjacent to the property;
(iii) the location of existing and proposed buildings by dimension from property lines and where a watercourse exists from the natural boundary of the watercourse;
(iv) seating, capacity, parking, height, site cover and other required calculations;
(v) the location and width of existing or proposed access(es) to the property, including locations of any services, (ditches, fire hydrants, kiosks, hydro and telecommunication poles, etc.) that may be affected by the access(es);
(vi) the size, location and number of on-site parking and loading spaces;
(vii) fire-fighting provisions, the location of on-site fire hydrants and fire department connections and the dimensions of access routes, including their turning radius;
(viii) proposed site screening and landscaping details; and
(ix) elevations of the site development from all sides.

If all of the above information is not provided in the Summary report prepared by the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Branch then the deficient information will be requested from the applicant prior to the matter being referred to a Public Input Meeting.

COST

A Liquor Licensing Proposal fee as set by the District of Mission Procedures Bylaw is payable by the applicant upon receipt of the Summary Report prepared by the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch or upon receipt of a completed Liquor Licensing Proposal Inquiry. It is noted that the applicant may also be required to conduct a Public Information Meeting at the applicant's cost as a processing requirement.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

As general guidelines for assessing applications for liquor licences or amendments thereto the following is provided:

- Liquor-primary or food-primary in non-residential areas – considered on individual merits and the circumstances of the application.
- Liquor-primary or food-primary in or adjacent to residential areas – considered on individual merits and the circumstances of the application but will not be supported past 1.00am.
Liquor Licensing Procedures Policy
LIC.15

TIMING
To comply with the requirements of the Liquor Licensing Regulations Council will process the application within 90 days of receipt of the Summary Report or liquor licensing inquiry. This is subject to Council being in receipt of all relevant information and fees.

PROCESS
In all instances consideration of a Liquor Licensing proposal by the District of Mission will be undertaken within the processing framework established by the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Branch. The following District of Mission Licensed Establishment Procedure Policy outlines the municipal process for review of licensing proposals:

LICENSED ESTABLISHMENT PROCEDURE POLICY

1. Upon receipt of a Summary Report prepared by the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Board or a request for Council's support for Liquor-Primary or Food-Primary Liquor Licence, and after consultation with the R.C.M.P. and other departments, the Director of Community Development will report to Council via the Committee of the Whole.

2. Council may at that time:
   (i) Refer the application to a Public Input Meeting to establish the level of community support or otherwise.
   (ii) Advise the applicant that it is not prepared to support a Licensing application to the Liquor Control & Licensing Branch, where the application is a liquor enquiry and not an application generating a Summary Report by the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch.
   (iii) Defer consideration of the proposal pending receipt of any additional information which may be required from the applicant.
   (iv) Resolve to “Opt out” of providing comment to the Liquor Control and Licensing Board, where the process has been initiated by a Summary Report prepared by the Liquor Control and Licensing Board (see Schedule 2).

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Community consultation shall be undertaken by means of Public Input Meeting, whereby adjoining property owners and residents are notified of the proposal and invited to attend a Public Input Meeting at a Meeting of Council. It is at the discretion of the Director of Community Development to recommend that the public input meeting be held in an alternative location (such as a local school) should the circumstances of the application warrant this.

For liquor-primary licence applications or amendments thereto, mail-out notices shall be sent to a radius of 400m (1312 ft) from the subject site. For food-primary licence applications or amendments thereto, mail-out notices shall be sent to a radius of 152m (500 ft) from the subject site.
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Should the application be deemed controversial by District staff the Director of Community Development can recommend to Council that these mail out distances be increased. Conversely where the application or amendment is considered to be minor in nature, the Director of Community Development can recommend to Council that the mail-out distances be reduced.

The Director of Community Development can also recommend that Council “opt out” of requiring community consultation on a specific application where the effects are considered minimal. This may include minor food-primary licence amendments in general commercial or industrial areas or minor licence amendments in remote areas.

1. Following the Public Input Meeting, Council shall further consider the proposal and may:

   (i) Resolve to support the proposal addressing each of the criteria specified in the Liquor Control and Licensing Regulation (standard resolution formats are attached as Schedules 3, 4 and 5).

   (ii) Resolve not to support the proposal addressing each of the criteria specified in the Liquor Control and Licensing Regulation (standard resolution formats are attached as Schedules 3, 4 and 5).

2. After making such a resolution, the Director of Corporate Administration shall advise, in writing, both the applicant and the General Manager of the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch of Council’s decision in the matter.

NOTE: The information in this guide summarizes the review process when the guide was prepared. It is the responsibility of an applicant to check with the Community Development Department and the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Branch to establish whether there have been any changes to the approval procedures since publication of the guide.
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SCHEDULE 1

File No.: PRO.DEV.LIQ 

LIQUOR LICENCING PROPOSAL FORM
DISTRICT OF MISSION

I/we hereby submit a Liquor Licensing proposal for property located at (civic address):

and legally described as:

for the following Class of Liquor Licence:
The required proposal fee as set by the District of Mission Procedures Bylaw and necessary information are attached.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________
(Date)                                           (Applicant's Signature)

Where the applicant is NOT the REGISTERED OWNER of the subject property, the application must be signed by the REGISTERED OWNER(S).

THIS APPLICATION IS MADE WITH MY FULL KNOWLEDGE AND CONSENT

__________________________________________
(Date)                                           (Registered Owner)

__________________________________________
(Date)                                           (Registered Owner)

NOTE: Development Cost Charges & the Works & Services Bylaw may be applicable to any development proposal in the District of Mission. Prior to determining specific project costs for any development proposal the applicant should check with the District of Mission to determine the exact impact of Development Cost Charges and the Works & Services Bylaw.

-------------------------------------------------------------
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Fee Received ___________    Receipt No. ________________

__________________________________________
(Date)                                           (Signature of Official)
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PROPOSAL FOR LIQUOR LICENCE

DISTRICT OF MISSION

THE INFORMATION REQUESTED IN THIS FORM IS REQUIRED TO EXPEDITE THE PROPOSAL AND ASSIST THE STAFF IN PREPARING A RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL. A SUBMISSION WHICH DOES NOT CONTAIN ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION CANNOT BE ACCEPTED.

This form is to be completed in full and submitted with all requested information and fees.

A COPY OF THE TITLE FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, DATED NO MORE THAN THIRTY (30) DAYS PRIOR TO THE SUBMISSION OF THE APPLICATION, MUST ACCOMPANY THE APPLICATION AS VERIFICATION OF OWNERSHIP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

1. APPLICANT AND REGISTERED OWNER INFORMATION
   Applicant's Name: ____________________________________________
   Address: ____________________________ Postal Code: ____________
   Telephone: Business: ____________ Home: ______________________
   Registered Owner(s) Name: ____________________________________
   Address: ____________________________ Postal Code: ____________
   Telephone: Business: ____________ Home: ______________________

2. PROPOSAL FEE
   A proposal fee, as set by the District of Mission Procedures Bylaw, is payable to the District of Mission and must accompany this proposal.

3. SUBJECT PROPERTY
   (a) Present Zoning: __________________________________________
   (b) Proposed Zoning (if required): ______________________________
   (c) Description of the existing use/Liquor Licence (if applicable): ______________

4. Full description of the proposed use and including details of entertainment, hours of operation, anticipated clientele etc. (use separate sheet if necessary): ________________________________

5. Full description of applicant's relevant experience in the entertainment/hospitality industry (use separate sheet to elaborate): ________________________________________________

______________________________
______________________________
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Services currently existing/changes required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Water Supply (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: THE APPLICANT IS ADVISED TO CONTACT THE DISTRICT OF MISSION ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT FOR INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICES AND TO CONFIRM ANY ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

6. Approximate commencement date of proposed project: ______________________

7. COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSAL

Outline the reasons and comments in support of the proposal (use separate sheet if necessary):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
SCHEDULE 2
RESOLUTION FORMAT FOR COUNCIL OPTING OUT OF COMMENT ON AN INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION

General Manager,
Liquor Control and Licensing Branch

RE:(describe type of application)

At the Council meeting held on <<date>>, the Council passed the following resolution with respect to the above named application:

"Be it resolved that the Council does not wish to provide comments of recommendations to the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch with regard to the application for (describe type of application and applicant)."

The undersigned hereby certifies the above resolution to be a true copy of the resolution passed by the Council of the District of Mission on <<date>>.

Sincerely,

(signature)
(name and title of official)
District of Mission
SCHEDULE 3
RESOLUTION FORMAT FOR COUNCIL INPUT FOR A LIQUOR-PRIMARY OR LIQUOR-PRIMARY CLUB LICENCE APPLICATION

General Manager,
Liquor Control and Licensing Branch

Re: Application for a liquor-primary licence at: (address of proposed establishment)

At the Council meeting held on <<date>>, the Council passed the following resolution with respect to the application for the above named liquor licence:

"Be it resolved that:

1. The Council (recommends/does not recommend) the issuance of the licence for the following reasons: (detail and explain reasons for recommendation).

2. The Council's comments on the prescribed considerations are as follows:
   (a) The location of the establishment (provide comments)
   (b) The proximity of the establishment to other social or recreational facilities and public buildings (provide comments)
   (c) The person capacity and hours of liquor service of the establishment (provide comments)
   (d) The number and market focus or clientele of liquor-primary licence establishments within a reasonable distance of the proposed location (provide comments)
   (e) Traffic, noise, parking and zoning (provide comments)
   (f) Population, population density and population trends (provide comments).
   (g) Relevant socio-economic information (provide comments)
   (h) The impact on the community if the application is approved (provide comments)

3. The Council's comments on the views of residents are as follows: (describe the views of residents, the method used to gather the views and provide comments and recommendations with respect to the views. If the views of residents were not gathered, provide reasons)."

The undersigned hereby certifies the above resolution to be a true copy of the resolution passed by the Council of the District of Mission on <<date>>.

Sincerely,

(signature)
(name and title of official)
District of Mission
SCHEDULE 4

RESOLUTION FORMAT FOR COUNCIL INPUT FOR A LICENCE AMENDMENT APPLICATION

General Manager,
Liquor Control and Licensing Branch

Re: Application for (addition of a patio/increase in person capacity/extension of hours of liquor service/patron participation entertainment) as an amendment to (liquor-primary/liquor-primary club/winery/food-primary) licence number: (licence number)

At the Council meeting held on <<date>>, the Council passed the following resolution with respect to the application for the above named amendment:

“Be it resolved that:

1. The Council (recommends/does not recommend) the amendment of the licence for the following reasons: (detail and explain reasons for recommendation).

2. The Council’s comments on the prescribed considerations are as follows:
   (a) The potential for noise if the application is approved (provide comments)
   (b) The impact on the community if the application is approved (provide comments)
   (c) Whether the amendment may result in the establishment being operated in a manner that is contrary to its primary purpose (provide comments only if the application is from a food-primary licence for an extension of hours of service past midnight or the addition of patron participation entertainment)
   (d) The views of residents (describe the views of residents, the method used to gather the views and provide comments and recommendations with respect to the views. If the views of residents were not gathered, provide reasons)

The undersigned hereby certifies the above resolution to be a true copy of the resolution passed by the Council of the District of Mission on <<date>>.

Sincerely,

(signature)
(name and title of official)
District of Mission
SCHEDULE 5

RESOLUTION FORMAT FOR COUNCIL INPUT FOR A WINERY LICENCE ENDORSEMENT APPLICATION

General Manager,
Liquor Control and Licensing Branch

Re: Application for a (winery lounge endorsement/picnicking endorsement) to winery licence number: (winery licence number)

-or-

Re: Application for a (winery lounge endorsement/picnicking endorsement) to a winery licence at: (address of proposed establishment, if applicant not already in possession of a winery licence)

At the Council meeting held on <<date>>, the Council passed the following resolution with respect to the application for the above named endorsement:

"Be it resolved that:

1. The Council (recommends/does not recommend) the issuance of the endorsement for the following reasons: (detail and explain reasons for recommendation)

2. The Council's comments on the prescribed considerations are as follows:
   (a) The location of the (winery lounge/picnicking area) (provide comments)
   (b) The proximity of the (winery lounge/picnicking area) to other social or recreational facilities and public buildings (provide comments)
   (c) The person capacity of the winery lounge (provide comments)
   (d) Hours of liquor service of the (winery lounge/picnicking area) (provide comments)
   (e) Traffic, noise, parking and zoning (provide comments)
   (f) The impact on the community if the application is approved (provide comments)

3. The Council's comments on the views of residents are as follows: (describe the views of residents, the method used to gather the views and provide comments and recommendations with respect to the views. If the views of residents were not gathered, provide reasons).

The undersigned hereby certifies the above resolution to be a true copy of the resolution passed by the Council of the District of Mission on <<date>>.

Sincerely,

(signature)
(name and title of official)
District of Mission
Appendix 4: Proposed Floor Plan
Appendix 5: Lounge & Special Event Area Application to LCRB

LOUNGE AND SPECIAL EVENT AREA APPLICATION

In the attached guide, complete this application form and assemble all related documents. Once complete, follow the instructions for submitting your application package to local government/first nation and the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch.

Part 1: Type of Application

- Lounge Endorsement
- Special Event Area Endorsement

Note: Do not apply for special event area if it will occupy same footprint as the lounge.

Are you submitting an application for a manufacturing licence with this application? Yes

Are you submitting an application to transfer the location of the manufacturing facility with this application? No

Part 2: Applicant

Manufacturer Licence Number (if licensed): N/A

Applicant/Licensee Name: Kylan Philip St.Jean

Mailing Address:

8484 Terrist Street, Mission, BC, V2V 5S1

Phone number: 604-650-4206
E-mail address: kylan@rhapsodybrewing.com

Part 3: Application Contact Person

Name: Kylan Philip St.Jean

Phone number: 604-556-4206
E-mail address: kylan@rhapsodybrewing.com

Part 4: Establishment

Establishment Name: Rhapsody Brewing Company Ltd.

Manufacturer Address:

13192 1st Avenue, Mission, BC, V2V 1G4

Parcel Identifier (PID): 000681245

Local Government/First Nation: District of Mission
Local Police: Mission RCMP

Is this location zoned for liquor service? Yes

Is this manufacturing site part of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR)? Yes

If the proposed site is on ALR land, have you reviewed the ALR policies regarding a lounge and/or special event area? Yes
### Part 5: Lounge Proposal

This section requires several supporting documents to be submitted with your application. Please see the checklist on page 3 below for more information regarding letter of intent, floor plan and site map.

5a. Proposed Service Areas:
Complete the following based on your establishment floor plan and occupant load (see page 5 of guide):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area No.</th>
<th>Floor Level (e.g. Basement, Main, 2nd)</th>
<th>Indoor</th>
<th>Patio</th>
<th>Occupant Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Main Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100 ppl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Occupant Load (of all licensed areas):

5b. Hours of Liquor Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 6: Special Event Area Proposal

This section requires several supporting documents to be submitted with your application. Please see the checklist on page 3 below for more information regarding letter of intent, floor plan and site plan.

6a. Proposed Service Areas:
Complete the following chart based on your establishment floor plan. Occupant load is required for Indoor and patio areas (see page 5 of guide). If you want an outdoor area that is not a patio see 6b:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area No.</th>
<th>Floor Level (e.g. Main, Mezzanine)</th>
<th>Indoor</th>
<th>Patio</th>
<th>Occupant Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Main Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100 ppl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Occupant Load (of all licensed areas):

6b. Complete the following chart if you will have an outdoor event area (not a patio). Outdoor areas require a person capacity not occupant load (see page 5 of guide):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area No.</th>
<th>Outdoor Area Identify by location or name</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Person Capacity for all Outdoor Areas:
6c. Hours of Liquor Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 7: Declaration of Signing Authority

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

As the licensee or authorized signatory of the licensee, I understand and affirm that all of the information provided is true and complete.

Signature: [Signature]

Authorized signatory of the licensee

Name: St. Jean Kyan Philip

Position: [Position] (if not an individual)

Date: 17/12/18

(DD/MM/YYYY)

Note: An agent, lawyer or third party operator may not sign the declaration on behalf of the licensee.

This form should be signed by an individual with the authority to bind the applicant. The Branch relies on the licensee to ensure that the individual who signs this form is authorized to do so. Typically, an appropriate individual will be as follows:

• If the licensee is an individual or sole proprietor, the individual himself/herself;
• If the licensee is a corporation, a duly authorized signatory who will usually be an officer or, in some cases, a director;
• If the licensee is a general partnership, one of the partners;
• If the licensee is a limited partnership, the general partner of the partnership;
• If the licensee is a society, then a director or a senior manager (as defined in the Societies Act).

If an authorized signatory has completed the Add, Change or Remove Licensee Representative/form (LCLRH10) and has specifically permitted a licensee representative to sign this form on the licensee’s behalf, the branch will accept the licensee representative’s signature.

Part 8: Checklist

Your application package must include the following documents. An incomplete application will delay the licensing process.

☐ Completed Lounge & Special Event Area Application (this form).
☐ Letter of Intent for each type of endorsement (page 5 of the guide).
☐ Lounge Floor Plan (2 copies) preferably with occupant load (page 5 & 6 of the guide).
☐ Special Event Area Floor Plan (2 copies) preferably with occupant load (page 5 & 6 of the guide).
☐ Site plan for any outdoor endorsement area (see page 6 of guide).
☐ Patio(s) (see Appendix I on page 8 of the guide).
☐ Any additional information (labelled per question number on application form) if there is not sufficient space to answer a question on the application form.
☐ Take your application package to Local Government/First Nation (Part 9 below). Note: This step is not required if you are applying for this endorsement(s) on a second manufacturing licence located at the same site (see # 3 on page 2 of guide).

☐ After Part 9 is completed, submit your application package to the Branch (Parts 10 and 11 below).
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Mike Dickinson, Planner
SUBJECT: To amend the Official Community Plan designation for the property at 8924 Cedar Street
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Draft Site Plan
Appendix 4 – Current OCP Designations
Appendix 5 – Proposed OCP Designations
Appendix 6 – Proposed OCP Bylaw Map
Appendix 7 – Policy LAN.47 OCP Official Community Plan Referrals
CIVIC ADDRESS: 8924 Cedar Street
APPLICANT: Sunny Mangat
OCP: Attached Multi-unit Residential and Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 8, 2019
LOCATION: Cedar Valley
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

RECOMMENDATION:

Council consider and resolve:

That, upon due consideration of Section 475 of the Local Government Act, referrals go forward for development application file OCP19-001 in accordance with Council Policy LAN 47, and that persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultation referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of the Section.

An Official Community Plan (OCP) amending bylaw, 5829-2019-5670(10), is listed for first reading under the “Bylaws of Consideration” section of the Council Agenda.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to introduce an OCP amendment bylaw for the property located at 8924 Cedar Street, located in the Cedar Valley neighbourhood of Mission (Appendix 2). Pursuant to Land Use Policy LAN.47, a resolution of Council is required to initiate relevant referrals to outside agencies on an OCP amending bylaw prior to further consideration of any subsequent rezoning and development permit applications on this property.

While this report will initiate the requisite consultation referrals for an OCP amendment, the development proposal for the subject property also involves rezoning and development permit applications. The details of the rezoning and proposed development will be provided to Council in a subsequent staff report including the application’s compliance with the OCP’s neighbourhood planning requirements for the area, the District’s financial and solid waste management plans.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property occupies an area of approximately 0.80 hectares (1.79 acres), located on the east side of Cedar Street, north of Tunbridge Avenue in Cedar Valley. The property is flat and is undeveloped. A portion of Gaudin Creek is situated at the south-west corner of the site, while a portion of the creek’s setback area is located further east, adjacent to the south property boundary.

