1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
   (a) Presentation of Fire Chief for a Day Awards --
   (b) Michelle Favero, Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce Re: Annual Report – Chamber Service Contract Page 5
   (c) Don Brown, Mission Heritage Association Re: Observatory Project Page 6

4. ADOPTION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   (a) Minutes of the Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee Meeting held on September 26, 2013 Page 7

5. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

6. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
   (a) Rezoning Application R13-002 (Dyer & Associates) – 33237 & 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road and 9321 & 9343 Barr Street Page 10
   (b) Implementation of Incentive Program – Adopt Downtown Design Guidelines Page 33
   (c) Calculation of Park Land Fees Page 59
   (d) Mission Community Heritage Commission Accomplishments for 2013 and 2014 Work Plan Page 64
   (e) Close Rezoning Application R11-007 and Development Permit Applications DP11-004 and DP11-005 (Keystone Arch.) – 32921 – 14th Avenue Page 70
   (f) Development of the Waterfront Page 73
   (g) History of Building Permit on 32562 Richards Avenue Page 77
(h) Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on November 18, 2013 and related Staff Report dated November 4, 2013 (R13-017 – Schill) Background for consideration of adoption of Zoning Amending Bylaw 5386-2013-5050(123) [see Section 12(c)]

7. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

(a) Compost Receiving/Processing Building at Mission Landfill

Page 90

8. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

(a) Fraser River Heritage Park – Observatory Proposal

Page 93

9. CORPORATE SERVICES


Page 96

(b) Correction to Road Closure and Sale Policy and User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 – Non-refundable deposit for a road closure application

Page 98

(c) 2014 Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grants – Report #3

Page 102

(d) Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Program Bylaw

Page 111

(e) Council Procedure Bylaw – Delegations

Page 129

10. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

11. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

(a) Adoption of Recommendations from the December 3, 2013 Engineering & Public Works Committee of the Whole Meeting

Page 132

12. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

MOTION: That the readings of all bylaws included in the Bylaws section of the December 16, 2013 regular council agenda be approved as listed.

(a) OCP Amending Bylaw 5247-2011-4052(17) (R11-007 – Keystone Architecture & Planning Ltd.) – a bylaw to redesignate property at 32921 – 14th Avenue from Urban Residential to Urban Compact – Multiple Family Rescind First, Second and Third Readings

Page 132
(b) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5248-2011-5050(55)**
(R11-007 – Keystone Architecture & Planning Ltd.) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32921 – 14th Avenue from Urban Residential Zone (R558) to Multiple Family 40 Townhouse Zone (MT40)

Rescind First, Second and Third Readings

(c) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5386-2013-5050(123)**
(R13-017 – Schill) – a bylaw to rezone property at 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RR7s)

Adoption

(d) **Board of Variance Establishment Bylaw 5390-2013** – a bylaw to establish a Board of Variance for the District of Mission

Adoption

(e) **User Fees and Charges Amending Bylaw 5397-2013-4029(4)** – a bylaw to add Board of Variance fees

Adoption

(f) **Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Amending Bylaw 5398-2013-3612(13)** – a bylaw to make the necessary amendments to implement the incentive program in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan

Adoption

(g) **Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Amending Bylaw 5399-2013-3612(14)** – a bylaw to add a new section to allow the option to waive a Public Hearing for rezoning applications on properties within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area

Adoption

(h) **Building Amending Bylaw 5400-2013-3590(3)** - a bylaw to make the necessary amendments to implement the incentive program in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan

Adoption

(i) **User Fees and Charges Amending Bylaw 5397-2013-4029(4)** – a bylaw to make the necessary amendments to implement the incentive program in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan

Adoption

(j) **Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Bylaw 5391-2013** – a bylaw to establish a revitalization tax exemption program

First, Second and Third Readings

(k) **Financial Plan (2014-2018) Bylaw 5392-2013** – a bylaw to establish the Financial Plan for the years 2014 to 2018

First, Second and Third Readings

(l) **Water Rates Amending Bylaw 5393-2013-2197(23)** – a bylaw to increase water rates by 2% for 2014

First, Second and Third Readings

(m) **Sewer User Rates Amending Bylaw 5394-2013-1922(20)** – a bylaw to increase sewer user rates by 2% for 2014