PROPOSED OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT

The applicant is proposing to develop the majority of the site area as a strata townhouse project with approximately 42 units. Two portions of the site, covered by the Gaudin Creek watercourse and streamside protection enhancement areas (SPEAs) are to be retained for environmental protection and designated Environmentally Sensitive Area (Appendix 3).

In order to achieve the proposed development, amendments to the OCP designation of portions of the property are proposed. One portion of the property would be redesignated from Environmentally Sensitive Area to Attached Multiple-unit Residential, and another portion would be redesignated from Attached Multiple-unit Residential to Environmentally Sensitive Area. The proposed amendments are consistent with the approaches outlined in the draft Cedar Valley Local Area Plan.

Appendices 4 and 5 show current and proposed OCP designations.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REFERRAL LAN 47 POLICY

Review of the proposed development application must be undertaken in compliance with LAN.47, attached as Appendix 6. Staff have reviewed the requirements of LAN. 47 and recommend that
referrals with respect to the OCP amendment be forwarded to First Nations, School District No.75, the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development, and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

SIGN-OFFS:

[Signature]

Mike Dickinson, Planner

[Signature]

Reviewed by: Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1
Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 8924 Cedar Street

PID: 009-315-446

Legal: Lot 1 Section 33 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23879
Appendix 2
Location Map

Subject Property: 8924 Cedar Street
Owner: 1008127 BC Ltd. (Sunny Mangat)
Applicant: 1008127 BC Ltd. (Sunny Mangat)
Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Townhouse & Environmentally Sensitive Area
Appendix 3
Conceptual Draft Site Plan

Legend
- Existing ESA
- Proposed ESA

~400 m²
~100 m²
~2,200 m²
Appendix 4
Current OCP Designations
Appendix 5

Proposed OCP Designations

Legend
- Subject Property
- Attached Multi-unit Residential
- Urban Residential
- Institutional
- Environmentally Sensitive Area

PROPOSED OCP MAP
8924 Cedar Street

Drawn by: JH  Date: 07/03/2019
File: P2017-065
Appendix 6
Proposed OCP bylaw map

Legend
- Gray: Portion to be redesignated from Environmentally Sensitive Area to Attached Multi-unit Residential
- Dark gray: Portion to be redesignated from Attached Multi-unit Residential to Environmentally Sensitive Area
Appendix 7
Policy LAN.47

LAND USE

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REFERRAL

LAN. 47

POLICY

Date Policy Adopted: July 2, 2002
Date Policy Amended: June 16, 2003

During the development of a new Official Community Plan, the District of Mission will consult with the organizations listed below prior to First Reading of the bylaw.

When an amendment is proposed to an Official Community Plan, the District of Mission will refer the proposed amendment to the organizations listed below following first reading of the bylaw, subject to the following provisions.

1. The Fraser Valley Regional District will be referred OCP amendment proposals that relate to land that is located adjacent to the boundary of Electoral Area “F” or that involve 100 or more urban lots located anywhere within the District of Mission. A referral to the Fraser Valley Regional District will be made during the development of new OCP’s.

2. The District of Maple Ridge will be referred OCP amendment proposals that relate to land that is located adjacent to its boundary. A referral to the District of Maple Ridge will be made during the development of new OCPs.

3. A referral to the City of Abbotsford will be made during the development of new OCPs.

4. First Nations will be referred OCP amendment proposals that relate to lands having high potential for archeological sites. This includes lands adjacent to the Fraser River and other watercourses and water bodies.

5. School District No. 75 will be referred amendment proposals in all cases.

6. The Ministry of Water, Land, and Air Protection will be referred OCP amendment proposals that involve a redesignation for residential, institutional, commercial, agricultural or industrial development that would result in a change to the land use, vegetative cover or surface water management within a watershed that has been identified as high risk by the agencies, or a property that is within an environmentally sensitive area. A referral to the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection will be made during the development of new OCP’s.
7. The Fraser Health Region will be referred OCP amendment proposals that would increase the number of parcels to be served by on-site sewage disposal systems. A referral to the Fraser Health Region will be made during the development of new OCPs.

8. The Ministry of Transportation will be referred OCP amendment proposals for land that is located within a radius of 800 metres of an intersection of a controlled access highway, where there is a companion rezoning involved. A referral to the Ministry of Transportation will be made during the development of new OCPs.

9. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans will be referred OCP amendment proposals relating parcels located adjacent to the Fraser River, any other watercourse or water body and where the subject parcels contain creeks. A referral to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will be made during the development of new OCPs.

10. The Land Reserve Commission will be referred OCP amendment proposals for land that is within or adjacent to the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary. A referral to the Land Reserve Commission will be made during the development of new OCPs.

11. Utility Companies will be referred OCP amendment proposals involving 100 or more urban lots.

12. Canadian Pacific Railway will be referred OCP amendment proposals relating to lands directly adjacent to its rail line.

Council must consider the requirement to make referrals on a case-by-case basis and adopt a resolution to clarify that the referral requirements have been considered. If the referrals considered comply with the provisions of this policy, the Council resolution should include the following wording “That, upon due consideration of Section 879 of the Local Government Act, consultations go forward in accordance with Policy LAN.47, and that the persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultation referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of the Section.”
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Mike Dickinson, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application (R18-046) to facilitate an eight (8) lot residential subdivision at 32939 Best Avenue
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan and Rezoning Bylaw Plan
Appendix 4 – Engineering Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32939 Best Avenue
APPLICANT: Teo Bate
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current (Urban Residential) OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: January 10, 2019
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the application for the property located at 32939 Best Avenue to rezone from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to the Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone and Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone to facilitate an eight (8) lot urban residential 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 5811-2018-5050(328) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 1, 2019.

SUMMARY

A rezoning application has been received from Teo Bate for the property located at 32939 Best Avenue (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to the Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone for three lots and to the Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone for five as shown in Appendix 3.

Development Permits are required to ensure that the form and character of the proposed development is consistent with the DP Area A: Intensive Development Permit Area and DP Area E: Natural Environment Development Permit Area guidelines.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Site Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mission Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Uses</td>
<td>One single family dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Area(s)</td>
<td>544.5 square metres (5,860 square feet) to 880.7 square metres (9,480 square feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>4,968 m2 (53,475 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official Community Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Urban Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management</td>
<td>Within the Urban Growth Boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone for proposed lots 6, 7 &amp; 8 Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone for proposed lots 1 to 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Eight (8) lot urban residential subdivision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Land Uses

| North                | Urban residential single family subdivision zoned R558 |
SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is approximately 0.49 hectares (1.21 ac.) in size and is located on the north side of Best Avenue between McIntyre Street and Hazel Crescent. The property also is bound by Best Avenue on the south and Bowyer Drive on the north. The existing single-family dwelling will be removed as part of the associated subdivision process. The property slopes upward immediately along Best Avenue, then gradually to the north where it fronts Bowyer Drive. The site contains many mature conifers located along the north boundary and within the eastern section, particularly on proposed Lots 5 – 8 that front Bowyer Drive (Appendix 3).

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009):

Considering the property’s Urban Residential OCP designation, the applicant proposes to rezone the property to the Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone and the Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone which both allow two options for lot size, a minimum size of 558 sq. m (6,006 sq. ft.) for Type I lots and 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.) for Type II lots. The proposal is to allow subdivision of the property into eight (8) lots, of which proposed lot 5 fronting Bowyer Drive, would be the smaller Type II lot with an area of 544.5 sq. m (5,860 sq. ft.) (Appendix 3).

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Character

The proposed development is located within the Mission Core area and is in compliance with the Urban Residential OCP designation. The subject property is surrounded primarily by urban residential properties zoned R558 with lot areas similar to those proposed in this application.

Development Proposal

This proposed infill development includes four identical sized lots (559.7 sq. m or 5,995 sq. ft.) fronting onto Best Avenue where a secondary suite could be developed on each of the proposed lots. Within this proposed subdivision, four lots of varying size from 544.5 sq. m (5,860 sq. ft.) to 880.7 sq. m. (9,480 sq. ft.) are proposed to front onto Bowyer Drive. Of the four lots fronting Bowyer Drive, three are cul-de-sac lots located where the road turns north. These lots have narrow frontages and based upon planning policy and cannot be developed with secondary dwellings given the insufficient lot frontage to accommodate on-street parking that frequently occurs with suite development.

The development site fronts onto Best Avenue, a collector road. Recognizing the potential for increased traffic volumes on this roadway, the developer is encouraged to create shared driveways where two properties use the same driveway located along a common lot line. The objective is to reduce the number of driveways, and turning locations on this busy collector road, thereby enhancing safety for pedestrians and motorists on Best Avenue. Shared driveways are also recommended for proposed lots 5 – 8 fronting onto Bowyer Drive in order to protect more of the mature trees existing on this portion of the subject property. This site design objective shall be illustrated on the tree preservation plan prepared by the project Arborist, required for this application (Appendix 3).

Access and Servicing

Municipal water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer are available on Best Avenue and Bowyer Drive. As such, no upgrades are required.
The property owner and applicant agree with an Engineering Department proposal to design and construct the sidewalk along the north side of Best Avenue between McIntyre Street and Hazel Crescent. Given that the four proposed lots fronting Best Avenue are intended to contain suites, provision of a sidewalk in this location will offer safer pedestrian passage along this section of Best Avenue for local residents. This sidewalk extension has been volunteered as a condition of rezoning.

**Environmental Protection**

There are no watercourses on the subject property. The property slopes upward moderately from Best Avenue to Bowyer Drive and therefore, no geotechnical issues are expected. However, there are several mature conifers on the north and east portions of the site that will require analysis by a qualified Arborist. The Arborist will be required to prepare a report with plans that identify existing trees and trees recommended for preservation at time of subdivision.

A Natural Environment Development Permit may be required based on the above mentioned Arborist report.

**Tree Retention**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of sixteen (16) trees @ 2 trees for each of the eight (8) proposed lots created. This condition will be met as part of the subdivision approval.

In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant tree (trees having a caliper of 0.2 metres or greater) that will be removed except within the proposed municipal infrastructure necessary to complete the development.

**Parks and Trails** (Section 510 of the *Local Government Act*, and the Parks and Trails Master Plan)

The subject property is located approximately 100 metres south of Griner Park (classified as a Community park). Pedestrian access to Griner Park is located at the north end of Bowyer Drive. Pursuant to Section 510 of the Local Government Act, the developer must pay a 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 $2,815 per new lot to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

**DEVELOPMENT PERMIT**

**DP Area A: Intensive Residential Development Permit Area**

The Intensive Residential Development Permit Area applies to all properties being developed to intensive residential densities within the urban growth boundary. The OCP establishes guidelines for the form and character of intensive residential development by facilitating a higher standard of building design, housing alternative, site compatibility and site aesthetics that promote the important quality of a vibrant residential neighbourhood. In addition to the requirement for an Intensive Residential DP, the applicant is required to register a covenant to ensure that the proposed residential buildings meet the Intensive Residential Development Permit Guidelines, as outlined in the OCP. Intensive Residential Development Permits are delegated to the Director of Development Services or Manager of Planning, thus, no approval from Council is required.
COMMUNICATION
In accordance with the 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 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
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to final adoption, subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 4.

Building Division
According to the Building Division, demolition permits are required. Sprinklers are required, so ensure water services are appropriately sized.

REQUIREMENT(S) 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 S18-021;
3. Securing or construction of the volunteered sidewalk extension; and
4. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
1. In accordance with Section 510 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash in lieu to subdivision file {S18-021}.

Mike Dickinson, Planner
Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed by:
Rob Publow, Manager of Planning
Appendix 1
Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32939 Best Avenue

PID: 017-452-368

Legal: Lot 28 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP1139
Appendix 3
Proposed Subdivision Plan and Rezoning Bylaw Plan

Legend

- Light gray: Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone
- Dark gray: Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone
Appendix 4
Engineering Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32939 Best Avenue

CURRENT ZONE: R558    PROPOSED ZONE: R465

DISCLAIMER:
The Engineering Department is aware of a development application associated with this rezoning and will provide servicing requirements with separate subdivision comments.

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Best Avenue and Bowyer Drive. Connection to the municipal system is required. No new connections or upgrades required at rezoning stage.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Best Avenue and Bowyer Drive. Connection to the municipal system is required. No new connections or upgrades required at rezoning stage.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Best Avenue and Bowyer Drive. Connection to the municipal system is required. No new connections or upgrades required at rezoning stage.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Best Avenue and Bowyer Drive provide paved access to the site. No upgrades to either road required at rezoning stage.

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

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

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

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development
Engineering & Projects
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Kirsten Pichaloff, Planning Technician
SUBJECT: Rezoning Application (R18-055) to allow a secondary dwelling use at 8250 Haffner Terrace
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Site Plan with Parking Location
Appendix 4 – Engineering Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8250 Haffner Terrace
APPLICANT: Scott Gibson
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Residential OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: December 20, 2018
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the rezoning application to rezone 8250 Haffner Terrace to the Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) 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 5828-2019-5050(336) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 1, 2019.

SUMMARY:

A rezoning application has been received from Scott Gibson for the property located at 8250 Haffner Terrace (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from the Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to the Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a secondary suite within the existing single family dwelling.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The subject property is located in the Mission Core neighbourhood and is approximately 574 m² (6,179 ft²) in area, which exceeds the minimum lot size for the proposed R558s Zone. The subject property is located on the east side of Haffner Terrace, just north of the cul-de-sac bulb.

PLANNING ANALYSIS:

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject property is currently designated Urban Residential in the OCP and is zoned Urban Residential 558 (R558). The proposal to rezone the property to the Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) zone would permit a secondary dwelling unit.

The proposed rezoning to R558s conforms with the District’s Official Community Plan section 2.3 Housing Choice and Quality and Section 2.4 Infill Residential which both support single family residences with secondary dwelling units.

The applicant has supplied a site plan that shows an additional parking space and separate entry to the proposed secondary suite, both of which are requirements of the Zoning Bylaw. The proposed secondary suite is approximately 86.5 m² (931 ft²), which conforms to the BC Building Code restriction of 90 m² (968.8 ft²) or 40% of the principal dwelling area.

A building permit will be required. The Inspection Services Division will ensure that the proposed secondary suite meets all of the BC Building Code requirements, including fire separation, during the building permit review and plan check process.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within an Urban Residential neighbourhood comprised of single family dwellings on urban-sized lots, some of which are zoned for a secondary dwelling. The proposed secondary dwelling unit will fit into 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.

Servicing:

As per the Engineering Department comments attached as Appendix 4, it is expected that the water service will need to be upgraded.

COMMUNICATION:

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development.

Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

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

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

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

REFERRALS:

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project.

REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING

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

1. The existing water service shall be fitted with a water meter as a condition of rezoning. Should the proposed rezoning and subsequent building permit trigger the requirement for an approved fire sprinkler system, as per the Fire Sprinkler Bylaw 5679-2017, a new and adequately sized water service (likely 38 mm diameter) complete with a meter will be required. This in turn will require the existing 19 mm diameter water service to be capped. These works would be completed by the District at the applicant’s expense.

2. Any requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including public hearing.
SIGN-OFFS:

Kirsten Pichaloff, Planning Technician

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 8250 Haffner Terrace

PID: 017-511-241

Legal: Lot 25 Section 29 Township 17 Westminster District Plan LMP1907
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 8250 Kudo Drive
Owner: Bradley Scott and Tracey Lee Gibson
Applicant: Scott Gibson
Zoning: R558
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Appendix 3

Site Plan with Parking Location
Appendix 4
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

February 26, 2019

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8250 Haffner Terrace

CURRENT ZONE: R550  PROPOSED ZONE: R550s

NOTE: The following Engineering Comments are made in accordance with the District of Mission Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw No. 5650-2017.

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Haffner Terrace. Connection to the municipal system is required. The existing service is 19 mm diameter copper, and was installed in 1991. The existing water service shall be fitted with a water meter as a condition of rezoning. Should the proposed rezoning and subsequent building permit trigger the requirement for an approved fire sprinkler system, as per the Fire Sprinkler Bylaw 5673-2017, a new and adequately sized water service (likely 38 mm diameter) complete with a meter will be required. This in turn will require the existing 19 mm diameter water service to be capped. These works would be completed by the District at the applicant’s expense.
Engineered design required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Haffner Terrace. Connection to the municipal system is required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is not available on Haffner Terrace. Connection to the municipal system is not required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Haffner Terrace provides paved access to the site. No upgrades are required for rezoning.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, this application may proceed to adoption once the water 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: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Hardeep Atwal, Planner
SUBJECT: Rescind Rezoning Application (R18-032) which proposed to allow a secondary dwelling unit at the property located at 29811 Donatelli Avenue

ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Land Use Development File Closure & Extension Policy (LAN.13)
Appendix 4 – Request to Close Rezoning Application R18-032

CIVIC ADDRESS: 29811 Donatelli Avenue
APPLICANT: Ajia Canadian Building Systems Inc.
OCP: Suburban Residential
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: Sept 11, 2018
LOCATION: Silverdale Community
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the applicant’s request to close the development application to rezone 29811 Donatelli Avenue to the Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s).

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5792-2018-5050(317) is currently sitting at third reading, and all readings need to be rescinded to close the file. Staff have listed the bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

SUMMARY

A rezoning application was received from Ajia Canadian Building Systems, for the property located at 29811 Donatelli Avenue (Appendix 2). The application had proposed to rezone the subject property from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling (S36s) Zone to facilitate a secondary dwelling unit in the form of a coach house. The rezoning application was presented to Council on the below dates:

- First & Second Reading: October 15, 2018
- Public Hearing & Third Reading: November 5, 2018

On February 25, 2019, the applicant submitted a formal request to withdraw the Rezoning Application (R18-032) and all associated development permits at the request of the property owner. As such, the readings are to be rescinded and the file closed.

File Closure Request

In accordance with Land Use Development File Closure and Extension Policy - LAN.13 (Appendix 3), the applicant has provided a written request to close the rezoning file (R18-032) and all associated development permits. The file closure request is attached as (Appendix 4).

Development Permits

As part of the file closure, the following developments permit applications will also be closed.

1. Area A – Intensive Residential Development Permit (DP18-067)
2. Area E – Natural Environment Development Permit (DP18-050)
3. Area H – Fire Interface Development Permit (DP18-047)

SIGN-OFFS

Hardeep Atwal, Planning

Reviewed by:
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1 - Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 29811 Donatelli Avenue

PID: 023-529-962

Legal: Lot A District Lot 457 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan LMP29949
Appendix 2 - Location Map

Subject Property: 29811 Donatelli Avenue
Owner: Florence Walthers
Applicant: Ajia Canadian Building Systems
Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Silverdale Comprehensive Planning Area
Appendix 3 – Land Use Development File Closure & extension Policy (LAN.13)

LAND USE

DEVELOPMENT FILE CLOSURE AND EXTENSION

LAN.13

Date Policy Adopted: July 4, 2011

Council Resolution Number: RC11/079

The following policies affect Rezoning, Subdivision, Development Variance Permit, Development Permit, Temporary Use Permit and Agricultural Land Commission development applications.

13.1 General File Closure and File Extension Policies:

- All outstanding or required development application materials must be submitted by the applicant within 6 months from the date of application or within 6 months after initial consideration by Council. The file will be closed if the applicant fails to provide all outstanding or required development application materials within those time frames.

- Written notification of an impending file closure will be mailed to the applicant thirty (30) days prior to the scheduled file closure date. After thirty (30) day has passed, the applicant shall be notified, by mail, that the file is closed.

- Once a development application file has been closed, a new application and full application fees will be required prior to any further consideration of the development proposal.

13.2 Rezoning Files:

- Rezoning files will be closed 1 year following the date of 3rd reading of the zone amending bylaw. Accordingly, if the applicant fails to satisfy rezoning requirements and obtain 4th and final reading of the zone amending bylaw, the Director of Planning (or designate) may grant a one-time-only extension for a period no longer than 1 year. The request for extension must be made in writing by the applicant in association with payment of the applicable extension fee. All file extensions granted are subject to bylaw and policy amendments that may affect development application requirements and fees.

13.3 Subdivision Files:

- Subdivision files will be closed 1 year from the issue date of a "Preliminary Layout Approval" (PLA) letter. Accordingly, if the applicant fails to satisfy PLA requirements within that 1 year period, the Director of Planning (or designate) may grant a one-time extension for a period no longer than 1 year. The request for extension must be made in writing by the applicant in association with payment of the applicable extension fee. In
Appendix 3 – Land Use Development File Closure & extension Policy (LAN.13)

Development File Closure and Extension
LAN.13

accordance with the Local Government Act, Section 943 (as amended from time to time), all subdivision applications are subject to bylaw and policy amendments that may affect development application requirements and fees. (i.e. development cost charges)

13.4 File Closure Process

- Following receipt of a letter to close a development file by the applicant or delivery of a file closure letter drafted by staff, refunds will be in accordance with the Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw, as amended from time to time.

- All file extensions fees will be in accordance with the Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw, as amended from time to time.

- If the development application has not been considered by Council for any readings or initial Council consideration, staff will make a note to file regarding the reasons and close the file, or

- If the development application has received 1st, 2nd or 3rd readings or initial Council consideration, staff will forward a report to Council recommending that the readings be rescinded and the file(s) be closed.

- In order to keep Council apprised of the frequency of development application file closures, staff must provide a bi-annual report to Council which lists all applications closed (with rationale) by staff and Council.

13.5 Exemptions

Upon consideration of supporting rationale supplied by the applicant, Council may provide development file extensions at their discretion, on a ‘case-by-case’ basis.
Appendix 4 – Request to Close Rezoning Application R18-032

Hardeep Kaur Atwal
Planner

District of Mission
Planning - Development Services
8645 Stave Lake St, Box 20, Mission, BC, V2V 4L9
Office: 604-820-3753
Email: hatwal@mission.ca

Regarding Project folder P2018-052, Rezoning Application R18-032 and all associated development permits.

We are requesting to close the development application due to the property owners having changed their decision. We apologize for the inconvenience.

Please contact us if you have further comments or concerns.

Best regards,

Robert Jones
Project Manager

AJIA Custom Prefab Homes
1367 Crown Street
North Vancouver, BC V7J 1G4
TEL: 604-990-1133
TOLL FREE: 1-888-990-2542(AJIA)
www.ajia.ca
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works
SUBJECT: Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Terms of Reference
ATTACHMENTS: A – Terms of Reference (Approved April 7, 2015)
B – Proposed Terms of Reference Amendments (Tracked Changes)
C – Proposed Terms of Reference Amendments (Final)

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
That the proposed changes to the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee Terms of Reference, as presented in the report from Director of Engineering & Public Works dated March 18, 2019 be adopted.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of the report is to seek approval from Council to amend the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee (MTTC) Terms of Reference (TOR).

BACKGROUND:
The MTTC is an established advisory committee to Council that is primarily concerned with traffic safety and transit issues within the District. The current TOR (Attachment A) was adopted by Council at the inception of the Committee in 2015 and has not been reviewed since.

As the MTTC is a Council appointed advisory body, the TOR for the MTTC are established by Council, and can only be altered by Council.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Changeover of the appointed Council positions for the MTTC after the 2018 municipal election provided an opportunity to review the MTTC’s TOR; the review identified some required housekeeping changes. The proposed updated TOR is included as Attachment B. Notable changes include the additions of a specific serving term for the members at large, the meeting schedule, and the inclusion of specified active and accessible transportation expertise or experience for the member at large positions.

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

COMMUNICATION:
At the next regular MTTC meeting, to be held on April 4, 2019, an update will be provided to the Committee.
SUMMARY:
The proposed changes to the MTTC TOR will enhance the frequency of engagement and communication with Council, and ensure succession planning is established for the long-term benefit of the MTTC. In turn, the MTTC will be better positioned to provide advice on traffic safety, transportation, roadway accessibility, and transit matters in the District of Mission, promoting public health and safety in the District.

SIGN-OFFS:

Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Reviewed by:

Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
BACKGROUND:
While there is a Joint Shared Services Committee (JSSC) to discuss shared services of Water, Wastewater, Recycling and Transit between Mission and Abbotsford, there is a need for a local advisory committee to discuss traffic safety and transit issues that are specific to Mission and to ensure that these issues are forwarded to the Council and the JSSC where appropriate for discussion and action.

MANDATE:
The mandate of the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee (MTTC) is to oversee traffic safety and transit within Mission. The MTTC is established to engage the community to receive its concerns and suggestions and to make recommendations regarding all traffic safety and transit issues including those related to the Central Fraser Valley Transit System and the West Coast Express. From time to time, recommendations are also made to maximize efficiency with regional transit systems such as the Translink system in Metro Vancouver and the Chilliwack Transit System.

AUTHORITY:
The MTTC is authorized by the District of Mission Council under Section 93 of the Community Charter as an advisory committee and is established under Council resolution RC15/173, April 7, 2015. As an advisory committee, issues are discussed and recommendations forwarded to Council for consideration.

SCOPE:
The MTTC provides advice and recommendations to the Council on traffic safety and transit issues and needs within Mission. The issues and needs are identified by the MTTC members, staff and the general public and are discussed at the MTTC meetings. Council will also use the MTTC as a resource on traffic safety and transit issues as required. With respect to transit, MTTC will report on initiatives such as, but not limited to, the Master and Annual Operating Agreements with BC Transit, the Transit Future Plan and the West Coast Express Mission Service and Funding Agreement. Broader issues that affect the provision of transit services in both Abbotsford and Mission, such as financial planning, contractual arrangements and infrastructure investments are not within the mandate of the MTTC and shall be addressed at the JSSC.

With respect to traffic safety, the MTTC will report on initiatives such as, but not limited to, improvements for safety of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists, improvements in driving behaviours, reducing traffic related concerns, exploring opportunities to partner with Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia and other funding agencies and assist with infrastructure planning.

RESPONSIBILITIES*
The MTTC will be responsible for the following:

- Receiving concerns and suggestions from the general public regarding traffic safety and transit in Mission;
- Receiving and discussing requests for action and referrals from Council;
- Receiving and addressing information and requests from BC Transit, Translink, City of Abbotsford and other partners; and
- Recommending appropriate actions to Council relating to the above.
MEMBERSHIP*

1. Voting Members (11 total)
   - The Chairperson shall be appointed by Council for the duration of that Council’s term;
   - The Vice-Chairperson shall be appointed by Council for the duration of that Council’s term;
   - One person appointed by Mission Community Services;
   - One person appointed by Mission Public Schools;
   - One person appointed by Mission Association for Community Living;
   - One person appointed by Mission Youth Committee;
   - One person appointed by Mission Association for Seniors Housing;
   - One person appointed by Mission Seniors Activity Centre;
   - One person appointed by the United Way Fraser Valley; and
   - Two members at large from the general public

2. Non-voting Members
   - The Director of Engineering and Public Works or their delegate;
   - The Director of Development Services or their delegate;
   - An administrative staff person who will alternate from Engineering and Public Works and Development Services on an annual basis;
   - The Manager of Social Development;
   - BC Transit staff (as required);
   - Bus contracting company staff (as required); and
   - RCMP member (as required).

3. Subcommittees
   - The MTTC may establish subcommittees as required either on an ongoing basis or for a single initiative;
   - The Chairperson of MTTC shall appoint subcommittee members; and
   - Apart from the membership, all other aspects of the Protocol for Council Committees shall apply.

RELATED BYLAWS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
   - Protocol for Council Committees

*See Protocol for Council Committees for a complete list of rules of procedure, committee appointments and staffing and committee business.

***END OF TERMS OF REFERENCE***
Mission Traffic and Transit Committee
Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND:
The societal impacts of traffic safety, transportation mobility, accessibility and transit, and the desire to consider input from a wide range of users on these issues, are the basis for a local traffic and transit advisory committee. While there is a Joint Shared Services Committee (JSSC) to discuss shared services of water, wastewater, recycling, and transit between Mission and Abbotsford, a local advisory committee would discuss traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility, and transit issues that are specific to Mission, and where appropriate ensure that these issues are forwarded to Council and the JSSC for information or action.

While there is a Joint Shared Services Committee (JSSC) to discuss shared services of water, wastewater, recycling, and transit between Mission and Abbotsford, there is a need for a local advisory committee to discuss traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility and transit issues that are specific to Mission and to ensure that these issues are forwarded to the Council and the JSSC where appropriate for discussion and action.

MANDATE:
The mandate of the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee (MTTC) is to represent the interests of Mission residents as they relate to traffic safety and transit within Mission. The MTTC was established to engage the community, to receive its concerns and suggestions, and to make recommendations to Mission Council regarding all traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility, and transit issues, including those related to the Central Fraser Valley Transit System and the West Coast Express. From time to time, recommendations are also made to maximize efficiency with regional transit systems such as the Translink system in Metro Vancouver and the Chilliwack Transit System.

Routine traffic requests will be handled by staff on a day to day basis.

AUTHORITY:
The MTTC is authorized by the District of Mission Council under Section 93 of the Community Charter as an advisory committee and is established under Council resolution RC15/173, April 7, 2015. As an advisory committee, issues are discussed, and recommendations forwarded to Council for consideration.

SCOPE:
The MTTC provides advice and recommendations to Council on concerns and requests as it relates to traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility and transit issues and needs within Mission. Concerns and requests may be identified by the MTTC members, staff, or the general public, and will be discussed at the MTTC meetings. Council will also use the MTTC as a resource on traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility and transit issues as required.

With respect to transit, MTTC will report on initiatives such as, but not limited to:

- Master and Annual Operating Agreements with BC Transit;
- The Transit Future Plan; and
- The West Coast Express Mission Service and Funding Agreement.

Broader issues that affect the provision of transit services in both Abbotsford and Mission, such as
financial planning, contractual arrangements and infrastructure investments are not within the mandate of the MTTC and shall be addressed at the JSSC.

With respect to traffic safety, the MTTC will report on initiatives such as, but not limited to:

- Improvements for safety of motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists;
- Improvements in driving behaviours;
- Reducing traffic-related concerns;
- Facilitating and raising awareness for commuter cycling, walking, and other alternative modes of transportation;
- Awareness of physical accessibility issues for pedestrians and transit users;
- Exploring opportunities to partner with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, and other funding agencies and
- Assisting with infrastructure planning.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The MTTC will be responsible for the following:

- Receiving concerns and suggestions from the general public regarding traffic safety and transit in Mission;
- Receiving and discussing requests for action and referrals from Council;
- Receiving and addressing information and requests from BC Transit, TransLink, City of Abbotsford, School District 75, ICBC, and other partners; and
- Recommending appropriate actions to Council relating to the above.

MEMBERSHIP:

Appointments to and removal of members from the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee will be made in accordance with Select Committees Policy COU.20b.

1. There will be twelve voting members as follows:(11 total)
   - The Chairperson (member of Council) shall be appointed by Council for the duration of that Council’s term;
   - Vice-Chairperson (member of Council) shall be appointed by Council for the duration of that Council’s term;
   - One person appointed by Mission Community Services representative;
   - One person appointed by Mission Public Schools representative;
   - One person appointed by Mission Association for Community Living representative;
   - One person appointed by Mission Youth Committee;
   - One person appointed by Mission Association for Seniors Housing representative;
   - One person appointed by Mission Seniors Activity Centre representative;
   - One person appointed by the United Way Fraser Valley of the Lower Mainland representative; and
   - Two (24) members at large from the general public with expertise or experience in:
     - Cycling mobility;
     - Pedestrian mobility;
     - physical Accessibility (i.e. or could be member of from the Canadian Council of the Blind, Abbotsford Chapter); and
The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be appointed by Council for the duration of the current Council term.

The organizations identified above will each be asked to designate one representative to the Committee. The members at large will each be appointed to a two-year term by resolution of Council. At the discretion of Council, members at large may serve an unlimited number of terms on the Committee.

2. From time to time, Representatives from other agencies may be requested to attend specific meetings, as non-voting members, which may include, but are not limited to:

- BC Transit;
- First Bus Canada Ltd.;
- Insurance Corporation of British Columbia (ICBC);
- Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI); and
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).
2.3. Non-voting Members

District staff liaisons (or their designate) will consist of, but are not limited to:

- The Director of Engineering and Public Works or their delegate;
- The Director of Development Services or their delegate; and
- An administrative staff person who will alternate from Engineering and Public Works, who will take minutes and forward them to Mission Council.

- The Manager of Social Development;
- BC Transit staff (as required);
- Bus contracting company staff (as required); and
- RCMP member (as required).

SUBCOMMITTEES:

The MTTC may establish subcommittees as required either on an ongoing basis, or for a single initiative, and the Chairperson of the MTTC shall appoint subcommittee members; and

- Apart from the membership, all other aspects of the Protocol for Council Committees shall apply.

MEETING SCHEDULE:

The Mission Traffic and Transit Committee will meet the first Thursday of every second month, with the exception of August.

RELATED BYLAWS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- Protocol for Council Committees Select Committees Policy COU.20b

*See Protocol for Council Committees for a complete list of rules of procedure, committee appointments and staffing and committee business.

***END OF TERMS OF REFERENCE***
Mission Traffic and Transit Committee
Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND:
The societal impacts of traffic safety, transportation mobility, accessibility and transit, and the desire to consider input from a wide range of users on these issues, are the basis for a local traffic and transit advisory committee. While there is a Joint Shared Services Committee (JSSC) to discuss shared services of water, wastewater, recycling, and transit between Mission and Abbotsford, a local advisory committee would discuss traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility, and transit issues that are specific to Mission, and where appropriate ensure that these issues are forwarded to Council and the JSSC for information or action.

MANDATE:
The mandate of the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee (MTTC) is to represent the interests of Mission residents as they relate to traffic safety and transit within Mission. The MTTC was established to engage the community, to receive its concerns and suggestions, and to make recommendations to Mission Council regarding traffic safety, active transportation, accessibility, and transit issues.

AUTHORITY:
The MTTC is an advisory committee established under Council resolution RC15/173, April 7, 2015. As an advisory committee, issues are discussed, and recommendations forwarded to Council for consideration.

SCOPE:
The MTTC provides advice and recommendations to Council on concerns and requests as it relates to traffic safety, active transportation, accessible transportation and transit within Mission. Concerns and requests may be identified by MTTC members, staff, or the general public, and will be discussed at the MTTC meetings. Council will also use the MTTC as a resource on traffic safety, active transportation, accessible transportation and transit as required.

With respect to transit, MTTC will report on initiatives such as, but not limited to:

- Master and Annual Operating Agreements with BC Transit;
- The Transit Future Plan; and
- The West Coast Express Mission Service and Funding Agreement.

Broader issues that affect the provision of transit services in both Abbotsford and Mission, such as financial planning, contractual arrangements and infrastructure investments are not within the mandate of the MTTC and shall be addressed at the JSSC.

With respect to traffic safety, the MTTC will report on initiatives such as, but not limited to:

- Improvements for safety of motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists;
- Improvements in driving behaviors;
- Facilitating and raising awareness for cycling, walking, and other alternative modes of transportation;
- Awareness of physical accessibility issues for pedestrians and transit users; and
- Assisting with infrastructure planning.
RESPONSIBILITIES:
The MTTC is responsible for the following:

- Receiving concerns and suggestions from the general public regarding traffic safety and transit in Mission;
- Receiving and discussing requests for action and referrals from Council;
- Receiving and addressing information and requests from BC Transit, TransLink, City of Abbotsford, School District 75, ICBC, and other partners; and
- Recommending appropriate actions to Council relating to the above.

MEMBERSHIP:
Appointments to and removal of members from the MTTC will be made in accordance with Select Committees Policy COU.20b.

1. There will be twelve voting members as follows:

   - Chairperson (member of Council);
   - Vice-Chairperson (member of Council);
   - Mission Community Services representative;
   - Mission Public Schools representative;
   - Mission Association for Community Living representative;
   - Mission Association for Seniors Housing representative;
   - Mission Seniors Activity Centre representative;
   - United Way of the Lower Mainland representative; and
   - Four members at large from the general public with expertise or experience in:
     - Cycling mobility;
     - Pedestrian mobility;
     - Accessible transportation (i.e. member of Canadian Council of the Blind); and
     - Transit.

   The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be appointed by Council for the duration of the current Council term.

   The organizations identified above will each be asked to designate one representative to the Committee. The members at large will each be appointed to a two-year term by resolution of Council. At the discretion of Council, members at large may serve an unlimited number of terms on the Committee.

2. Representatives from other agencies may be requested to attend specific meetings, as non-voting members, which may include, but are not limited to:

   - BC Transit;
   - First Bus Canada Ltd.;
   - Insurance Corporation of British Columbia (ICBC);
   - Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI); and
   - Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).
3. District staff liaisons (or their designate) will consist of, but are not limited to:
   - The Director of Engineering & Public Works;
   - The Director of Development Services; and
   - An administrative staff person from Engineering & Public Works, who will take minutes and forward them to Mission Council.

SUBCOMMITTEES:
The MTTC may establish subcommittees as required either on an ongoing basis, or for a single initiative, and the Chairperson of the MTTC shall appoint subcommittee members.

MEETING SCHEDULE:
The Mission Traffic and Transit Committee will meet the first Thursday of every second month, with the exception of August.

RELATED BYLAWS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
   - Select Committees Policy COU.20b

***END OF TERMS OF REFERENCE***
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services
SUBJECT: Short Term Extension of Curbside Collection Contract

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
That the curbside collection contract with Remple Disposal Ltd. be extended by a period of one year from April 1, 2019, to March 31, 2020, to allow time for procurement documents to be completed, to ensure the transition from blue bags to bins is smoother, and to allow the successful proponent sufficient time to make the necessary equipment purchases.

PURPOSE:
This report is to request Council's approval for extending the current curbside collection contract by one year to ensure uninterrupted curbside collection services to residents, while the District of Mission solicits proposals for a longer-term contract.

BACKGROUND:
Remple Disposal Ltd. was awarded the curbside collection contract on January 1, 2009, subsequent to a competitive procurement process. The initial contract with Remple was for a term of five years, with an additional five-year renewal option. The contract was accordingly extended in 2014 with a new end date of March 31, 2019.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The current curbside collection contract with Remple Disposal ends on March 31, 2019. The preparation of the procurement documents for extending the contract have not been finalized due to the size of the contract, the age of the contract, and the need to update the terms and requirements, and therefore an extension of the contract is required to ensure continuity of service. Remple Disposal has agreed to an extension, preferably of one year. Staff support an extension of one year, so as to allow time for the procurement documents and process to be completed, to ensure an orderly transition from blue bags to bins, and to allow the successful proponent sufficient time to make the necessary equipment purchases. The quality and value of the service provided by Remple Disposal has been good, and therefore, staff recommend a one-year extension of the contract.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications associated with this report, since the curbside collection costs included in the 2019 operating budget were based on the current contract with the appropriate inflation.
COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The current contract with Remple Disposal for curbside collection services expires on March 31, 2019. In order to allow time for procurement documents and process to be completed, to ensure the transition from blue bags to bins is smoother, and to allow the successful proponent sufficient time to make the necessary equipment purchases, staff recommend extending the current contract by one year to March 31, 2020.