First, Second and Third Readings
(n) **Refuse Collection and Disposal Amending Bylaw 5395-2013-1387(53)** – a bylaw to increase refuse collection rates by 2% for 2014

First, Second and Third Readings

(o) **Collection, Removal and Marketing of Recyclables Amending Bylaw 5396-2013-2639(17)** – a bylaw to increase curbside recycling rates by 2% for 2014

First, Second and Third Readings

(p) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5402-2013-5050(125)** - a bylaw to rezone properties at 33293 & 33237 Dewdney Trunk Road and 9343 & 9321 Barr Street from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Rural Residential 7 Zone (RR7) and Suburban 36 Zone (S36)

First and Second Readings

(q) **User Fees and Charges Amending Bylaw 5403-2013-4029(6)** – a bylaw to adjust the non-refundable deposit amount for a permanent road closure and sale

First, Second and Third Readings

(r) **OCP Amending Bylaw 5404-2013-4052(30)** – a bylaw to incorporate MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines

First Reading

(s) In accordance with Section 882 of the *Local Government Act*, Council has considered District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5404-2013-4052(30) in conjunction with the District's Financial Plan (including the Capital Expenditure Plan and Operating Expenditure Plan) and the Waste Management Plan

13. MINUTES

(a) Regular Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a Closed meeting) – December 2, 2013

Page 135

(b) Regular Council Meeting – December 2, 2013

Page 137

(c) Freestanding Committee of the Whole – December 3, 2013 (Engineering & Public Works Committee)

Page 133

14. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Request for District Membership to BC Communities in Bloom (Mayor Adlem)

Page 153

15. MAYOR'S REPORT

16. MEMBERS' REPORTS ON COMMITTEES, BOARDS, AND ACTIVITIES

17. QUESTION PERIOD

18. ADJOURNMENT
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: November 4, 2013
To: Deputy Director of Corporate Administration

I hereby request permission to appear as a delegation before District of Mission Mayor and Council with reference to the following topic:

Annual Report – Chamber Service Contract

I understand that 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** and that once my appearance has been confirmed, I will be allotted a maximum of **10 minutes** to make my presentation.

Name:

Michelle Favero

Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: November 6, 2013

To: Deputy Director of Corporate Administration

I hereby request permission to appear as a delegation before District of Mission Mayor and Council with reference to the following topic:

Presentation of the Observatory Project requesting formal approval to proceed.

I understand that 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 and that once my appearance has been confirmed, I will be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes to make my presentation.

Name:

Don Brown
Mission Heritage Association
Minutes of the Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee meeting held September 26, 2013, at 10:05 a.m. in Room 530 of Abbotsford City Hall

Members Present: Mayor Adlem (Chair) (Mission); Councillor Barkman (Abbotsford); Councillor Braun (Abbotsford); Councillor Loewen (Abbotsford); and Councillor Luck (Mission)

Staff Present: General Manager, Engineering & Regional Utilities – J. Gordon (Abbotsford); Director of Transportation & Projects – R. Mammel (Abbotsford); Traffic Engineer – J. Sun (Abbotsford); Deputy Director of Planning – B. Pitkethly (Mission) and Recording Secretary – S. Jones (Abbotsford)


Public Present: 1

Media Present: 1

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

ADDITION TO THE AGENDA

Elect the Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee Vice-Chair

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Barkman, that the election of a Vice-Chair be added to the agenda.

MATC 52-2013 CARRIED.

Councillor Braun was nominated and elected by acclamation as the Vice-Chair of the Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the July 25, 2013 Meeting

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the minutes of the Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee meeting, held July 25, 2013, be adopted.

MATC 53-2013 CARRIED.
3. DELEGATION

.1 James Wells, 4-32465 South Fraser Way, to Address Transition from West Coast Train Pass to Compass Card

Moved by Councillor Loewen, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the delegation of James Wells, 4-32465 South Fraser Way, regarding the transition from West Coast Train Pass to Compass Card, be received.

MATC 54-2013 CARRIED.

4. BUSINESS OUT OF MINUTES

.1 Monthly Follow-up Sheet – September 2013

Moved by Councillor Loewen, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the Monthly Follow-up Sheet – September 2013, be received.

MATC 55-2013 CARRIED.

.2 Mission Abbotsford Transit System Efficiency Review

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the Mission Abbotsford Transit System Efficiency Review, be received.

MATC 56-2013 CARRIED.

.3 Mission and Maple Ridge Passenger (West Coast Express) Survey Results Update

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the verbal update from M. Orfield, BC Transit, regarding the Mission and Maple Ridge Passenger (West Coast Express) Survey Results, be received.

MATC 57-2013 CARRIED.

.4 Google Trip Planner and Real Time Bus Tracker Update

Moved by Councillor Barkman, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the verbal update from J. van Schaik, BC Transit, regarding the Google Trip Planner and real time bus tracker, be received.

MATC 58-2013 CARRIED.
Minutes of the Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee meeting held
September 26, 2013, at 10:05 a.m. in Room 530 of Abbotsford City Hall

5. REPORTS

.1 2nd Quarter 2013 Ridership and Revenue Report

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Loewen, that the 2nd Quarter 2013 Ridership and Revenue Report, be received.

MATC 59-2013 CARRIED.

6. NEW BUSINESS

None.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

.1 Email Correspondence Dated August 14, 2013, from Lori Reisig, regarding the fare credit for West Coast Express ticket holder once the TransLink Compass Card is introduced

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the e-mail request from Lori Reisig, regarding the fare credit for West Coast Express ticket holder once the TransLink Compass Card is introduced, be received.

MATC 60-2013 CARRIED.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Loewen, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the September 26, 2013, Mission Abbotsford Transit Committee meeting, be adjourned (11:55 a.m.)

MATC 61-2013 CARRIED.

The next MATC meeting will be held at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, October 24, 2013, at the City of Abbotsford in Room 530.

Certified Correct:

[Signature]
Mayor Adlem

[Signature]
S. Jones, Recorder
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: MAYOR AND COUNCIL
FROM: Marcy Bond, Planner
SUBJECT: To create ten (10) bare land strata lots under the Rural Residential 7 (RR 7) zone and two (2) remainder fee simple lots under the Suburban 36 (S36) zone.

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33293 and 33237 Dewdney Trunk Road and 9343 and 9321 Barr Street

APPLICANT: Slade Dyer & Associates Inc.

OCP: The bare land strata portion of this application is in conformance with the current OCP designation: Rural Residential.

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: October 30, 2013

ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 - Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 - Plan of Reference
Appendix 3 - Draft Plan of Subdivision
Appendix 4 - Official Community Plan
Appendix 5 - Zoning
Appendix 6 - Environmentally Sensitive Areas
Appendix 7 - Applicant’s Rationale for Development Variance Permit
Appendix 8 - Engineering Comments
Appendix 9 - Fire Department Comments
Appendix 10 - Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Comments

LOCATION:
LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Council Consider and Resolve:
1. That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by rezoning a portion of the properties located at 33237 and 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road from:
   i) Rural 16 (RU16) zone to Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone labelled as Area “A” comprising 5.36 hectares (13.24 acres) as shown on Appendix 2 in the report from the Planner dated December 16, 2013.
   ii) Rural 16 (RU16) zone to Suburban 36 (S36) zone labelled as Area “B” comprising 1441.9 sq. metres (15,521.5 sq. feet) as shown on Appendix 2 in the report from the Planner dated December 16, 2013.
   iii) Suburban 36 (S36) zone to Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone labelled as Area “C” comprising 0.495 hectares (1.22 acres) as shown on Appendix 2 in the report from the Planner dated December 16, 2013.
2. That the bylaw be considered for 1st and 2nd readings at the Regular Council meeting on December 16, 2013;
3. That following these readings the bylaw be forwarded to Public Hearing on January 6, 2014.

COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Council Consider and Resolve:
7. That in accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32, the Tree Retention and Replanting plan to plant two trees per lot be approved and listed as a requirement of approval for Subdivision. (Subdivision File S13-002)
8. That in accordance with Section 941 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent is applied as cash-in-lieu to subdivision file S08-005.
9. That in accordance with Section 39 of the Community Charter and Council Policy STR. 38, a bylaw be prepared to provide names for one new road shown on Appendix 3, as per the report from the Planner dated December 16, 2013, as follows:
   a. Road running east west as Caselton Terrace.
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT RECOMMENDATION:

Council consider and resolve:

10. That Development Variance Permit Application DV13-017 to waive the requirements of Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1986:
   i) SCHEDULE B-1 SERVICE REQUIREMENTS – Works on Adjacent Highway - Within Cedar Valley Neighbourhood Land Use Concept Plan - Urban Residential requiring the construction of asphalt, piped storm, Municipal water system, curb/gutter, sidewalk sanitary sewer, underground hydro/tel, street lighting and boulevard trees for the extension of Larkspur Avenue;
   ii) SCHEDULE B-1 SERVICE REQUIREMENTS – Works on Adjacent Highway - Within Cedar Valley Neighbourhood Land Use Concept Plan - Urban Residential requiring the construction of curb/gutter, sidewalk sanitary sewer, underground hydro/tel, street lighting and boulevard trees for the portion of Dewdney Trunk Road adjacent to the site
   be forwarded to public input meeting on January 6, 2014.

REQUIREMENT PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

11. That the Final Reading of the amending bylaw be held until the following has been satisfied:
   a. The community amenity contribution in the amount of $2,815 per newly created lot is received.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The development site includes four parent properties comprising 9.2 hectares of which 4.73 hectares (11.68 acres) or 51% of the area is Environmentally Sensitive Area. The proposal is to rezone a portion of the properties from Rural 16 (RU16) zone to Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone to create ten (10) bare land strata lots and two (2) remainder, fee simple lots under the existing Suburban 36 (S36) zone.

The bare land strata development is consistent with the Rural Residential designation in the Official Community Plan. The two (2) fee simple lots are designated Urban Residential in the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan and have been configured to allow for Urban Residential development when the area is supplied with full urban services and ready for higher density development.

The rationale for the bare land strata development is as follows:

1) It will be connected to a private water system connected to the municipal water system;
2) The development affords a greater opportunity to protect the Environmentally Sensitive Area;
3) There is greater flexibility for road standards within a bare land strata development which has allowed for a narrower road outside of the ESA.

The applicant is requesting to waive two requirements of the Subdivision Control Bylaw, both of which are supportable. The first is to waive the requirement to construct the extension of Larkspur Avenue. This request is supportable as any extension of this road would be through an ESA. The second request is to waive the requirement to construct Dewdney Trunk Road to an urban road standard. This is supportable for the following reasons:

1) No new lots fronting Dewdney Trunk Road are being created;
2) The two remainder lots have been designed to facilitate the development of urban sized lots in the future;
3) The road construction requirements when the application was originally submitted were to the suburban standard.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The development site comprises four properties; 33237 and 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road and 9321 and 9343 Barr Street totalling 9.2 hectares (22.73 acres) shown on Map 1. The development site contains a watercourse with a significant Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). The topography is generally flat with some steeper portions close to the northern property lines and a ravine close to Dewdney Trunk Road. The applicant and Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) have designed a lot layout with building envelopes outside of the ESA.

PROPOSAL

The application is to create ten (10) bare land strata lots and two (2) remainder fee simple lots. The bare land strata development is proposed to be developed under the Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone, while the two remainder fee simple lots are proposed to retain their Suburban 36
(S36) zoning. The draft plan of subdivision is attached as Appendix 3. The two fee simple remainder lots have future development potential based on the Urban Residential designation of Phase IV of the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan and the Official Community Plan designation.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN - Compliance

The development site includes three Official Community Plan Designations; Rural Residential, Environmentally Sensitive Area and Urban Residential. The Official Community Plan map is attached as Appendix 4.

The proposed ten (10) lot bare land strata development proposal is consistent with the Rural Residential designation in the Official Community Plan.

The two remainder fee simple lots are designated as Urban Residential in the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan and the Official Community Plan and are in Phase IV and will remain designated Urban Residential. The lot lines for these remainder lots are being adjusted to coincide with the Environmentally Sensitive Area; thus allowing for future development under the Urban Residential designation when the area is supplied with full urban services and ready for higher density development.