SIGN-OFFS:

Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services

Reviewed by:
Ilsa Foster, Manager of Purchasing and Stores

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: March 18, 2019  
TO: Chief Administrative Officer  
FROM: Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator  
SUBJECT: Curbside Collection Area Expansion  
ATTACHMENT: A – Curbside Collection Map with Proposed Expansion

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the curbside collection area be expanded to include a proposed townhome development at 8279, 8289, and 8387 Nelson Street, and a proposed single-family subdivision at 8455 Nelson Street;
2. That the area between the current curbside collection area and the proposed expansion be declared a curbside collection optional area; and
3. That Plan No. G127E, which shows the current curbside collection and curbside collection optional areas, be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend the expansion of the District of Mission (District) curbside collection and curbside collection optional areas to enable the provision of municipal waste collection services to a proposed urban-density residential development at 8279, 8289, 8387, and 8455 Nelson Street, as well as the existing lower-density development between the proposed development and the current curbside collection area.

BACKGROUND:
Curbside collection services have been provided to residents in the curbside collection (i.e., urban-density) area since the early 1990’s. Single-family residences receive bi-weekly curbside collection of up to two 80 litre bins of garbage, bi-weekly collection of container glass, and weekly collection of unlimited amounts of compost and mixed recyclables at a total cost of $295.32 per unit per year. By default, multi-family complexes receive weekly, municipal on-site service of communal compost and recyclables carts at $74.88 per unit per year, and make private arrangements for garbage collection.

As a practical courtesy, a lower-density area outside of the curbside collection area, but along the way to the landfill, has been designated as a curbside collection optional area. Residents in this area may choose to join the curbside collection program at the curbside collection fee of $295.32 per year, rather than delivering their household wastes to the landfill themselves and paying tipping fees, or hiring a private waste collection contractor. By default, residents in the curbside collection optional area, like rural residents, pay only the rural recycling processing fee of $17.64 per year on their property taxes. Appendix A shows the extent of the current collection area designations.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
As per Solid Waste Management Bylaw 5526-2015, multi-family complexes with a layout that is suitable for curbside collection can opt in at the single-family collection rate. The developer of the subject sites has requested that both the single-family and the multi-family subdivision be serviced door-to-door by the municipal contract at $295.32 per unit per year. The District also periodically receives requests from individual residents in the Sports Park area for inclusion in curbside collection services which, due to the lack of density and consensus, have not been acted on.

Since the new development has urban density, but is not contiguous with the current curbside collection area, staff confirmed with the District’s current curbside collection service provider that the proposed development could indeed be serviced at the same rates as the existing curbside collection area. Based on this confirmation, staff recommends adding the new development to the District’s curbside collection area.

To access the new development, collection vehicles would traverse the Sports Park area, which is currently not part of the curbside collection area. Considering that requests for collection services have been received from individual residents on occasion, staff suggests to include it as an additional curbside collection optional area. This would provide Sports Park residents with a choice of joining the collection system, without imposing higher annual fees on all residents of this lower-density area.

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

COMMUNICATION:
Should Council approve the recommendations in this report, the choice of opting into the municipal curbside collection system in the additional curbside collection optional area would be communicated to affected residents in a mail-out.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
A proposed urban-density development west of the current curbside collection area, but not contiguous to it, could be serviced by the District’s contractor at current unit rates. It is recommended to add the new development to the curbside collection area, and to declare the lower-density existing development between the current and the proposed curbside collection area a curbside collection optional area.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by:
Barry Azevedo, Manager of Environmental Services

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transportation
SUBJECT: Traffic Calming Policy Update
ATTACHMENTS:
A – Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A)
B – Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 be repealed;
2. That Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A), as attached to the report from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic & Transportation dated March 18, 2019 be approved; and

PURPOSE:
This report outlines the proposed updated Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A), provided herein for Council’s consideration.

BACKGROUND:
Traffic is a major concern on neighbourhood streets in the District of Mission (District). With recent development, many residents have reported increased traffic volumes and speeds on neighbourhood streets. As a result, many residents have requested traffic calming to address speeding, short-cutting, and safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists on their streets.

Although increased development traffic is the reason for recent resident enquiries, traffic issues and requests for traffic calming are not new; on July 21, 2003 Council adopted the Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 (STR.32), included as Attachment B. This policy was most recently amended on February 2, 2009.

STR.32 has high traffic volume thresholds for neighbourhood streets, resulting in limited eligible projects for the streets it is intended to target. In 2018 staff received Chief Administrative Officer approval to update the Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy to address this concern. Requests for traffic calming on existing roads have been placed on hold, pending an update to the Policy.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
STR.32 put significant emphasis on vehicle volumes, with a required minimum of 1,000 vehicles per day for District funded traffic calming, however any road which had 1,000 vehicles per day qualified for resident funded traffic calming regardless of speeds. Most local roads do not achieve daily traffic volumes that high; this system heavily favors collector roadways. The Transportation Master Plan identifies expected daily traffic of up to 1,000 vehicles per day on local roads.
The process to update the Policy included a review of several lower mainland municipalities’ traffic calming policies. All policies reviewed included a warrant system utilized to determine if traffic calming should be installed, the specified criteria, and the applicable funding source. How these factors varied are identified below:

- **Warrant Systems** – single or dual criteria, multi-criteria scoring, multi-warrant, and petition only

- **Criteria (number of occurrences in reviewed policies)** – speed (6), volume (6), pedestrian generators (4), cycling (4), transit/emergency access routes (3), accident history (3), road classification (4), non-local traffic (3), sidewalks (1), and grades (1)

- **Funding Source** – municipally funded, resident funded, or a combination of both, with funding source based on the warrant or specific criteria.

The updated Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) (Policy) is largely similar to STR.32 in regards to the consultation and approval process; the warrant process is where it predominantly differs.

The main purpose of the Policy is to reduce vehicle speeds where the majority of traffic is driving inappropriately. It is not intended to address locations where a small number of motorists are speeding; enforcement is the more appropriate response in those cases. To ensure that the District installs traffic calming that addresses the majority of drivers, the Policy includes a minimum 85th percentile speed threshold of 10 km/h above the posted speed limit. If the threshold is met, the Policy utilizes a multi-criteria scoring system to determine if traffic calming is warranted, which includes traffic speeds, daily traffic volume, proximity to schools and parks, preventable crash history, and the existence of cycling routes.

Not all roadways are eligible for traffic calming, specifically arterial roads, emergency routes, Priority #1 snow plow routes, and locations with grades greater than 8%. Additionally, special attention must be taken when considering traffic calming on transit routes, or Priority #2 snow clearing routes.

STR.32 included discrete warrants for District funded and resident funded traffic calming projects, whereas the updated Policy utilizes the scoring from the warrant process to determine the applicable funding source.

The process identified in the Policy is comprehensive and will require significant staff time to investigate and implement. At the current staffing level, only a single “active” traffic calming project development can proceed at any time. An “active” traffic calming project commences once a preliminary petition is deemed to have sufficient support, and extends until:

- Funding is successfully secured; or
- Project is cancelled due to:
  - Insurmountable objections; or
  - Lack of support.

Once funding has been secured or the project is cancelled, the highest scoring and sufficiently supported petition qualifies for consideration as the “active” project.

During the review of neighbouring municipality’s traffic calming policies, it was noted that Chilliwack has placed a moratorium on all traffic calming projects. The moratorium is a result of negative feedback regarding increased emergency services response times, speeding relocated to adjacent streets, residents feeling “stuck” with the traffic calming devices, the perception that drivers are speeding despite the speed humps, and lastly that drivers circumvent the speed humps by driving on resident’s lawns.
To decrease the likelihood that similar concerns occur in the District, staff recommends the first traffic calming project based on the updated Policy be conducted as a pilot program, with a minimum six month waiting period to collect sufficient feedback from residents, and traffic data to determine the traffic calming effectiveness.

A District Traffic Calming Guide is being developed to supplement the Policy, and will be available on the District website and provided to proponents with the preliminary petition form.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This report addresses Council’s goal of improved public safety by reducing vehicle speed and cut-through volumes on District roads. Reduced vehicle speeds have been proven to decrease the number and severity of collisions, particularly when an incident involves a pedestrian or cyclist.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

While this report has no direct financial implications, the proposed policy does identify that the District may be required to fund certain traffic calming projects, subject to Council approval. Depending on the popularity of the Policy, a significant amount of staff time and resources may be required to investigate and action this Policy before any construction even occurs. In regards to construction costs, there is currently no annual funding available for traffic calming. If District-funded traffic calming is warranted and supported, funding will be requested on a project-by-project basis; should funding not be available, the project would be added to the list of unfunded capital projects. Individual traffic calming projects may be eligible for ICBC funding, or in some cases could be funded by area residents through a Local Area Service tax.

It’s important to consider that implementing a new policy that requires funding, where no funding is identified, can put Council in a difficult position as requests likely would come forward outside of the established budgeting process, therefore without the ability to prioritize against other pending requests for funds.

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

COMMUNICATION:

The Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) will be included in the District’s Policy and Procedure Manual. The District’s website includes a traffic page with information regarding traffic calming. Links to Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) and the Traffic Calming Guide will be included.

Development of the Policy involved consultation with internal stakeholders, including public works and Mission Fire Rescue, and the external stakeholders from the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee, including BC Transit, RCMP, and ICBC.

Any traffic calming projects borne of this Policy will also involve consultation with a resident committee, as well as the internal and external stakeholders identified above.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Concerns regarding speeding and increased vehicle traffic often lead to requests for traffic calming. The District’s Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 has high traffic volume thresholds for neighbourhood streets, resulting in limited eligible projects for streets it is intended to target. The policy needed to be updated, and the process for the update included a review of neighbouring municipality’s traffic calming policies, and consultation with internal and external stakeholders. Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) is an updated policy that sets the criteria for the evaluation and prioritization process for traffic calming requests, and as well as the funding, approval, and implementation of traffic calming projects on District roadways.

SIGN-OFFS:

Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transportation

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission receives numerous requests each year for Traffic Calming on neighbourhood roads. Traffic Calming measures such as speed humps/tables, curb extensions, raised medians, and traffic circles are designed to encourage safe driving by slowing down the speed of vehicles and reducing the volume of traffic on local roads.

Traffic Calming can be controversial, and general support of the residents and owners of parcels in an area is desirable before Traffic Calming measures are implemented. The measures may also require funding contributions from residents and owners. This policy sets out the processes for determining the level of support, the type of funding, and the apportionment of that funding.

Traffic Calming projects are intended to be small scale neighbourhood-level projects, with low implementation costs. Projects which are projected to cost more than $50,000 will be considered Local Area Service projects, and will be processed using the District's Tax Policy for Local Service Areas.

PURPOSE:
The Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy (Policy) sets the criteria for the evaluation and prioritization process for Traffic Calming requests as well as the funding, approval, and implementation of Traffic Calming projects on District roadways.

This Policy is intended to address existing road conditions. While it is not intended to guide new development, any Traffic Calming measure installed on newly constructed roads is also subject to Section 2 of this Policy.

POLICY:
1. Definitions
   “Ballot Sheet” means a ballot mailed to all parcel owners and residents in the Benefiting Area, affording each parcel one vote in the Traffic Calming initiative in their neighbourhood.
“Benefiting Area” means the area which bounds the properties that face, flank or back onto the section of highway proposed to receive Traffic Calming and may be responsible for costs associated with the work. This area will include, at a minimum, the entire block where Traffic Calming measures are proposed.

“Council” means the duly elected officials of the District of Mission, those being the Mayor and Councilors.

“Director” means the Director of Engineering and Public Works or their designate.

“District” means the District of Mission.

“Funding Parties” means the owners or residents of parcels who have indicated a willingness to fund the proposed Traffic Calming measures.

“Highway” means any public street, road, lane, and any other public way.

“LAS” means Local Area Service, a municipal service that is to be paid for in whole or in part by an LAS tax, in accordance with the established LAS Bylaw.

“Official Ballot for Traffic Calming” means an official Ballot Sheet and information package mailed out to all owners and residents of parcels in the Benefiting Area.

“Parcel” means any lot, block or other area in which land is held or into which it is subdivided, but does not include a highway.

“Preliminary Petition” means a petition form issued to the Proponent whereby signatures are requested from parcel owners or residents that benefit from or abut the proposed Traffic Calming project.

“Proponent” means the owner(s) or resident(s) of a parcel who have requested Traffic Calming for their street or neighbourhood.

“Traffic Calming” means physical features installed on a road to reduce the speeds at which vehicles travel, to discourage through traffic, to improve traffic safety, and to improve comfort levels for all road users. Traffic Calming measures may include speed humps, curb extensions, and mini-roundabouts or traffic circles.

2. Traffic Calming

2.1 All Traffic Calming measures installed in the District of Mission shall conform to the standards established in the Transportation Association of Canada’s Canadian Guide to Traffic Calming (February 2018) and any revisions thereto.

2.2 In general, Traffic Calming measures will only be installed in residential areas or on a roadway adjacent to a park or school. Traffic Calming measures will generally be limited to the following measures and applications:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Calming Measure</th>
<th>Location Applicability</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Collector</th>
<th>Arterial</th>
<th>Emerg/ Priority/ #2 Snow Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Deflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Crosswalk (only considered where there is an existing marked crosswalk, or a crosswalk is warranted)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Cushion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Hump</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Bump</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Bump Lane only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZONTAL DEFLECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Radius Reduction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circle / Mini-Roundabout</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Narrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking (as appropriate by road cross-section)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Median</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Physical Measures (includes surface treatments and education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Rumble Strips</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Road Pavement Markings (“Sign”, converging chevrons)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Display Devices</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Watch</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Appropriate  ■ Use with Caution  ✗ Not Appropriate

2.3 Other measures will only be considered in the event that the above measures would not, in the opinion of the Director, adequately address the identified traffic issues or concerns. The above notwithstanding, traffic control signs other than those associated with the above noted measures will not be considered for use as Traffic Calming measures. Signs are considerably less effective than structural measures in achieving speed and volume reductions or decreasing shortcutting traffic, and generally require enforcement for compliance.
2.4 Vertical and horizontal deflection Traffic Calming measures will not be considered where:
   a) Grades are greater than 8 percent;
   b) Emergency access route would be significantly impacted; or
   c) Location is a Priority #1 snow clearing route, in accordance with Snow Plowing Policy EPW.25(C).

2.5 Caution must be exercised when considering Traffic Calming measures for transit routes and Priority #2 snow clearing routes.

2.6 Stop signs shall not be considered for Traffic Calming. The purpose of a stop sign is to assign right-of-way at an intersection and they are only installed where MUTCD warrants are met. Unwarranted stop signs have low compliance rates, potentially leading to increased accidents, additional noise and air pollution, and increased speeds between intersections.

2.7 Traffic Calming measures within or fronting new developments will be considered at the development application review stage.

3. Initiation

3.1 A request for Traffic Calming is generally initiated by a resident or business. Residents and businesses can request Traffic Calming in writing via email, letter or by completing a Traffic Inquiry Form. The Traffic Inquiry Form is available on the District’s website.

3.2 Staff will conduct an initial assessment to determine if a similar request has been submitted in the past five (5) years. If a request has been submitted and reviewed, staff will investigate if traffic patterns have changed significantly thereby necessitating a new investigation. If a previous request has been unsuccessful in the past five years, staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent.

3.3 Staff will undertake a traffic study which will include vehicle speeds, traffic volumes, road classification, nearby pedestrian generators, and collision history. A minimum 85th percentile speed threshold of 10 km/h above the posted speed limit is required to proceed. If the minimum threshold is not met staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent that the Traffic Calming project will not be proceeding.

3.4 If the minimum threshold is met, the data gathered during the traffic study will be scored based on the warrant criteria and weighting for Traffic Calming warrant in accordance with Appendix A.

4. Evaluation and Funding Options

4.1 The warrant process will result in a numeric score ranging from 10 to 60. This score will determine the applicable funding source. Traffic Calming requests that score 40 points or greater may be considered for District-funding, while requests that score between 20 and 39 may be approved to be funded by residents. Traffic Calming requests which score less than 20 will not be approved. If Traffic Calming is not warranted staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent that the Traffic Calming project will not be proceeding.

4.2 District-funded Traffic Calming projects will be prioritized based on the warrant score, and are subject to Council approval and available budget. Traffic Calming requests which meet the warrant for District funding, but for which funding is not currently available will be placed on the District’s unfunded budget list to be considered in a subsequent year.
4.3 Traffic Calming projects with warrant scores below the District-funded threshold, but above the minimum threshold of 20 points may be funded directly by residents in the Benefiting Area. Costs associated with resident-funded Traffic Calming will be 100% borne by owners.

4.4 Traffic Calming projects which satisfy the warrant score for District-funded Traffic Calming, but do not receive District funding in a given year, may be funded by residents. Costs associated with these types of Traffic Calming projects will be 100% borne by owners.

5. Project Development – Neighbourhood Support

5.1 If Traffic Calming is warranted, the Benefiting Area will be defined. The Benefiting Area will be used to determine which residents are to be consulted in the Preliminary Petition, open house, and Official Ballot for Traffic Calming. The extents of the Benefiting Area are influenced by the nature of the traffic concerns. It may be confined to a single street if speeding is the major concern, or include an entire neighbourhood in the case of non-local or short-cutting traffic into local streets. For a local road, the Benefiting Area should be comprised of one block of the local road, at a minimum; while for a collector road, the Benefitting Area will encompass a larger area.

5.2 A Preliminary Petition may be circulated by the Proponent to gauge neighbourhood support. The Proponent will be provided with:
   a) District of Mission Traffic Calming Guide; and
   b) Applicable Preliminary Petition form (Appendix B).

5.3 The Proponent has up to sixty (60) days to circulate the Preliminary Petition for Traffic Calming and return it to the District. If the Preliminary Petition is not returned, the District will not take any further steps with respect to the proposed Traffic Calming.

5.4 Sufficient support is deemed to exist when at least fifty percent (50%) of the residents of parcels (based on one vote per parcel) located in the proposed Benefiting Area have indicated their support for the proposed Traffic Calming on the Preliminary Petition.

5.5 If the Preliminary Petition fails to achieve sufficient support, the Traffic Calming request will be closed and the location will not be considered for Traffic Calming for a period of one year. Staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent.

5.6 If the Preliminary Petition is returned within sixty (60) days and the Director is satisfied that there is sufficient support for the proposed Traffic Calming project, staff will:
   a) Form a residents’ advisory committee of up to four owners or residents of parcels located in the Benefiting Area;
   b) Meet with residents’ advisory committee to review areas of concern and discuss possible Traffic Calming measures to mitigate issues;
   c) Develop one or more options which meet the criteria of this policy and TAC guidelines;
   d) Consult with the RCMP, Mission Fire and Rescue Service, transit and Public Works;
   e) Prepare a cost estimate for each option; and
   f) Meet with the residents’ advisory committee to obtain input on the proposed options.
g) Schedule an open house. All owners and residents in the Benefiting Area will be invited to attend and provide input on proposed options. Notice of the open house will be posted in the newspaper and District website. If concerns or objections are identified which cannot be reasonably solved, the Traffic Calming request will be closed. Staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent.

h) Finalize the preferred option’s design based on feedback from the open house and revise the estimate as required. If the cost estimate of the preferred option exceeds the allowable maximum for Traffic Calming projects, the Local Service Area Tax Policy will be applied.

6. Funding Approval

6.1 Based on feedback at the open house, staff will request approval from Council to initiate the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming process, or the LAS Tax Policy, and, in the case of a District-funded project, also request approval of funding-in-principal.

6.2 If Council approves the request to initiate the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming process, staff will mail an information package to owners and residents of parcels in the Benefiting Area. The mail out will include a cover letter, project costs, and in the case of a resident-funded project the estimated cost plus a 5.5% administration fee to each parcel; a map of the proposed works; a Ballot Sheet (Appendix C); and a pre-paid, pre-addressed return envelope.

6.3 Each parcel is allocated a single vote in the process. If a parcel is owned by two or more persons the Ballot Sheet must be signed by the majority of owners. If the resident is not the owner and the support of the owner and resident are not the same, the vote for the parcel is considered neutral.