Neighbourhood Character

The areas to the north of the development site are comprised of rural lots, with some lots already developed under the Rural Residential designation with minimum lot sizes of 0.7 hectares (1.73 acres). Thus, the 10 lot bare land strata development with an average lot size of 0.7 ha (1.73 acres) fits within the existing neighbourhood character.

The 10 lot bare land strata development is accessed from a 6.0 metre wide private road off of Barr Street, and thus for the most part will not be visible from Barr Street.

No new lots fronting Dewdney Trunk Road will be created as part of the development proposal. The two existing dwellings and accesses from Dewdney Trunk Road will be retained, thus there will be no change in the neighbourhood character along Dewdney Trunk Road.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Bare Land Strata Development

The applicant is proposing the 10 lots accessed off Barr Street to be developed as a bare land strata. The rationale for a bare land strata development versus a traditional fee simple development for this specific application includes:

1) The bare land strata development will be connected to a private water system connected to the municipal water system. The area is susceptible to arsenic contamination in drilled wells and shallow wells are susceptible to contamination; thus a private water line that is connected to a municipal water line is a more secure source of water.

2) The bare land strata development affords a greater opportunity to protect the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). Appendix 6 shows the ESA that encompasses the development site and the area that will be protected as common property as part of the bare land strata. The common property will also form a buffer between the Rural Residential development and the future urban development in Cedar Valley.
3) The bare land strata development provides greater flexibility for road standards within the development. The benefit is the applicant was able to create a narrower road, 6.0 metre wide, located entirely outside of the ESA.

The bare land strata development provides an opportunity to provide community water and protection of the ESA that may not have been achievable under a traditional fee simple development.

Zoning

Portions of the development site require rezoning to facilitate the ten (10) lot bare land strata development and the creation of the two remainder fee simple lots. The zoning for the entire development site is shown on Appendix 5.

The portions of 33237 and 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road requiring rezoning to Rural Residential 7 to accommodate the bare land strata development are identified on Appendix 2 - Plan of Reference. The properties at 9321 and 9343 Barr Street are already zoned Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone and do not require rezoning to facilitate the 10 lot bare land strata development.

Appendix 2 – Plan of Reference shows the portions of the development site requiring rezoning:

A. Area A: Comprising 5.36 hectares (13.24 acres) from Rural 16 (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 (RR 7) zone;
B. Area B: Comprising 141.9 sq. metres (15,521.5 sq. ft.) from Rural 16 (RU16) zone to Suburban 36 (S36) zone; and
C. Area C: Comprising 4949 sq. metres (1.22 acres) from Suburban 36 (S36) to Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone.

The entire bare land strata is proposed to be zoned Rural Residential 7 which allows for the creation of bare land strata lots with minimum lot sizes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Size for a Lot within a bare Land Strata</th>
<th>Average Bare Land Strata Lot Size – including common property used for roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6 ha (1.5 ac)</td>
<td>0.7 ha (1.73 ac)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each proposed lot within the bare land strata meets the minimum lot size of 0.6 hectare (1.48 acres) required for bare land strata developments, the average proposed bare land strata lot size, which includes all common property is 0.78 hectares (1.92 acres).

The two remainder fee simple lots require a minor adjustment to the Suburban 36 (S36) zone boundary to ensure the lot line, zone boundary and ESA boundaries coincide; thereby facilitating future development along Dewdney Trunk Road under the Urban Residential designation.

Although the adjustment of the S36 zone boundary is not consistent with the Urban Designation in the Official Community Plan the rationale for supporting these small adjustments to the lot line and not triggering an Official Community Plan amendment are as follows:

i. The zone boundary will be consistent with the Environmentally Sensitive Area on the ground;
ii. The zone boundary is being adjusted so split zoning is eliminated; and

iii. Each lot has further development potential under the Urban Residential designation when full services are brought to the area and are ready for higher density development.

Environment

The Environmentally Sensitive Areas within the development, identified by a qualified professional, is based on a combination of the Riparian Area Regulations and Streamside Protection setbacks established in the Cedar Valley Environmental Management Plan and the Zoning Bylaw. The Environmentally Sensitive Area encumbering the development site is identified on Appendix 6. Of the total site area, 51% - 4.73 hectares (11.7 acres) has been identified as ESA.

The proposed ten (10) bare land strata lots encompass 7.78 hectares (19.22 acres) of which 4.76 hectares (11.76 acres) or 61% is Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA). Appendix 6 identifies the ESA in green and buildable area in white on each proposed strata lot. The proposed bare land strata development has been designed with building envelopes located on the north side of the strata access road and outside of the ESA. The strata access road provides a hard boundary between buildable area and ESA thus helping to further protect the ESA from encroachment. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the developable area and Environmentally Sensitive Area on each proposed lot.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata Lot</th>
<th>ESA</th>
<th>Buildable Area</th>
<th>Strata Lot</th>
<th>ESA</th>
<th>Buildable Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4139 m²</td>
<td>2249 m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2999 m²</td>
<td>3209 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4169 m²</td>
<td>2049 m²</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3229 m²</td>
<td>3519 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3969 m²</td>
<td>2139 m²</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3229 m²</td>
<td>2829 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3689 m²</td>
<td>2309 m²</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1029 m²</td>
<td>4979 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3409 m²</td>
<td>2799 m²</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2389 m²</td>
<td>3259 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed strata lots range in size from 0.601 hectares (1.48 acres) to 0.639 hectares (1.57 acres) and meet the minimum requirement of the Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone.

The entire ESA within the development site will be protected at the subdivision stage with sign posts identifying the location of the ESA and with the registration of a Section 219 restrictive covenant.

Access

Access to the 10 bare land strata lots is via a 6.0 metre wide private road from Barr Street. The applicant and the qualified professional have located the access road outside of the Environmentally Sensitive Area.

The two remainder lots will continue to be accessed from their existing driveways on Dewdney Trunk Road.
Topography

According to the District of Mission topographical mapping the northern portion of the bare land strata, development includes slopes greater than 30%. A Landslide Hazard Assessment will be required prior to final subdivision approval to ensure there is a safe building site on each lot.

The two remainder fee simple lots include existing dwellings and have large flat buildings areas, no Landslide Hazard Assessment is required for these lots.

Tree Removal

The tree survey has identified 109 trees that require removal to facilitate the bare land strata development. As per LAN. 32 Tree Retention and Replanting policy all 109 trees are located within on site necessities and thus do not require replacement. The developer will be required to plant 2 trees per lot for a total of 24 trees.

The two remainder fee simple lots require no tree removal.

The proposal for directional drilling of the water service through the ESA is intended to have minimal impact on tree removal within the development.

Street Naming (Policy STR. 28 - Street Naming)

The private strata road will be named Caselton Terrace, (Appendix 3). The Caselton’s owned land in Mission from 1898 to 1900 and resided in Victoria.

SERVICING

Water Supply

The Rural Residential 7 (RR7) zone permits each lot to be serviced by an individual well. However, the developer wishes to provide the bare land strata with municipal water. At this time, the developer is proposing to extend a private water main off the existing municipal water main on Dewdney Trunk Road. This private water main would extend north through one of the fee simple lots, by way of an easement or right of way, then through the strata owned Environmentally Sensitive Area to service the development. The developer prefers this option as this route results in reduced costs relative to constructing the water main in the municipal road right of way along Dewdney Trunk Road and Barr Street. The strata corporation would be responsible for the on-going maintenance of the water line on strata property.

The Engineering Department has voiced concerns about the developer’s proposal to install a private water main through the strata land in terms of future repairs in the event of a break and the strata’s potential expectations on the District to repair the break. The final decision to approve the servicing plan for the development lies with the Approving Officer and discussions with the developer and the Approving Officer will continue as the application proceeds.

The two remainder lots are currently serviced by municipal water; there will be no changes to the service levels for these lots.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985)

The initial development application was submitted to the District in February 2008. However, with the various revised lot layouts, submission of numerous environmental reports in an attempt to address the environmentally sensitive areas and then the addition of two parent
The application was significantly different than the initial application, thus a new application was required that would be evaluated based on the regulations of the day. The applicant is requesting to waive Service Requirements, Works on Adjacent Highway as part of the development.