6.4 Ballot Sheets are to be returned to the District within sixty (60) days, or another period of time as specified by the Director. Ballot Sheets received after sixty days will not be considered in the determination of sufficiency and validity of the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming.

6.5 The Director will determine the sufficiency and validity of the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming. To be certified as sufficient and valid:

   a) A minimum fifty percent (50%) of parcels located in the Benefiting Area must submit a Ballot Sheet; and

   b) A minimum of two-thirds (66.7%) of parcels in the Benefiting Area must support the project before it can proceed, even if a lesser number of owners/residents are willing to fund a resident-funded project.

6.6 If the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming is not certified as sufficient and valid by the Director, the District will provide written notice to the owners/residents of parcels in the proposed Benefiting Area and will not take any further steps with respect to the proposed Traffic Calming, nor will any further requests for Traffic Calming be considered for five years, unless significant traffic pattern changes take place in the area.

6.7 If the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming has been certified as sufficient and valid by the Director, Council may choose to:

   a) Approve construction and funding of a District-funded Traffic Calming project;

   b) Defer construction and funding of a District-funded Traffic Calming project to a subsequent year;
c) Approve construction of a resident-funded Traffic Calming project; or
d) Cancel the Traffic Calming project.

6.8 If Council approves the construction of a resident-funded Traffic Calming project, all Funding Parties will be contacted to provide a deposit for their share of the estimate plus a 5.5% administration fee.

6.8.1 In the case of a change in willingness to fund the Traffic Calming project by one or more parties, staff will contact the remaining Funding Parties to solicit sufficient funds for the project. If funding in the amount of the estimate and administration fee is not available, the Traffic Calming project will be placed on hold for one (1) year.

6.8.2 If funding is not secured within the year, the Traffic Calming project will be cancelled, and further requests for Traffic Calming will not be considered for an additional four (4) years. Any funds collected will be returned to the person(s) that provided the deposit.

7. Implementation

7.1 Once funding is secured, the Traffic Calming project will proceed and the measures will be implemented.

7.2 Construction of approved Traffic Calming projects may be delayed by the Director to coordinate with other construction projects.

7.3 Where possible, the Traffic Calming measures will be initially installed on a temporary basis. If after a monitoring period of at least six months the temporary measure is achieving the initial objectives then the permanent installation may be considered. This approach is not possible for measures involving vertical deflection such as speed humps, raised crosswalks, etc.

7.4 For resident-funded Traffic Calming projects, if the actual cost of installation is less than the estimate and administration fee, the difference will be refunded to the Funding Parties in proportion to their contributions. If the cost of installation is more than the estimate and administration fee, the District will fund the additional expense.

8. Evaluation

8.1 Evaluation of the performance of temporary measures will be conducted using a similar process to the Traffic Calming warrant.

8.2 For permanently installed measures staff will monitor the Traffic Calming measure to assess performance; however, residents will not be contacted for further input.

8.3 Once installed, Traffic Calming measures will generally remain in place. The process for removing Traffic Calming measures will follow the same initiation, project development, approval, and implementation procedure as a Traffic Calming request would. Resident requested Traffic Calming removal will be 100% resident funded.

8.4 If Council decides to remove resident-funded Traffic Calming measures, the District will pay for the removal and if this occurs within two (2) years of the installation, it will refund the Funding Parties their contributions to the project.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AGREEMENTS AND/OR BYLAWS:
Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw 5650-2017
Local Area Service Tax Policy FIN.53(C)
Snow Plowing Policy EPW.25(C)

*** END OF POLICY ***
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### APPENDIX A

#### WARRANT CRITERIA FOR TRAFFIC CALMING STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Basis for Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85th percentile vehicle speeds (1 point for every km above existing speed limit, up to a maximum of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Average daily traffic (varies based on road classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 – Local &gt; 750 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Local &gt; 500 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 – Collector &gt;3,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Collector &gt; 1,500 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>School frontage located within 150 m of location (scoring varies based on level of school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 – Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 – High School or Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Park frontage located within 150 m of the proposed location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greater than 1 preventable accident per year for the last 5 years (based on ICBC data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Location is on a bike route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 points or greater - may be considered for District-funded Traffic Calming  
20 to 39 points - may be considered for resident-funded Traffic Calming  
20 points or less - will not be considered for Traffic Calming  

District-funded Traffic Calming projects will be prioritized according to their score.
**APPENDIX B**

**TEMPLATE PRELIMINARY PETITION FOR DISTRICT-FUNDED TRAFFIC CALMING**

Traffic calming generally involves the use of physical features installed on a road to a) reduce the speeds at which vehicles travel, b) discourage through traffic, c) improve traffic safety, and d) improve comfort levels for all road users. Typical traffic calming measures include speed humps, curb extensions, and traffic circles.

A request has been received from residents of your neighbourhood for the District of Mission to initiate a traffic calming project on `<STREET(S)>`. Please refer to the provided map for the extent of the neighbourhood covered by the request.

Before the District can proceed with this request, it is necessary to determine whether or not residents of the neighbourhood generally support traffic calming. In accordance with the District's Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy, for traffic calming to proceed to the next step at least 50% of the addresses below must support traffic calming. If supported, the following steps include identification of options, preparation of cost estimates, and an open house.

By signing below I am indicating my support in principle for a traffic calming project in my neighbourhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (Please print)</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Provide phone no. if you wish to volunteer for the resident advisory committee (max. 4 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;i.e. 8645 Stave Lake St&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this petition to the District of Mission Engineering Department on or before `<DATE>`. 
Traffic calming generally involves the use of physical features installed on a road to reduce the speeds at which vehicles travel, to discourage through traffic, to improve traffic safety, and to improve comfort levels for all road users. Typical traffic calming measures include speed humps, curb extensions, and traffic circles.

A request has been received from residents of your neighbourhood for the District of Mission to initiate a traffic calming project on <STREET(S)>.

Before the District can proceed with this request, it is necessary to determine whether or not residents of the neighbourhood generally support traffic calming. In accordance with the District's Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy, for traffic calming to proceed to the next step at least 50% of the addresses below must support traffic calming. If supported, the following steps include identification of options, preparation of cost estimates, and an open house.

This traffic calming project does not warrant District funding in accordance with the District's Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy. Costs for this project will be borne 100% by residents. The intent of this petition is to determine neighbourhood support in principle; signing this petition carries no financial obligation.

By signing below I am indicating my support in principle for a traffic calming project in my neighbourhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (Please print)</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Provide phone no. if you wish to volunteer for the resident advisory committee (max. 4 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;i.e. 8645 Stave Lake St&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this petition to the District of Mission Engineering Department on or before <DATE>.
APPENDIX C

ADDRESS LABEL

TEMPLATE BALLOT SHEET FOR
DISTRICT-FUNDED TRAFFIC CALMING

The District of Mission is considering the installation of the following traffic calming measures, as indicated on the map:

1. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 1>; and
2. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 2>.

Please check one of the following:

☐ I/we support the above noted traffic calming
☐ I/we DO NOT support the above noted traffic calming

Owner Name (print)  
_________________________  
Signature  
_________________________

Owner Name (print)  
_________________________  
Signature  
_________________________

Owner Name (print)  
_________________________  
Signature  
_________________________

Owner Name (print)  
_________________________  
Signature  
_________________________

Ballot must be received at the District of Mission Engineering Department by close of business on <DATE>.

Note: Each parcel is allocated a single vote in the process.

• If a parcel is owned by two or more persons the Ballot Sheet must be signed by the majority of owners.
• If a parcel is occupied by other than the owner, the occupant may vote. However, if the owner and occupant votes differ, the votes will cancel each other.
The District of Mission is considering the installation of the following traffic calming measures, as indicated on the map:

1. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 1>; and
2. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 2>.

Please check one of the following:

☐ I/we DO support the above noted traffic calming

☐ I/we DO NOT support the above noted traffic calming

This traffic calming project does not warrant District funding. The costs of this project are to be borne by the benefiting neighbourhood. If you support the identified traffic calming measures please check one of the following:

☐ I am/we are willing to fund a portion of the traffic calming measures, understanding that if others are unwilling to contribute that the cost may increase. Any increase in cost will be communicated to all funding parties prior to the project proceeding.

☐ I/we DO NOT wish to financially contribute to the construction of traffic calming measures. I/we understand that if others are also unwilling to fund the project then the project will not move forward and traffic calming in this location will not be considered again for five (5) years.

Owner Name (print)  Signature

Owner Name (print)  Signature

Owner Name (print)  Signature

Owner Name (print)  Signature

Ballot must be received at the District of Mission Engineering Department by close of business on <DATE>.

Note: Each parcel is allocated a single vote in the process.
- If a parcel is owned by two or more persons the Ballot Sheet must be signed by the majority of owners.
- If a parcel is occupied by other than the owner, the occupant may vote. However, if the owner and occupant votes differ, the votes will cancel each other.
NEIGHBOURHOOD TRAFFIC CALMING

STR.32

1.0 Purpose

This policy identifies standards and provides a procedure for consideration, evaluation, funding, and implementation of requests for traffic calming devices on residential streets.

2.0 Standards

All traffic calming devices installed in the District of Mission shall conform to the standards established in the Transportation Association of Canada’s Canadian Guide to Neighbourhood Traffic Calming - December 1998 and any revisions thereto.

In general, traffic calming devices will be installed only on urban residential streets except as noted herein, and will be limited to the following:

- Raised crosswalk
- Road markings
- Collector standard speed hump (3.0 metre wide top)
- Chicane
- Curb extension
- Curb radius reduction
- Traffic circle

Other devices will only be considered in the event that none of the above devices would, in the opinion of the Director of Engineering, address the issue under consideration.

The above notwithstanding, traffic control signs other than those associated with the above noted devices will not be considered for use in traffic calming solutions. The primary purpose of traffic control signs is to regulate traffic and not to calm traffic.

Signs are considerably less effective than structural measures in achieving speed and volume reductions or controlling shortcutting traffic and require greater enforcement for compliance.

It is particularly critical that stop signs only be installed where MUTCD warrants are met. Experience in other municipal jurisdictions has demonstrated that unwarranted stop signs
may cause accidents, generally breed contempt for other necessary stop signs, create
added noise and air pollution, and may increase rather than decrease speeds between
intersections controlled with stop signs.

Installation of traffic calming devices will be subject to the following restrictions in relation
to road classification, transit and school bus routes, truck routes, priority snow clearing
routes and adjacent land use designation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Calming Measure</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
<th>Type of Route</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Crosswalk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Markings</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Hump</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Radius Reduction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = use;   x = don’t use;   A = Avoid wherever possible;   * = avoid use where trucks turn right on a truck route

3.0 Funding

Traffic calming requests which meet District funded project warrants will be paid for by the
District subject to availability of budget and Council approval. Requests will be processed
on a first come first served basis and those which meet District funding warrants but are
submitted after all current budgetary funds are committed will be placed in a first come
first served waiting list for subsequent years.

Requests which do not meet District funded project warrants but do meet resident funded
project warrants must be paid for by the residents in the benefiting neighbourhood
through direct funding by the residents. A two thirds majority of the residents must
approve the project before it can proceed even though a lesser number of residents may
be prepared to cover the costs.

Residents whose requests meet District funded project warrants but whose requests have
been placed in a subsequent year’s waiting list due to budgetary constraints will have the
option of paying for the projects through a direct funding mechanism as noted above to
advance the project.

4.0 Warrants

A warrant calculation process must be completed before a traffic calming project request
is allowed to proceed through to the implementation process.
a) **District Funded**
   - Minimum 1000 vehicles per day (24 hour 2 way total); *and*
   - Measured 85\textsuperscript{th} percentile speed > 10 km/h over posted speed limit; *or*
   - Minimum average of 1 accident per year over the past two years with speed listed as a contributing factor.

b) **Resident Funded**
   - Combined number of vehicular speed and volume points ≥ 20 where points are calculated as follows:
     
     2 points for each km/h the measured 85\textsuperscript{th} percentile speed is over the posted speed limit; *plus*
     
     2 points for each 100 vehicles per day (24 hour two way total)
     
     Note: calculated points will be rounded to the nearest whole number.

If both warrants fail the individual(s) who made the request will be notified that no further action will be taken.

5.0 **Determination of Benefiting Neighbourhood Boundaries**

In responding to a traffic concern on a particular street, any potential effects of proposed solutions on adjacent streets must be considered. Each request must be evaluated on a site specific basis in order to determine a reasonable boundary for the extent of traffic calming works and the associated benefiting area. Some public input may be required in defining the extent of the traffic concern and in identifying areas potentially impacted by proposed traffic calming measures.

The extent of the study area is to a degree influenced by the nature of the traffic concerns. It may be confined to a single street if speeding is the major concern or be expanded to include an entire neighbourhood bounded by arterial and collector streets if the issue is excessive infiltration of non local traffic into local streets.

The benefiting area will be used to determine which residents are to be consulted in both the threshold warrant process and the selection and implementation of measures as well as to define the extent of local improvement areas or similar areas for direct resident paid projects and for soliciting feedback after installation.

6.0 **Consultation and Approval Process**

Once it has been established that both warrants have been met, the following consultation process will be followed.

- Residents’ committee of up to four members is formed with staff’s assistance.
- Staff meet with residents’ committee to review possible calming measures which could address the issues of concern and obtain input.
- Staff develop one or more options which meet the criteria of this policy and the TAC Guide in consultation with the RCMP, Fire Department and Public Works, prepare a
cost estimate for each and meet with the residents’ committee to obtain input on the proposed options.

- An open house is scheduled and all residents in the benefiting area are invited to attend and provide input on proposed options.
- Staff finalize the proposed calming project details, revise the estimate if required and determine resident acceptance of the proposed measures.
- In the case of a District funded project a questionnaire including a sketch of the proposed works will be circulated to all residents in the benefiting area and the results of the questionnaire will be forwarded to Council for approval or shelving of the project. A two thirds majority of residents based on a minimum questionnaire return rate of two thirds must be in favour in order for the project to proceed.
- In the case of a resident funded local improvement project, staff will prepare a questionnaire including a sketch of the proposed works for circulation among neighbourhood residents by the residents' committee members. If a 2/3 majority approve, based on a minimum questionnaire return rate of two thirds, then the residents committee will be asked to deposit an amount with the municipality equal to the estimated cost of the work before the work proceeds. Staff will obtain quotations from contractors to install the works. If the low bid exceeds the amount of the deposit the residents shall deposit the difference before the work proceeds. If the cost of the work is less than the deposit the difference will be refunded.

7.0 Implementation and Monitoring

Where possible the traffic calming devices will be initially installed on a temporary basis. This approach is not possible for calming devices involving vertical deflections such as speed humps, raised crosswalks, etc. If after a monitoring period of at least six months the device has been demonstrated to be achieving the initial objectives then the permanent installation will be constructed.

Evaluation of performance of temporary devices will be done by obtaining data on traffic characteristics as well as by sending a questionnaire to residents in the benefiting area. If the device falls short of expected performance as indicated by traffic data or if the response to the questionnaire on a minimum 50% return results in two thirds or more of respondents unsatisfied, the matter will be referred back to the original residents' committee for review, and the consultation and approval process may be repeated for another option.

For permanently installed devices staff will obtain traffic data to assess performance; however, residents will not be contacted for further input.

8.0 Device Removal

Once installed, traffic calming devices will generally remain in place unless residents petition Council for the removal. Should such cases arise, a procedure similar to that set out in section 6.0 herein would be followed with respect to removal of the devices.
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Arthur Kastelein, Manager of Engineering Planning & Design
SUBJECT: Traffic Safety Strategy for Mission
ATTACHMENTS: A – Table 1. Traffic Safety Strategy – Improving Vehicle, Pedestrian and Cycling Safety in Mission
B – Communication and Education Framework
C – Communication Strategy Checklist

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. To endorse the Traffic Safety Strategy for the District of Mission as outlined in this report;
2. To hire a new full-time Engineering Technologist position for traffic safety initiatives in 2019, with one-time funding in the amount of $145,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus in 2019, and an approximately 0.46% tax increase to provide ongoing funding in 2020 and beyond;
3. To establish a new budget in the amount of $425,000 per year for 2019, 2020, and 2021, for a total of $1,275,000, for capital expenditures for traffic safety issues, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund; and
4. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
This report presents a strategy to address emerging traffic related safety issues for consideration by Council, in accordance with Resolution 18/704.

BACKGROUND:
District of Mission Council, at the December 3, 2018 Regular Meeting, resolved:
1. That staff prepare an outline for a strategy that will address emerging traffic related safety issues facing the District of Mission (District) that will include the following:
   - Categorize the traffic safety related complaints received at the District;
   - Identify priority categories and types of works that could be completed to address identified issues;
   - Identify financial and staffing resources;
   - Identify potential partnerships (ICBC, School District #75, and RCMP); and
   - Identify the components of a broad communication/education program.
2. That the outline be discussed at the next Mission Traffic and Transit Committee (MTTC) meeting (February, 2019); and
3. That the MTTC present the outline for the strategy for Council's consideration.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Like other local governments, the District is able to directly influence traffic safety on and along the roads within its jurisdiction through the infrastructure it can provide along those roads. Signage, lighting, sidewalks, traffic markings, flashing beacons, traffic signals, traffic calming, geometric improvements, etc., are all measures the District can install or construct as necessary. Note this does not include roads outside the District's jurisdiction, such as Highways 7 and 11.

A review of traffic safety related complaints received by the District results in five broad categories of issues that can be targeted by the District:

- Speeding vehicles;
- Intersection safety;
- Roadway geometry;
- Pedestrian safety; and
- Cycling and other (e.g., rail, heavy vehicle traffic).

These five can be broken down into sub-categories, which lend themselves to identifying works, improvements, and strategies which can be implemented by the District or, in a few instances, by partners such as ICBC, School District, or RCMP.

Attachment A provides an overview of the categories. It also identifies potential mitigation measures, lists agencies which might be involved, and summarizes the steps required to implement improvements. The mitigation measures are primarily focused on those that the District is able to implement, but for completeness it includes measures such as Enforcement and Education, which partner agencies would be asked to assist or lead.

Attachment A was presented to the MTTC meeting held on February 7, 2019, and received general support.

IMPLEMENTATION:
Implementing this Traffic Safety Strategy involves a combination of engineering activities, funding, and communications. Over-sight activities are also required, and it can be provided through regular reports to the MTTC.

Implementing the engineering components requires identifying problem sites, setting up evaluation criteria, identifying appropriate mitigation measures, and taking corrective action. Identifying problem sites can be done using ICBC data for motor vehicle accidents, combined with complaints received by the District.

Evaluating sites, identifying appropriate mitigation measures, and taking corrective action will require additional staffing resources. It is anticipated at least one additional position at an Engineering Technologist level will be needed to assist the existing Engineering Technologist, Traffic & Transport.

As well, the resulting construction and/or installation of improvements will require funding. Some measures, such as adding signage, can be installed relatively easily and can be performed by existing personnel or through existing contracts. Others, like overhead flashing beacons and street lighting, generally require engineering consultants and the associated complexities of tendering, over-sight, and inspection of construction projects. Note that measures with large capital costs, such as traffic signals, roundabouts, etc., are not included in this discussion, as they are generally funded by capital budgets, development cost charges, or through grant programs.
A complementary communications and education program has been drafted by the District's Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives. It requires staff time and has costs for design, printing, advertising, and so on.