Specifically, the applicant is requesting Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985 be waived for the following standards:

i. SCHEDULE B-1 SERVICE REQUIREMENTS – Works on Adjacent Highway - Within Cedar Valley Neighbourhood Land Use Concept Plan - Urban Residential requiring the construction of asphalt, piped storm, Municipal water system, curb/gutter, sidewalk, sanitary sewer, underground hydro/tel, street lighting and boulevard trees for the extension of Larkspur Avenue.

ii. SCHEDULE B-1 SERVICE REQUIREMENTS – Works on Adjacent Highway - Within Cedar Valley Neighbourhood Land Use Concept Plan - Urban Residential requiring the construction of curb/gutter, sidewalk sanitary sewer, underground hydro/tel, street lighting and boulevard trees for the portion of Dewdney Trunk Road adjacent to the site.

Applicant’s Rational for the DVP

The applicant’s rationale is attached as Appendix 7.

The rationale for requesting to waive the requirement to construct the Larkspur Avenue road extension directly south of the two Barr Street properties is that the road dedication is located within an ESA and the lot layout has been developed providing access to the bare land strata development outside of the ESA; therefore it is not necessary to construct a road through an ESA that does not serve the development or any future development potential.

The second request is to waive the road construction requirements fronting Dewdney Trunk Road based on the Urban Residential designation in the Official Community Plan. These requirements include:

- Asphalt
- Curb/gutter
- Sidewalk
- Piped storm sewer system
- Municipal water
- Sanitary sewerage
- Underground electrical, natural gas distribution and telephone system
- Ornamental street lighting
- Boulevard tree planting.

The applicants rationale to waive the above urban road construction requirements is that when the original development application was submitted in 2008 road construction requirements in the Subdivision Control Bylaw were based on the proposed zone, i.e. Suburban 36. Today, road construction requirements in the Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985 are based on the land use designation in the Official Community Plan, i.e. Urban Residential. Appendix 5 shows the portions of 33237 and 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road designated Urban Residential in the
Official Community Plan. When the original development application was submitted the applicant was required to construct Dewdney Trunk Road to the Suburban road standard, today that requirement has been upgraded to the Urban Standard with full sidewalk, curb and gutter.

The applicant wishes to construct the road to the requirements similar to the Suburban designation in the Official Community Plan. The road construction requirements based on the Suburban designation in the Official Community Plan are as follows:

- Asphalt
- Piped storm sewer system
- Municipal water

The application request is to upgrade asphalt and install piped storm sewer system as would have been required prior to changes in the Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985. Municipal water service is installed along the entire frontage of Dewdney Trunk Road.

Planning Department Rationale for the DVP

The request to waive the requirement to construct the Larkspur Avenue extension, shown as dedicated road on Appendix 2 is supportable. The road dedication shown on Appendix 2 was established prior to the mapping of the Environmentally Sensitive Area in Cedar Valley and as such the construction of road through the environmentally sensitive area is not beneficial. The 6.0 metre private road provides access to the bare land strata development outside of the ESA. Due to the ESA encumbrances on the development site, the extension of Larkspur Avenue would result in a road leading into the ESA with no surrounding development potential.

The request to waive the requirement to construct Dewdney Trunk Road to an Urban road standard is supportable for the following reasons:

- No new lots fronting Dewdney Trunk Road are being created;
- The two remainder lots have been designed to facilitate the development of urban sized lots in the future;
- The road construction requirements when the application was originally submitted were to the Suburban standard.

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

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $22,520 ($2815 per new lot or unit) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted two (2) development notification signs on the site which summarize 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. time and place). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 500 metres (1640 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Pre-public hearing information packages will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and are available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.
Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

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

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

Policy LAN. 50 - Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages

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.

REFERRALS

Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 8.

Mission Fire/Rescue Service
The Mission Fire/Rescue Service has no objection to the project subject to the completion of the requirements outlined in Appendix 9.

Parks, Recreation and Culture
The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objections to the proposed development. Their comments are attached as Appendix 10.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES

1. Approval of Development Variance Permit DV13-017 will be considered as part of the same Council agenda as the Zone Amending Bylaw is considered.