An initial review suggests that approximately $1,275,000 is required to acquire, supply, install, construct the mitigation measures, and undertake the communications program identified in the strategy. Spreading the initial $1,275,000 over a reasonable three year period timeframe requires an annual budget of $425,000. Maintaining this strategy into the future requires the same amount of funds annually.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Adoption and implementation of the Traffic Safety Strategy requires additional staff and capital funds sourced from General Revenue. One additional Engineering Technologist is required, at an annual cost of about $145,000 (wages and benefits). Funding for the new technologist position would be required to be drawn from General Fund Accumulated Surplus for 2019 given that Council has already provided direction to finalize the 2019 budget. General Fund Accumulated Surplus currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $4.5 million, as compared to a minimum recommended balance of $3.6 million. Ongoing funding for the technologist position will require an approximately 0.46% property tax increase in the 2020 budget.

Capital funds of $425,000 annually for 2019, 2020 and 2021, for a total of $1,275,000, are necessary for design and installation of mitigation measures. Should Council deem this initiative to be of the absolute highest priority, funding for the capital portion could be sourced from the General Capital Reserve Fund, however it will have a significant impact on the District’s ability to fund other priority capital projects and emergent issues. New infrastructure will also have maintenance and operating costs, which will result in increased operating budgets as the infrastructure comes on-line. It is expected these will be relatively low, however the impact is not known at this time, and any impact would put pressure on future budgets.

The General Capital Reserve Fund currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $1.2 million in years 2019 and 2020, and it is projected to grow by an additional $300,000 in 2021. The recommended funding would severely compromise the District’s ability to initiate new priority capital projects, and would severely limit the District’s ability to respond to emergent issues that require capital funding. While the minimum recommended balance for the General Capital Reserve Fund as per District policy is $6 million, the recommended funding would leave only $700,000 in funds remaining in this reserve. Further, this would limit the District’s ability to fund from reserves any of the over $70 million in additional capital projects that currently sit on the District’s unfunded list, or any other priorities that might result from Council’s strategic plan. Approval of these capital funds would likely cause the District to require long-term borrowing sooner than otherwise, adding additional costs to those projects.

Staff is concerned with this request being considered outside of the established budget cycle, as it prevents Council from being able to consider the request in terms of other priorities that are brought forward for consideration during the budget process. Further, it limits the District’s ability to effectively undertake long-term financial planning.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance
COMMUNICATION:
Attachment A was presented at the February 7, 2019 meeting of the MTTC and received general support.

A communications plan for this strategy was drafted by the District’s Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives – Attachments B & C.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The Traffic Safety Strategy outlined in this report is a response to Council Resolution 18/704, which directed staff to review traffic safety related complaints, categorize and prioritize them, and identify works which would address them.

Focusing on works which the District has jurisdiction over, the strategy identifies five broad categories of complaints, breaks them down into sub-categories, and identifies potential mitigation measures to improve road-way safety.

Implementation of the strategy requires additional staffing resources and capital funding. An additional Engineering Technologist needs to be hired, a three year capital funding allocation of $425,000 per year is needed to implement the initial set of mitigation measures, and annual on-going funding of $425,000 should be allocated to maintain this strategy in the future.

SIGN-OFFS:

Arthur Kastelein, Manager of Engineering Planning & Design

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Complaint</th>
<th>Description of Safety Issues</th>
<th>Potential Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Agencies to be Involved</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Speeding Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. On Major roads</td>
<td>Excessive speeds on arterial and collector roads.</td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: traffic signal coordination on Cedar Street (400 m intersection spacing).</td>
<td>District of Mission</td>
<td>Investigate coordination on Cedar Street corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education: “Don’t race to red” campaign.</td>
<td>ICBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: speed display devices.</td>
<td>District of Mission; ICBC</td>
<td>Set up evaluation process for site, estimate costs, request funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design of subdivisions.</td>
<td>District of Mission; Planning</td>
<td>Investigate design options, revise standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Intersection Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Signalized</th>
<th>Congestion leading to risk-taking, lack of sight lines of opposing vehicles, pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.</th>
<th>Engineering: add signal phases, construct left turn lanes, restrict movements, change layout to roundabout, add anti-skid pavement treatment on the downhill approaches to intersections.</th>
<th>District of Mission; ICBC</th>
<th>Note: ICBC completed a safety review of Cedar corridor (our highest crash locations)</th>
<th>Set up evaluation program for review of high accident locations, request funding to improve 1 intersection annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. All-way stop</td>
<td>Pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, visibility of stop signs, stop sign compliance.</td>
<td>Engineering: add street lights, add overhead flashing beacons, construct roundabout.</td>
<td>District of Mission; ICBC</td>
<td>Set up evaluation process for sites, estimate costs, request funding.</td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Two-way stops</td>
<td>Delays leading to risk-taking, lack of sight lines of opposing vehicles.</td>
<td>Engineering: change to all-way stops, construct roundabouts, install signals, add street lights.</td>
<td>District of Mission; ICBC</td>
<td>As warranted, estimate costs, request funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Road Geometry Issues

| Requests for roadside barriers and curve warning signs. | Engineering: install signs, barriers, street lights. | District of Mission; ICBC | Set up evaluation process for sites, estimate costs, request funding. | | |
### D. Pedestrian Safety

**a. At road crossings**
- **Vehicles not stopping for pedestrians, pedestrian visibility issues.**
  - Engineering: install crosswalks, street lights, pedestrian-activated flashing beacons, curb bulges.
  - District of Mission; ICBC
  - As warranted, estimate costs, request funding.
  - Engineering: existing non-stop controlled pedestrian crossings.
  - District of Mission
  - Update Crosswalk Policy to include RRFB and Special Crosswalk, review all non-stop controlled pedestrian crossings for conformance to current Pedestrian Crossing Control Guide (underway).

**b. Along roads**
- **Pedestrians walking in travel lanes or too close to traffic, nighttime visibility.**
  - Engineering: sidewalks, street lights.
  - District of Mission
  - Set up evaluation process for sites.
  - Education: encourage pedestrians to make themselves visible.
  - ICBC

**c. Near Elementary Schools**
- **Safety at crosswalks.**
  - Programming: provide crossing guards.
  - School District 75

### E. Cycling

**Lack of comfortable cycling facilities for all ages and abilities.**
- Engineering: improve on-street and off-street cycling facilities.
- District of Mission
- Develop a more comprehensive cycling network, develop plans for cycling construction projects, estimate costs, request funding.
- Education: encourage and promote cycling as part of a healthy lifestyle.
Traffic Safety Strategy - Communication and Education Framework

Introduction
This framework will help the municipality undertake communication, engagement, and education programs in relation to traffic, transportation, and pedestrian safety.

Council has expressed their concern regarding traffic safety, and want to work with partners to improve safety while expanding public engagement and education.

This framework provides the basic structure to support the development and implementation of the Traffic Safety Strategy. It is provided with consideration to the complex multi-stakeholder nature of traffic safety in and around the community, and recognizes that the successful launch of this project depends on dedicated staffing resources.

Driver
Currently, the public is concerned about traffic and pedestrian safety, frustrated with the behaviour of fellow drivers and pedestrians, and frustrated with what they perceive as a lacklustre approach to safety at intersections.

Council and staff recognize these concerns, and the Traffic Safety Strategy is the primary response to addressing these concerns.

The main driver for this communications framework is that multi-agency communications are required to support the on-the-ground traffic safety improvements with a coordinated communication and engagement effort if we are to maximize public benefit.

Goals & Outcomes
The primary goal is to support enhanced, coordinated communication and engagement efforts related to the Traffic Safety Strategy. These are mainly led by partner agencies, and the intent is to leverage municipal and other community resources to expand their reach and resonance across the community.

Together with partner agencies we will work to achieve the following outcomes:

- Improved understanding and engagement with existing processes.
- Improved participation in engagement efforts related to traffic safety.
- Improved behaviour (or reduction in negative behaviour) related to traffic safety.
Implementation

The project team will need to review and finalize the communication strategy checklist attached. It identifies the six key considerations required for delivering a public engagement initiative, and will form the basis of a complete strategy to support the Traffic Safety Strategy.

To complete a communication strategy, the Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives will facilitate a discussion and the completion of the strategy checklist, and from that complete a formal communication plan and the required project management tools so that the project team is properly resourced moving forward.

Staff recognize some funding will be required to successfully support this initiative, and provide the following preliminary annual budget based on their best estimate of the scale and scope of this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotions &amp; communications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and development</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and advertising</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing costs</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and supplies</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional material</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $19,000

Tools

The tools below can be used to support the overall communications objectives. They are listed under their best-use, however there is crossover where individual tools can and do serve multiple purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Engaging</th>
<th>Promoting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public websites</td>
<td>Engage.mission.ca</td>
<td>Promoted posts and online advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media posts</td>
<td>Social media dialogues</td>
<td>Re-sharing partner content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media relations &amp; City page</td>
<td>Project ambassadors at events</td>
<td>Partnered advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agendas and webcasts of meetings</td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>Promo items for events and engagement points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Current Issues</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Public</strong></td>
<td>• Perception that roads are unsafe due to other-driver-behaviour (ODB), and poor lighting/road surface markings and intersections</td>
<td>• Informed with accurate picture of traffic statistics for Mission and region</td>
<td>• Update online content and develop brochure on process for distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disengaged from municipality and partner agency communication channels</td>
<td>• Informed with clear and accessible info on process/systems for voicing concerns and potential for change</td>
<td>• Review and enhance partnership with CPO and ICBC on in-person initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reengaged with municipal and partner agency communication channels</td>
<td>• Municipal channels coordinated with partner agencies to amplify messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Media-relations to drive exposure to seasonal messaging on safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians &amp; Cyclists</strong></td>
<td>• Perception roads are unsafe due to driver behaviour, insufficient lighting, and road surface markings</td>
<td>• Clear on process and opportunities for requesting upgrades</td>
<td>• Online content updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perception that more and safer sidewalks and walkways are needed</td>
<td>• Engaged on annual budget to advocate for their desired outcomes</td>
<td>• Media campaign with record and what’s on – article/advertorials published regularly throughout the implementation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perception that crosswalks are poorly lit and/or marked</td>
<td>• Informed with accurate statistics comparing Mission to other municipalities in the region</td>
<td>• Develop communication channel to connect with parents through schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved visibility through the choice of clothing and safety devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Public</strong></td>
<td>• Increasing perception that roads are unsafe due to under-lit and/or marked roadways and intersections as well as driver behaviour</td>
<td>• Informed with accurate statistics</td>
<td>• Online content updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear on process and opportunities for requesting work</td>
<td>• Media campaign with record and what’s on – article/advertorial published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engaged with municipal budget and proper contacts for engagement</td>
<td>• Ensure road safety is a component of 2019 citizen satisfaction and asset survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Track and report on all traffic safety improvements completed as part of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What are we trying to achieve?

- Raising awareness & education
- Transforming or resolving conflict
- Exploring ideas & information
- Gathering information to inform decision-making
- Driving action or creating behavioural change

### What questions are we asking the public?

- What questions does the public want to address?
- What is the opportunity for engagement?
- What is off the table / not up for discussion?
- What are the risks of not engaging with the public?
- How will our work affect the community?

### How will our work or decisions affect the community?

- What's the impact on the whole community?
- What impacts are there on specific areas or groups within the community?

### How will community input affect our work & decisions?

- Based on the IAP2 spectrum, what are our commitments to the public and to partners? *See IAP2 Spectrum on p.2*

### What is the scale of engagement?

- How broad should our reach be for this effort?
- What is our budget for engagement?
  - How is that budget related to the overall project budget?

### How do we follow through & report back?

- How do we report back to our partners, the community, and Council?
- How do we continue to engage and work with the community related to this project?
Communication Strategy Checklist

IAP2 spectrum

developed by the international association for public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL</th>
<th>INFORM</th>
<th>CONSULT</th>
<th>INVOLVE</th>
<th>COLLABORATE</th>
<th>EMPOWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROMISE TO THE PUBLIC</td>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decision.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will keep you informed.</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
<td>We will implement what you decide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the sfu centre for dialogue, civic engage framework for public engagement – sfu.ca/civic-engage
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Tim Henry, Operations Manager
SUBJECT: Award of Contract for 2019 Sewer CCTV Assessment Program

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the two year CCTV Inspection Program for sewer and drainage gravity mains contract, in the amount of $269,280 ($134,640 per year) plus GST, be awarded to Dougness Holdings Ltd.;

2. That the existing annual budget of $33,154 for sewer and $31,890 for drainage CCTV be increased by $34,798 for sewer and $34,798 for drainage, funded through a corresponding decrease to the transfers to the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund and Drainage Capital Reserve Fund respectively for 2019, and funded through a core budget increase beginning in 2020, for a total revised two year budget of $269,280 ($134,640 per year) plus GST; and

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

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council approve the award of a two year contract (2019 and 2020) for the closed-circuit television (CCTV) inspection of sanitary and storm gravity mains to Dougness Holdings Ltd. This report also recommends that Council amend the District’s financial plan to approve additional funds to cover the higher costs than budgeted for.

BACKGROUND:
To minimize the District’s risks associated with a sewer and drainage gravity pipe failures, up to 15% of each pipe inventory is CCTV inspected annually. For more than 20 years the CCTV inspections have been used as the primary tool to identify and manage pipe failures.

In late 2018, the existing CCTV inspection contractor which held the contract for 2018 and 2019 closed their CCTV business division. To acquire a replacement CCTV contractor, Purchasing posted a Pre-Qualification (PQ), followed by an Invention to Tender (ITT), with a closing date of February 27, 2019.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Two tenders were received by the closing date of February 27, 2019. An Evaluation Committee consisting of staff from Purchasing and Engineering reviewed the tenders against the bid requirements. Both tenders were deemed acceptable by the District, and therefore the recommended contractor is based on the tender pricing provided.
The pricing of each tender is shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Name</th>
<th>Two Year Price (excluding GST)</th>
<th>Ranking (#1 ranking recommended bid)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dougness Holdings Ltd.</td>
<td>$269,280</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Tech Underground Services Ltd.</td>
<td>$309,600</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dougness Holdings Ltd. tender had the lowest price. Staff recommend that Dougness Holdings Ltd. be awarded the CCTV Inspection Program contract subsequent to ITT 2019-001.

The tender price exceeds the available budget amount, as discussed in the Financial Implications section of the report. The tender amount was higher than anticipated, likely due to the recent reduction in CCTV contractors in the Lower Mainland. Staff recommend increasing the budget and maintaining the length inspected. Staff evaluated reducing the Inspection Program to fit within the existing budget, reducing the length from 15% to 7%. This approach is not supported by recent infrastructure risk assessment workshops with District of Mission staff facilitated by GHD Consulting, that suggest the annual percentage should increase to 20-30% to proactively identify and manage pipe failures.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**

The CCTV Inspection Program supports the council objective to “Optimized Planning and Management of Assets and Infrastructure Effective” pillar of the strategic plan by optimizing maintenance activities to ensure continuous service levels at the lowest possible asset life cycle cost.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The 2019 budget is $33,154 for sewer and $31,890 for drainage CCTV. It is recommended that the budgets be increased by $34,798 for sewer and $34,798 for drainage, with funding from a corresponding decrease in the transfers to the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund and Drainage Capital Reserve Fund respectively for 2019, and a core budget increase for 2020 and beyond. Both capital reserve funds have adequate balances on hand to accommodate the recommended increase, and the core budget increase in 2020 ensures that the transfers to capital reserves are maintained at current levels moving forward.

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

**COMMUNICATION:**

No communication action is required.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

Annual CCTV inspections of at least 15% of the sewer and drainage gravity pipes are required to proactively manage the risks associated with failures. The contractor engaged for 2019 closed their CCTV business unit in late 2018. A PQ followed by an ITT for CCTV Inspection was issued and closed on February 27, 2019. Two tenders were received. Dougness Holdings Ltd. had the lowest price and is recommended for the award of contract. The current budgets are insufficient to fund the CCTV Program on an ongoing basis. It is recommended that the operational budgets for CCTV be adjusted to include an additional $34,798 per year for sewer and $34,798 per year for drainage.
SIGN-OFFS:

Tim Henry, Operations Manager

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

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jason Kinch, Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management, and Richard Skelton, GIS Technician / Draftsperson III
SUBJECT: Change Order for Welton Common Building Renovation

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That Change Order 1, in the amount of $39,381, for additional work as part of the Welton Common Construction contract be issued, and the contract with Tikal Construction Ltd. amended accordingly; and

2. That notwithstanding Policy FIN.24 Procurement, Stores and Disposition, any future change orders to the contract for construction work at the Welton Common building be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer, provided they are within the $1,100,000 Renovations for Relocation of Staff project capital budget previously approved by Council.

PURPOSE:
This report is provided to fulfill the requirements of the District of Mission (District) procurement policy FIN.24, whereby Council’s approval is required for contract awards greater than $250,000. Staff is therefore seeking approval to amend the contract to include additional work that was not foreseen at the time the Invitation to Tender was issued, and delegate authority to approve any further change orders and contract amendments within the previously approved project budget to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO).

BACKGROUND:
Council previously allocated a budget of $1.1 million for the purpose of completing detailed designs and construction of improvements to the building located at 7337 Welton Street (Welton Common), the Public Works building, the Information Services trailer, and the Municipal Hall building, to accommodate the re-location of staff.

Prior to relocating departments to the District-owned Welton Common building, the existing office space required reconfiguring to meet the District’s needs. As part of the construction process, additional works were identified as necessary and/or desirable.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Previously, Council authorized award of the contract for Welton Common building renovation work to the lowest compliant bidder, Tikal Construction Ltd. (Tikal), as the District’s procurement policy FIN.24 requires Council’s approval for contract awards greater than $250,000. As construction has progressed, District staff have identified previously unforeseen work to added to the scope of work/contract documents.
To date, changes have been identified related to server room upgrades to accommodate IT needs, emergency/exit lighting to fulfill building permit requirements, electrical changes to facilitate alarm and access needs, installation of a shut-off on the waterline to an exterior hose bib, and minor layout changes to improve functionality. Costing for Change Order 1 associated with this additional work has been received from Tikal in the amount of $39,381, excluding GST.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The recommended Change Order 1 is within the previously approved $1,100,000 Renovations for Relocation of Staff project budget.

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

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Staff seek the approval of Council to increase the Welton Common Construction contract with Tikal by $39,381 to cover the identified change order, and delegate approval for any further change orders to the CAO, provided they are within the $1,100,000 Renovations for Relocation of Staff project capital budget previously approved by Council.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jason Kinch, Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management
Reviewed by: Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Richard Skelton, GIS Technician / Draftsperson III
Reviewed by: Ilsa Foster, Manager of Purchasing & Stores

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed.
The Minutes of the Mission Community Heritage Commission meeting held in the Conference Room at the City Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC on Wednesday, September 12, 2018 commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Members Present: Michelle Rhodes, Chair
Korina Charpentier
Jennifer Holmes
Janis Schultz
Danny Plecas, Councillor
Ken Bourdeau, Manager of Long Range Planning,

Members Absent: Erin Mackintosh
Jim Hinds Councillor
Marcy Bond, Senior Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved and seconded,
That the agenda of the Mission Community Heritage Commission meeting held on September 12, 2018 be approved as circulated.
CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

No minutes for approval.

4. OLD BUSINESS

(a) Heritage Awards – Plaque or sign

Heritage Awards will be held on October 15, 2018 during the evening portion of the District of Mission regular Council meeting. K. Bourdeau presented information to the Committee regarding engineering costs, etc. Leisure Centre display space and a letter from M. Rhodes.
5. **NEW BUSINESS**

**(a) Silverdale School – Request to place on Heritage Registry**

Request has been received to place Silverdale School on heritage registry. Discussion ensued regarding Al Kendal, Silverdale School, October meeting, scanning documents to Val.

**(b) Street signs**

Discussion ensued regarding recognizing the old street names, or some historically significant street names, by way of adding a sign to the existing sign pole. Ken advised he contacted Engineering and they advised of three items to consider:

i) Cost to install and maintain signs. The District’s current street sign poles can accommodate one sign. Having two signs (i.e street name sign and commemorative sign) would necessitate replacing the pole as well.

ii) Engineering is doubtful Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) would approve; and

iii) Could cause confusion with wayfinding.

**(c) Statement of significance (SoS) for Ukrainian Church**

Discussion ensued regarding request from property owner of Ukrainian Church at 33059 Dewdney Trunk Road. Ken advised due to Marcy’s absences and shortage of staff that this will be delayed until December or January. Staff report is required and there isn’t sufficient capacity to write the report at this time.

6. **NEXT MEETING**

October 10, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Mission Leisure Centre at City Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED
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, October 4, 2018 commencing at 1:30 pm.

Members Present: Councillor Danny Plecas, Chair  
Councillor Pam Alexis, Vice-Chair  
Constable Nathan Berce, RCMP  
Ken Collier, Member at Large, resident of the District of Mission  
Judith Ray, Mission Association for Seniors Housing  
Jodi Marshall, School District #75  
Heather Andrew, Mission Seniors Activity Center  
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Members Absent: Representative, Mission Community Services  
Representative, Mission Association for Community Living  
Representative, Mission Youth Committee  
Representative, United Way Fraser Valley

Others Present: Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic & Transportation  
Joan Hendriks, BC Old Age Pensioners’ Organization (Branch #28)  
Wendy Wilson, Mission Cycling Coalition  
David Hill, Insurance Corporation of British Columbia  
Kirsten Yaffe, School District #75  
Julie Holmes, Asset Technician  
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering and Projects  
Kate Woochuk, Insurance Corporation of British Columbia

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

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA  
Moved and seconded,

1. That the following item be added to this agenda under “New Business”:  
   • “Xaytem Left Turn Lane”; and

2. That the October 4, 2018 Mission Traffic and Transit Committee agenda be approved as amended.  
CARRIED
3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved and seconded,

That the minutes of the June 7, 2018 meeting of the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee be approved.

CARRIED

4. OLD BUSINESS

(a) Speeding on Henry Avenue

The Committee reviewed several reports from residents received through RCMP regarding speeding in the Hatzic area. Staff will be evaluating the traffic throughout all of Hatzic and placing traffic counters in the school zone to review school hours specifically.

Action Item: Staff will send a letter to the school and its Parent Advisory Council advising of the speeding review and neighbourhood study. The complainants who expressed concern regarding speeding within Hatzic will also receive follow up communication.

(b) Hatzic Sidewalk Update

Michele Fernie presented information to the Committee regarding the contracted sanitary installation project along Draper Street. Due to delays because of Hatzic Secondary School’s schedule, staff are postponing the Hatzic sidewalk project until 2019. The Hatzic sidewalk project will be incorporated with the Hatzic traffic neighbourhood study referenced above.

Action Item: Staff to include the Hatzic sidewalk project update in the same above mentioned letter to the school and its Parent Advisory Council. The complainants who expressed concern regarding the Hatzic sidewalks to also receive follow up communication.

(c) 1st Avenue – Update / Messaging of Bus Stops

Through the design process of the 1st Avenue Improvement Project, the middle-block bus stop was eliminated, leaving two formalized bus stops remaining along 1st Avenue. There have been requests received by the Mission Seniors Activity Center from transit riders to reinstate the middle-block bus stop, and the associated costs and coordination were noted.

Action Item: Staff will report to Council on re-instating the middle-block bus stop after the current project contract has ended.

(d) 2nd Avenue Update – Bus Shelter Replacement and Safety Upgrades

The project is in its design stage and is on schedule to be completed by the end of 2018. In addition to the funding received from ICBC, BC Transit has obtained third party funding to include a bus shelter funding portion, further reducing the overall costs for the District of Mission.
(e) MOTI Projects Updates

It was noted that the MOTI Committee members were absent from the Committee meeting.

Staff reported that MOTI’s Highway 11 bridge paving project has been completed, and also Phase 1 of the upgrading to the intersection of Highways 7 and 11 will be commencing next month. This phase includes upgrades to turning, and increasing the storage for vehicles that are turning.

(f) ICBC Road Safety Updates - Campaigns and PowerPoint Presentation on Pedestrian Safety

Kate Woochuk, Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, presented information to the Committee regarding the following campaigns completed over the past three months:

- July – ‘CounterAttack Impaired Driving’ campaign
  - Included a presence at the MissionFest that focused on finding a safe ride home.

- August – Second annual ‘Drive Smart’ campaign
  - Focused on all around awareness, including the top three factors causing crashes.
  - Driver refresher tests were offered with questions pulled right off of the actual driver knowledge tests.
  - Last year saw around 30 thousand participants, and this year it rose in success to 140 thousand participants looking at their own behaviors.

- September – ‘Back to School’ and ‘Distractions’ campaigns
  - Included a think of me campaign of positive ticketing, and Operation Hang Up that made it almost impossible for a driver not to know to put your phone down.

It was noted that the October ‘Pedestrian Safety’ campaign consists of volunteers and police targeting the biggest target audience – the general population in business clothing and/or all black – not looking to see if they are being seen. October’s campaign is set for October 11, 2018 at the Mission West Coast Express station.

It was noted that no PowerPoint presentation followed, however if any partnering agencies desire road safety education presentations, they can be provided for ICBCs Licensing program, New to BC program, and the Enhanced Road Assessment for Seniors program. The next and reoccurring Road Assessment for Seniors program presentation is set for November 1, 2018 at the Mission Seniors’ Centre.

**Action Item:** The RCMP will gather information in relation to ICBC campaigns for inclusion on the District’s website.

5. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Traffic Calming Policy

Staff are reviewing and updating the existing Traffic Calming Policy for Council’s consideration. To date, the policy has never been updated, nor does it take road classifications into consideration. Until the new policy has been completed and approved, all traffic calming requests are on hold. The policy will align with the
existing Local Area Service Policy by creating the warranty of local service area funding.

It was noted that ICBC promotes funding for traffic calming – usually $1,000 to $2,000.

(b) Jimmy's Lunchbox – Pedestrian Concerns

Discussions ensued regarding pedestrian safety on Bridge Street at Jimmy's Lunchbox. Patrons are forced to park on the opposite side of Bridge Street once the parking on the restaurant side of the street runs out. Additionally, there is a “no parking” sign on Bridge Street where it intersects with London Avenue, and another sign stating patrons can’t park anywhere else except the designated cross street area.

**Action Item:** Michele Fernie will conduct a site visit to determine if/what safety improvements are required.

(c) Changes to Intersection Safety Camera Program

It was noted that the intersection safety camera positioned on Lougheed Highway will be changed as of the date of this meeting to issue tickets to the owner of the vehicle regardless of who is driving it. The camera was also upgraded to staying active from intermittently to twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

(d) Rai Avenue – Pedestrian Safety After Dark

The Committed reviewed a request by pedestrians of the Sikh Community to install additional lighting on Rai Avenue in the area of Walmart.

It was noted the one streetlight in the area belongs to the District, and that this is a light industrial area that is not heavily trafficked. BC Hydro recently added a streetlight beside the bus stop there, and looked at trimming some bushes and other things that can improve people’s feeling of safety.

**Action Item:** Staff will work with BC Hydro to see if there can be more lighting installed and will report back to the Committee.

(e) Ambassador Program – Acknowledging the Volunteers

It was noted that the Ted and ECG ambassadors providing volunteer assistance for the 1st Avenue Improvement Project received positive feedback from the residents they assisted along the street during construction.

Moved and seconded,

That Tracy Kyle prepare a thank you letter to the Ted and ECG volunteer ambassadors for all the services they provided.

CARRIED
(f) **14th Avenue – Resident Meeting Outcome / Improvements / Ties to Staff Report**

Michele Fernie presented information to the Committee regarding an update to the May 7, 2018 report to Council, “Sidewalk Program Update 2018”. Council approved the recommendation within this report to include sidewalk installation on 14th Avenue for consideration with the 2019 budget discussions. Ms. Fernie explained that sidewalks should really be part of a larger capital project, including road upgrading and improvements to the signals at Cedar Street and 14th Avenue. Staff will be reporting back to Council and include conceptual drawings.

Concerns have been raised by residents, and the design of the road will attempt to address speeding concerns.

Discussion ensued regarding implementation of 50 km speed limit signs on 14th Avenue. Staff will investigate a program involving relocation of the speed reader board from Stave Lake Street to 14th Avenue as part of a speed reader program.

Kate Woochuk, Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, presented information to the Committee regarding ICBC’s three strike program, which combines the use of a speed watch volunteer or speed reader board, and police to issue inoffensive tickets, and bring awareness back to the driver.

(g) **11th Avenue – Topper Drive, and Weaver Crescent – McEwen Avenue Petition to Change Two Bus Stops**

A petition has been received through the mayor’s office requesting the relocation of two bus stops, one on 11th Avenue, and one in Hatzic.

It was noted that more consultation and a meeting with BC Transit and other stakeholders should commence in advance to any decisions made regarding changing the bus stops.

Moved and seconded,

That staff work with BC Transit to determine the logistics surrounding moving a stop, and why they are there to begin with, and that no funds be spent prior to more consultation due to the 2,500 plus hours being introduced into this system in the future.

CARRIED

(h) **Cedar Valley Connector – Safety Concerns**

The Committee discussed a recent accident whereby a vehicle travelling southbound on Cedar Valley Connector lost control and left the road, nearly crashing into a townhouse complex on the east side. Staff subsequently met with a strata representative of the complex to discuss options to improve safety on this road.

It was noted that this is the third accident in the last few years on Cedar Valley Connector, and therefore staff will be preparing a report to Council to request funding for traffic safety improvements in this area. This will be in addition to any funding from ICBC.

(i) **RCMP – School Zones and Speeding Update**

The Committee discussed the issue of drivers not slowing down or stopping at intersections, specifically at Cade Barr Street and Cherry Avenue (near Edwin S.
Richards Elementary School). The installation of larger stop signs was discussed, however it was determined that since the intersection is relatively flat and straight which improve visibility, bigger stop signs are not warranted. Speedbumps also are not a viable option, as drivers should be stopping at stop signs, not slowing down. Roundabouts could be considered as an option.

**Action Item:** Michele Fernie will conduct a school zone traffic study that will include the above referenced school.

(j) **Speeding on Kenney Avenue, Harms Street, and Cherry Avenue**

It was noted that Harms Street was referenced in error, and that is should have been Cade Barr Street. This agenda item was addressed in the RCMP's School Zones and Speeding Update discussion.

(k) **Xaytem Left Turn Lane**

The Committee reviewed the information received from Jodi Marshall, School District #75, with regards to the installation of a no west bound left turning lane for the busloads of kids frequenting the Xaytem Longhouse Interpretive Centre on Lougheed Highway. Currently, buses are required to travel down Lougheed Highway and past Xaytem to Shook Street or Sylvester Road to avoid backing up traffic along Lougheed Highway. The Committee discussed the need for a left turn lane into the Xaytem Longhouse Interpretive Centre.

**Action Item:** Tracy Kyle will document and forward these concerns to the MOTI in light of their absence, and obtain the logistics and financial details involved with the Committees request for a left turn lane. Those details will be provided to the Committee at a future meeting.

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence to the District regarding traffic and/or transit-related issues, were received by the Committee for information.

7. **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, December 6, 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 3:30 pm.
The Minutes of the Mission Community Heritage Commission meeting held in the Conference Room at the City Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC on Wednesday, January 2, 2019 commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Members Present: Michelle Rhodes, Chair  
Cal Crawford, Councillor, District of Mission  
Korina Charpentier

Members Absent: Marcy Bond  
Jennifer Holmes  
Erin Mackintosh  
Janis Schultz

Others Present: Ken Bourdeau, Manager of Long Range Planning, District of Mission  
Monica Stuart, Planning Assistant, District of Mission

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order declaring no quorum was present. It was agreed by the members present that the meeting should proceed in a limited capacity so that the business and work of the Commission could proceed.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

No quorum available for approval of January 2, 2019 agenda.

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

No quorum available for approval of minutes.

4. OLD BUSINESS

(a) Statement of Significance (SoS) for Ukrainian Church – K. Bourdeau reported that a staff report will be presented to Council on January 21, 2019.

(b) Silverdale School – A discussion on the placement of Silverdale School on Heritage Registry was held and it was determined that further information would be needed as the current building has been converted from the original school to a residential use and has had a few additions over the years.

Action Item: K. Bourdeau is to gather more information and photos of the Silverdale School and invite the current property owners to a future meeting.
5. NEW BUSINESS

(a) 2019 Meeting Dates and Times – The meetings for the Commission will remain on the first Wednesday of each month at 6:00 p.m.

(b) 2019 Work Plan and Budget – A discussion ensued on possible items for the 2019 Work Plan and Budget. Last year’s workplan involved the Strategic Plan, a Statement of Significance for the Ukrainian Hall and the 2018 Streetscape Awards. Further discussion on the need to have a membership drive followed.

Action Item: M. Rhodes to provide draft Work Plan items and review the spending budget for 2019.

Action Item: M. Rhodes to provide a draft Strategic Plan by March 2019.

(c) Contract for Archives – A discussion ensued on hiring summer students for undetermined upcoming projects. Last year’s student was funded jointly with the Mission Archives.

Action Item: M. Rhodes to discuss with Mission Archives possible joint heritage projects to pursue for this year.

Action Item: M. Rhodes to provide the Commission copies of the flyers created by last year’s summer students.

Action Item: K. Charpentier to research the hotspots for heritage and create inventory of possible spots.

(d) Silverhill Hall – Item to be discussed at next meeting.

(e) Advertise for 2019 Heritage Awards – A discussion ensued on advertising for 2019 Heritage Awards nominations & the upcoming display at the Leisure Centre from January 15th to January 30th for the 2018 Streetscape Awards. Further discussion on ways to increase community involvement in determining Mission heritage or being involved as a Commission member.

5. NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, February 6, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. in the Conference Room at City Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
The Minutes of the Mission Community Heritage Commission meeting held in the Conference Room at the City Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC on Wednesday, February 6, 2019 commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Members Present: Michelle Rhodes, Chair
                Jennifer Holmes

MembersAbsent: Janis Schulz
               Korina Charpentier

Others Present: Cal Crawford, Councillor, District of Mission
                Marcy Bond, Senior Planner, District of Mission
                Monica Stuart, Planning Assistant, District of Mission

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order declaring no quorum was present. It was agreed by the members present that the meeting should proceed in a limited capacity so that the business and work of the Commission could proceed.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

No quorum available for approval of February 6, 2019 agenda.

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

One correction noted on the Sept. 12, 2018 minutes to spelling of M. Rhodes name. No quorum available for approval of minutes.

4. OLD BUSINESS

(a) Ukrainian Church – Statement of Significance (SoS) – Council passed a resolution to add the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to the Mission Heritage Registry. A letter to the province is the next step.

   Action: M. Bond to complete the required supporting documents and forward the letter to the province.

   Action: M. Bond to inquire with the province as to what other Mission Heritage sites are on not on the provincial registry.

(b) Silverdale School – A discussion was held about what the defining character elements are for this building that would make it eligible to be on the heritage register.
Action: M. Bond to check if Silverdale School was listed on the Context Study and M. Rhodes to check with the Mission Archives for pictures to show original school.

(c) Silverhill Hall – More information on the future of the hall will come available as time progresses.

Action: M. Bond to provide update to the Commission following a meeting with a local retired Fire Chief as well as on any research.

(d) Workplan and Budget – Discussion held on the possibility of funding the Mission Archives to do hire a summer student for a research project. Other ideas included taking the Commission on the road for monthly meetings (Steelhead, Ukrainian Hall, Mission Library, Leisure Centre). This may include alternating meeting times. Also discussed contacting UFV to have students create a logo for a sign to put up for “on the road” meetings.

Action: M. Rhodes to contact Mission Archives regarding last year’s summer student and get feedback on possibilities for this year.

Action: M. Rhodes to contact UFV to inquire about students creating a logo for the Commission.

(e) Advertise for 2018 Heritage Awards Nomination – Discussion held on the timeline for receiving nominations and doing the research for the next awards. The Commission talked about different ideas and themes for next Heritage Awards. A few theme ideas discussed were:

- neighbourhoods in transition;
- back from the dead (buildings that have been revitalized);
- gone but not forgotten;
- industry (mills, old cannery);
- Stave Lake & First Nations; and
- Silverdale Development & Logging.

Action: M. Stuart to setup social media advertising for heritage awards through the District website and the Heritage Commission facebook page.

(f) Streetscape Display – Display to be moved and setup at the Library with nomination forms attached during Heritage Week, February 18th to 24th.

Action: M. Bond and M. Rhodes to create and organize the creation and setup of the Mission Library display to be installed on Thursday, February 14th.

(g) Membership vacancies and advertising – Discussion held on membership drive and the current vacancy created from the membership expiry for E. Mackintosh
(h) Contract for Archives with funding of $500 – No discussion held.

5. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Discussion item for next meeting – The following items were discussed:
   - Themes and ideas for Heritage awards
   - Updates to workplan and budget
   - Start planning community meetings
   - Need to carry on with the Strategic Plan
   - Elections next meeting

(b) New public consultation website for District website – A brief overview was presented to the Commission of the new public consultation website https://engage.mission.ca/ that may be used by the Commission when public engagement is needed.

(c) Elect Chair and Alternate – No elections held due to no quorum.

(d) Heritage BC Annual Conference – Discussion on the annual conference that some members had attended in the past and to see if there was any interest in 2019 for current members to attend.

(e) Added agenda item – Membership for National Trust for Canada – It was asked if the Commission wished to renew membership for the National Trust for Canada. Due to no quorum an email vote will be sent to Commission members.

   Action: M. Bond will send out email to Commission members for vote on renewing membership for the National Trust for Canada.

5. NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, March 6, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. in the Conference Room at City Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.
Minutes of the **SPECIAL MEETING** of the **DISTRICT OF MISSION COUNCIL** (with the Board of Education / School District 75) held in Room #4 of the Mission Leisure Centre, 7650 Grand St, Mission, British Columbia on Tuesday, February 26, 2019 commencing at 1:30 p.m.

**Council Members Present:**  
Mayor Pam Alexis  
Councillor Cal Crawford  
Councillor Jag Gill  
Councillor Carol Hamilton  
Councillor Ken Herar  
Councillor Danny Plecas  

**Council Members Absent:**  
Councillor Mark Davies  

**Staff Members Present:**  
Mike Younie, Chief Administrative Officer  
Jennifer Russell, Corporate Officer  
Kris Boland, Director of Finance  
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement & Corporate Initiatives  
Ken Bourdeau, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects  
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture  
Christine Brough, Executive Assistant  

**Board of Education and School District Staff Present:**  
Tracy Loffler, Board Chair  
Randy Cairns, Board Vice-Chair  
Rick McKamey, Trustee  
Julia Renkema, Trustee  
Angus Wilson, Superintendent of Schools  
Corien Becker, Secretary-Treasurer  

**Board of Education and School District Staff Absent:**  
Shelley Carter, Trustee  

1. **CALL TO ORDER**  

The meeting was called to order.  

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Crawford, and  

RESOLVED: That the February 26, 2019 Special Council Agenda be adopted.  

CARRIED
3. NEW BUSINESS

Board of Education / School District No. 75 Discussion

Minerva Foundation

Mayor Alexis provided an overview of the programs and resources offered by the Minerva Foundation https://minervabc.ca/about/about-us/ in support of women of all ages, including youths, in British Columbia.

The Mayor and the Board Chair committed to working together to discuss potentially hosting a women’s forum or similar event.

Graduation Completion Rates

The Superintendent of Schools confirmed that graduation and post-secondary rates are lower in Mission than in the surrounding areas. Discussion ensued on how to support students and families in the community.

Emergency Preparedness Participation

Councillor Plecas provided an overview of the District of Mission’s Emergency Preparedness Program and anticipated changes to the system.

The Secretary-Treasurer noted that the School District has recently hired a new Health and Safety Manager.

It was agreed that the health and well-being of everyone in the community is advanced when local governments, regional districts, school boards and First Nations communities all work together on public safety and emergency preparedness issues.

Traffic Safety Strategy Input

The District of Mission’s Traffic Safety Strategy and Neighbourhood Calming Policy is anticipated to come before Council at the March 18, 2019 Regular Council meeting. The draft documents were provided to the School Board representative at the last Mission Traffic and Transit Committee meeting with a request for feedback.

Discussion ensued on crosswalk and pedestrian safety, crossing guards, and cycling corridors.

Safe Routes to Schools

Cedar Valley Neighbourhood Plan

The Secretary-Treasurer confirmed that the School District has sent a letter to the District on this matter.

Albert McMahon, Windebank, and Heritage Park Middle

Discussion ensued on traffic and pedestrian safety in the areas around Albert McMahon, Windebank, and Heritage Park Middle Schools and the need for planning and cooperation to ensure that there are pedestrian safe corridors to each school.

Transit Use for Students and Input Into Future Planning

Discussion ensued on the Mission transit system, overcrowding on some routes at the start and close of the school day, and planning for future needs.
At the request of Council, the Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects confirmed that he would be happy to facilitate a meeting between the BC Transit representative on the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee and School District 75 the next time she is in town.

**Municipal Government Taught in Schools**

Councillor Crawford expressed his belief that fostering an interest in local government in young people will ultimately result in greater civic participation.

The Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives provided a brief overview of the excellent work that is already being done by teachers within the Mission School District to liaise with the municipality and Council. He outlined some of the resources that are available and expressed a willingness to continue his work with the School District going forward. The Mayor and Council also expressed a willingness to visit schools and participate in course curriculum on local governments. The Superintendent stated that he would pass this information on to the Principals.

Councillor Hamilton offered to follow-up with the Fraser Valley Regional District and the Abbotsford representatives to the FVRD on their initiatives in this area.

**Future Plans and Updates**

*Being Prepared for Growth / Enrolment Growth Projections*

Discussion ensued on enrolment growth projections and planning for the future. It was recognized that schools are usually at 120% of capacity before the Province considers them eligible for replacement.

In response to questions from the School District, the Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects explained that the District of Mission’s growth projections are based on maximum density under the *Official Community Plan* which is not always achieved. He committed to working with the School District to establish an alternate formula for growth projections that will better assist the School District with their planning.

*Stave Fall Elementary School – Reopening Update (School District)*

The Superintendent confirmed that the Stave Falls Elementary School is scheduled to reopen in September of 2019.

*Mission Leisure Centre – Parking (Maureen Sinclair)*

The Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture noted that students and teachers from Mission Senior Secondary (MSS) continue to park at the Mission Leisure Centre parking lot. Once construction begins on the new seniors’ project in July 2019, parking space will be at a premium and this will no longer be tolerated. Ms. Sinclair requested that this information be communicated to MSS students and staff so that they can make alternate arrangements.

---

4. **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC**

Moved by Councillor Crawford, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and
RESOLVED: That, pursuant to Sections 90 and 92 of the Community Charter, this Special Meeting of Council be closed to the public 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)(f) of the Community Charter – law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment; and
- 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.

CARRIED

5. ADJOURN TO CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Gill, and

RESOLVED: That the Special Council meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

PAMELA ALEXIS  JENNIFER RUSSELL
MAYOR  CORPORATE OFFICER
Minutes of the REGULAR MEETING of the DISTRICT OF MISSION COUNCIL (for the purpose of going into a closed meeting) held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Monday, March 4, 2019 commencing at 1:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Pam Alexis
Councillor Cal Crawford
Councillor Mark Davies
Councillor Jag Gill
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Danny Plecas

Council Members Absent: Councillor Ken Herar

Staff Members Present: Mike Younie, Chief Administrative Officer
Jennifer Russell, Corporate Officer
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement & Corporate Initiatives
Christine Brough, Executive Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

2. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Crawford, and
RESOLVED: That, pursuant to Sections 90 and 92 of the Community Charter, this Regular Meeting of Council be closed to the public 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; and
- Section 90(1)(l) of the Community Charter – discussions with municipal officers and employees respecting municipal objectives, measures and progress reports for the purposes of preparing an annual report under section 98 [annual municipal report].

CARRIED

3. ADJOURN TO CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Crawford, and
RESOLVED: That the Regular Council meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting was adjourned at 1:02 p.m.

__________________________________________________________
PAMELA ALEXIS     JENNIFER RUSSELL
MAYOR               CORPORATE OFFICER
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION and COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on March 4, 2019 commenced at 6:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Pam Alexis
Councillor Cal Crawford
Councillor Mark Davies
Councillor Jag Gill
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Ken Herar
Councillor Danny Plecas

Staff Members Present: Mike Younie, Chief Administrative Officer
Jennifer Russell, Corporate Officer
Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Allyssa Fischer, Administrative Assistant
*Guy Gusdal, Manager of Inspection Services
Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
Chris Knowles, Manager of Information Services
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
Robert Publow, Manager of Planning
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture
Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services
*Present for a portion of the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER
Mayor Alexis called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Herar, and
RESOLVED: That the agenda for the Regular Council meeting of March 4, 2019 be adopted.
CARRIED

3. PROCLAMATIONS
Moved by Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Crawford, and
RESOLVED: That March 26, 2019 be proclaimed “Purple Day – Epilepsy Awareness” within the District of Mission.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Gill, and
RESOLVED: That May 4, 2019 be proclaimed “Ukrainian Cultural Festival Day” within the District of Mission.
CARRIED
4. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Herar, and
RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.
CARRIED

5. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Enterprise Application Strategy Presentation

Gord Locke of New Value Solutions Group Inc. presented the findings from District’s Enterprise Application Strategy analysis and provided the following recommendations:

- **Stabilizing the District’s existing foundation,** including increasing the size of the District’s existing IT department, updating training materials, and looking for opportunities to integrate data across multiple systems;
- **Completing system implementations,** including addressing existing workflow issues and working on system fixes with vendors;
- **Stronger Governance of IT Systems,** including the appointments of IT executive and advisory committees and improving interactions with vendors;
- **Prioritizing new and replacement systems,** including conducting thorough needs assessments, developing comprehensive evaluation criteria, and collaborating with other municipalities of a similar size; and
- **Developing an implementation plan,** including hiring an experienced project manager and improving staff training during implementation.

6. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Development Variance Permit (DV18-024) - 33356 Dalke Avenue

A report from the Planner dated March 4, 2019, regarding a development variance application for 33356 Dalke Avenue, was provided for the Committee’s information.

Staff support both variance requests and as such have listed the Development Variance Permit (DV18-024) for approval under the “Permits for Consideration” section of the Agenda.

Discussion ensued, and Council expressed concerns including the reasons for the variances and the proposed height of the buildings in relation to existing structures in the surrounding area.

In response to comments from Council, the Manager of Planning stated that there were no form and character requirements for the property due to its current zoning. He noted that the property was designated as commercial under the District’s new Official Community Plan, but was currently zoned as Suburban.

7. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

Moved by Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and
RESOLVED: That the Committee of the Whole now rise and report.
CARRIED
8. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

There were no recommendations from the Committee of the Whole.

9. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Davies, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes and items be received as information:

(a) Sustainable Housing Committee Meeting – March 22, 2018
(b) Sustainable Housing Committee Meeting – June 14, 2018
(c) Sustainable Housing Committee Meeting – October 11, 2018
(d) Sustainable Housing Committee Meeting – November 8, 2018
(e) Sustainable Housing Committee Meeting – December 13, 2018

CARRIED

10. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Davies, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Regular Council Meeting – February 19, 2019
(b) Regular Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a closed meeting) – February 19, 2019
(c) Special Council Meeting – February 25, 2019

CARRIED

11. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Gill, and

RESOLVED:

That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5633-2017-5050(239) R16-050 (Civic Consultants), a bylaw to rezone properties at 32554, 32596 and 32598 Cherry Avenue from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone and to Residential Compact 372 Secondary Dwelling (RC372s) Zone, be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Crawford, seconded by Councillor Herar, and

RESOLVED:

That Street Naming (Breakey Street, McQuarrie Lane Extension, Lissimore Ave Extension) Bylaw 5634-2017, a bylaw to name a new road and two road extensions in a new subdivision, be adopted.

CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Herar, seconded by Councillor Davies, and

RESOLVED:

That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5808-2018-5050(326) R18-039 (Shields), a bylaw to rezone the property at 7642 Stave Lake Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 558 Secondary Dwelling (R558s) Zone, be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED:

That Land Use Contract Repeal Bylaw 5814-2019 LUC18-017 (DOM), a bylaw to terminate Land Use Contract 631-1977 for the property located at 7303 Hurd Street, be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and

RESOLVED:

That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5813-2019-5050(330) LUC18-017 (DOM), a bylaw to rezone property at 7303 Hurd Street from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Commercial Local One Zone (CL1), be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Herar, and

RESOLVED:

That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5817-2019-5050(331) R18-050 (McKitrick), a bylaw to rezone property at 7960 Nelson Street from Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s), be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Crawford, and

RESOLVED:

That Housing Agreement – 8358 Cedar Street Bylaw 5821-2019, bylaw to authorize the District of Mission to enter into a housing agreement with Cedar Valley Manor Life Lease Society for the property located at 8358 Cedar Street, be adopted.

CARRIED

12. PERMITS FOR CONSIDERATION

Development Variance Permit DV18-024 (33356 Dalke Avenue)

Moved by Councillor Gill,

That Development Variance Permit DV18-024 (33356 Dalke Avenue) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback from 7.5 metres (24.6 feet) to 1.78 metres (5.8 feet) and increase the maximum height for an accessory building from 6.0 metres (19.7 feet) to 8.4 metres (27.5 feet) for the above property be approved.

Motion failed for lack of a seconder.
13. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no new/other business.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION

1st Avenue Public Art

Moved by Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Gill, and

RESOLVED: That Council reconsider resolution RC19/098 regarding the 1st Avenue public art proposal by artist Imu Chan.

CARRIED

Discussion ensued, and Council noted the following:

- Public art in Mission is not funded by the general tax revenue collected from residents. Funding for public art is provided by gaming revenue and is included in the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department annual operating budget.

- Public art is subjective and can be controversial, particularly in a diverse community.

- The Mission Cultural Resources Commission members are appointed by Council to provide advice and recommendations on social and cultural matters. The Commission was tasked with selecting a piece of public art and followed the District’s Public Art Policy during the selection process.

- Council is elected to make decisions on behalf of the community, Council will be tasked with making difficult decisions and will not be able to please every member of the public.

- Council members are always able to ask questions in order to make deliberate and informed decisions.

- If the District moved forward with this public art piece, people may think more about the conflict than the actual art.

- While reconsidering a motion can be warranted, it should not become a practice of Council.

- The placement of future art pieces in the downtown area was questioned and Council noted that a decision must be made on how to proceed with public art and the budget for public art moving forward.

Council expressed appreciation to the Mission Cultural Resources Commission for their hard work and dedication during the art selection process and to the artist Imu Chan for his design and creativity. Council also thanked residents who engaged effectively and respectfully in the conversation regarding the public art piece.

The Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture clarified that the District had not entered into a formal contract with the artist and that he would be compensated for his work on the project to date.
The Mayor called the question on the original motion:

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Council support the 1st Avenue Public Art proposal by artist Imu Chan as recommended by the Cultural Resources Commission; and

2. That staff be authorized to execute a Public Art agreement with Imu Chan.

OPPOSED: Mayor Alexis
Councillor Crawford
Councillor Davies
Councillor Gill
Councillor Hamilton
Councillor Herar
Councillor Plecas

DEFEATED

Staff were directed to review the District’s current Public Art Policy and provide recommendations to Council, including the District’s annual allocation for public art.

15. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the public.

16. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Gill, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.
WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, adopt one or more community plans for one or more areas;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council deems it desirable and in the public interest to further amend the Official Community Plan Bylaw;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5829-2019-5670(10)."

2. "District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 5670-2017" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) Redesignating portions of the property located at 8924 Cedar Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 009-315-446
      Lot 1 Section 33 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 23879
      from Environmentally Sensitive Area to Attached Multi-unit Residential, identified as the lightly shaded area on Schedule 1 attached to and forming part of this Bylaw, and
      from Attached Multi-unit Residential to Environmentally Sensitive Area, identified as the darker shaded area on Schedule 1 attached to and forming part of this Bylaw; and
   b) amending the official community plan maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ___, 2019
COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF SECTION 477 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT given this ___ day of ___, 2019
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2019
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of ___, 2019
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2019
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2019

PAMELA ALEXIS
MAYOR

JENNIFER RUSSELL
CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE 1

Legend

- Grey: Portion to be redesignated from Environmentally Sensitive Area to Attached Multi-unit Residential
- Dark grey: Portion to be redesignated from Attached Multi-unit Residential to Environmentally Sensitive Area
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
5811-2018-5050(328)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended
by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 32939 Best Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 017-452-368
      Lot 28 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan
      LMP1139
      from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone
      and Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone, as identified on
      Schedule 1 attached to and forming part of this bylaw; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of ___, 2019
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2019
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2019
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2019
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2019

PAMELA ALEXIS  JENNIFER RUSSELL
MAYOR  CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE 1

Legend

- Light gray: Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone
- Dark gray: Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling (R465s) Zone
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5828-2019-5050(336)

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 5828-2019-5050(336)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 8250 Haffner Terrace and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 017-511-241
      Lot 25 Section 29 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan LMP1907
      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 __, 2019
READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of __, 2019
PUBLIC HEARING held this ___ day of __, 2019
READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of __, 2019
ADOPTED this ___ day of __, 2019

PAMELA ALEXIS ..........................................................  JENNIFER RUSSELL ..........................................................
MAYOR .......................................................... CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5824-2019-2197(30)

A Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990"


AND WHEREAS, the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to amend “District of Mission Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990”;

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 Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5824-2019-2197(30)".

2. "District of Mission Water Rates Bylaw 2197-1990", as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   (a) deleting Schedule “A” in its entirety; and
   (b) replacing it with the new amended Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of __, 2019

READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of __, 2019

READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of __, 2019

ADOPTED this __ day of __, 2019

PAMELA ALEXIS, JENNIFER RUSSELL,
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of Consumer</th>
<th>Rates Payable Effective January 1, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 One and Two Unit Residential (Unmetered)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Residential Use, One Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Two Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Multi-Unit Residential (Unmetered)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mobile Home Park Use - per pad</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Apartment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) more than 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.00 per month $432 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Residential Use, Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Commercial/Industrial/Institutional (Unmetered)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Per account</td>
<td>$42.00 per month $504 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Commercial/Industrial/Institutional and Multi-Unit Residential (Metered)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Quarterly Metered Water User Rates (subject to minimum charge per quarter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$1.0968 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On next 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$0.8993 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On next 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$0.8148 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On next 300 cubic meters</td>
<td>$0.7310 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On balance</td>
<td>$0.5616 per cubic meter of water consumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size</th>
<th>Minimum Charge per Quarter</th>
<th>Quarterly Meter Rental Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 19mm</td>
<td>$119.57</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>$119.57</td>
<td>$4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32mm</td>
<td>$119.57</td>
<td>$5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38mm</td>
<td>$119.57</td>
<td>$8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>$132.87</td>
<td>$13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75mm</td>
<td>$132.87</td>
<td>$40.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100mm</td>
<td>$432.09</td>
<td>$60.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150mm</td>
<td>$432.09</td>
<td>$60.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **5 One and Two Unit Residential (Metered)** |                                  |
| (a) Annual Water User Rate: $1.27 per cubic meter of water consumed annually |                                  |
| (b) Annual Meter Rental Rates |                                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size</th>
<th>Annual Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 19 mm</td>
<td>$13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mm</td>
<td>$18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 mm</td>
<td>$32.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5825-2019-1922(25)

A Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Sewer User Rates and Charges Bylaw 1922-1989"


AND WHEREAS, the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to amend "District of Mission Sewer User Rates and Charges Bylaw 1922-1989";

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 Sewer User Rates and Charges Amending Bylaw 5825-2019-1922(25)".

2. "District of Mission Sewer User Rates and Charges Bylaw 1922-1989", as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   (a) deleting Schedule “A” in its entirety; and

   (b) replacing it with the new amended Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of __, 2019

READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of __, 2019

READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of __, 2019

ADOPTED this __ day of __, 2019

PAMELA ALEXIS, JENNIFER RUSSELL,
MAYOR CORPORATE OFFICER
### Schedule "A"

#### SEWER UTILITY FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of Consumer</th>
<th>Rates Payable Effective January 1, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 One and Two Unit Residential that are not metered for water purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Residential Use, One Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Two Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Multi-Unit Residential and Commercial/Industrial/Institutional that are not metered for water purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mobile Home Park Use - per pad</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Residential Use, Apartment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) more than 4 dwelling units, per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$31.00 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Residential Use, Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) per secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Commercial/Industrial/Institutional</td>
<td>$36.25 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Commercial/Industrial/Institutional and Multi-Unit Residential customers that are metered for water purposes shall pay the following quarterly sewer rates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 87.00% of the quarterly water user charges imposed and levied against the owner of real property for the use of water pursuant to District of Mission Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5601-2016-2197 (27) and amendments thereto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 One and Two Unit Residential that are metered for water purposes shall pay the following annual sewer rates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 87.00% of the annual water user charges imposed and levied against the owner of real property for the use of water pursuant to District of Mission Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5601-2016-2197 (27) and amendments thereto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 5792-2018-5050(317)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the property located at 29811 Donatelli Avenue and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 023-529-962
      Lot A District Lot 457 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan
      LMP29949
      from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling (S36s) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.
RCMP APPRECIATION DAY in BC - FEBRUARY 1

On February 1st, 1920, the Parliament of Canada created the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, combining the Northwest Mounted Police (1873) and the Dominion Police (1868).

At this time, Manitoba is the only Province in Canada to have February 1st designated RCMP Appreciation Day.

February 1st, 2020 is their 100th Anniversary

We are a group of Canadian citizens residing in Vernon, BC, who formed a committee to acknowledge February 1st each year as a day to honor and recognize the men and women of the RCMP for their dedication and service.

We are asking for a letter of support from the Mayor and Council of your city or town. We will compile this support with other cities, municipalities, BC MLA's and BC Members of Parliament and present it to the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia to ultimately acknowledge February 1st as Royal Canadian Mounted Police Appreciation Day.

The Vernon City Council voted unanimously to endorse our motion and their letter is attached.

The Maple Leaf Forever.

Thank you for your earliest reply and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Martin von Holst  
RCMP Day - Vernon Committee Chair
RCMPappreciationday@gmail.com
Contact # - 250-241-5000

Guy Bailey  
RCMP Day - Vernon Committee Secretary
RE: RCMP Appreciation Day

Dear Mr. Von Holst:

Council, at their Regular meeting of August 13, 2018 passed the following motion:

"THAT Council authorize the Mayor, on behalf of Council to provide a letter of support to the RCMP Day Committee for their efforts to move forward with a petition signed by Canadian citizens that will be directed to the Province of British Columbia and the Government of Canada to ultimately acknowledge February 1st as 'Royal Canadian Mounted Police Day'

CARRIED"

On behalf of Council, we support the initiative that February 1st be recognized as Royal Canadian Mounted Police Day to acknowledge and recognize the men and women of the RCMP who have given much to our communities in terms of service and sacrifice.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Akbal Mund
Mayor

copy: Council
Eric Foster, MLA
Mel Arnold, MP
Supt. S Baher, RCMP Vernon