SIGN-OFFS:

Marcy Bond, Planner

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 9321 Barr Street
PID: 016-145-291
Legal: Lot 1, Section 33, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 85896

Civic Address: 9343 Barr Street
PID: 016-145-313
Legal: Lot 2, Section 33, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 85896

Civic Address: 33237 Dewdney Trunk Road
PID: 002-017-512
Legal: Lot 21 Except : Part Subdivided by plan 66978: Section 33 Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 3344

Civic Address: 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road
PID: 010-995-862
Legal: Lot 20 Section 33, Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 3344
Appendix 2

Plan of Reference- showing areas to be rezoned

Area A: Rezone from Rural 16 to Rural Residential 7

Area B: Rezone from Rural 16 to Suburban 38

Area C: Rezone from Suburban 38 to Rural 7

Dedicated unconstricted road
Appendix 3
Draft Plan of Subdivision

- Common Property 1.4 ha
- Caselton Terrace: Private 6 m wide road (common property)
- Fee Simple Lots 1 and 2
Appendix 4
Official Community Plan Designations

OCP

Subject Properties

Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Boundary

Orange Rural Residential Designation

Green: Environmentally Sensitive
Yellow: Urban Residential

In the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan
Appendix 5
Zoning

33237 and 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road have split zoning; the northern portion is zoned RU16 with the southern portion zoned S36.

Zone Boundary (shown in blue)
Appendix 6

Environmentally Sensitive Areas in Green & Buildable Area in White
Appendix 7

Applicant’s Rationale for DVP

ATTN: MAYOR AND COUNCIL

Re: Development Variance Permit rationale for subdivision application S13-002

Although a Development inquiry was made for the subject property in June of 2007 an application for subdivision was not made until February of 2008. At that time the proposed subdivision of the property included two lots fronting on Dewdney Trunk Road, being created under the existing zoning of RS-2 (Suburban Residential).

At the time of application (2008) the District of Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw set out subdivision servicing standards based upon land zoning. For the existing RS-2 zone the only works required on Dewdney Trunk Road were, asphalt road and water service. Both of which existed at the time. No indication was provided through the Development Inquiry or subsequent subdivision application, that any works or improvements on Dewdney Trunk Road were needed or required respecting water or asphalt.

However development issues such as; environmental protection, site contamination questions and adjacent development did need to be addressed. In consideration of adjacent development potential a further plan of development, including an additional assembly lot, was reviewed and supported in principle by the Planning Department in April of 2012. This additional lot was then included into the development assembly and an updated subdivision plan submitted in June of 2012.

This revised plan of subdivision now showed three lots fronting on Dewdney Trunk Road. Two lots from the original plan and one additional lot because of the extra lot added to the development assembly. At that time the Subdivision Control Bylaw still applied servicing standards based upon zoning. The three lots on Dewdney Trunk Road were still being created under the existing RS-2 zone and the servicing standard still only required asphalt and water, as it did in 2008.

As part of ongoing discussions with the Municipality, regarding environmental protection issues in the area, the Planning Department had suggested that a further land assembly would be helpful in reducing the impact on an environmentally sensitive area. This additional lot was added to the development assembly in July of 2012 and another revised plan of subdivision produced that; lessened the impact on the environmentally sensitive area and still maintained three lots on Dewdney Trunk Road under the existing zoning. The revised plan was submitted to the Municipality on August 2, 2012. At that time we had an ongoing subdivision application that had been amended from time to time since 2008, with no indication of any road works being required on Dewdney Trunk Road.

On August 7, 2012 the Municipality adopted a new Subdivision Control Bylaw which not only updated the servicing standards in the Municipality but completely changed how these standards were to be applied. Servicing standards were no longer based upon zoning but on land use designations set out in the Official Community Plan. We were not aware of this change but the consequences, in respect of this subdivision, are quite significant, as will be explained later in this rationale.

Although the original subdivision application of 2008 was still valid, the changes up to August 2012 required additional fees. For purposes of administrative simplicity, staff suggested that the original application be
withdrawn and a new application be applied for. This was agreed to and a new application was submitted in February 2013. Hence the 2013 file number rather than a 2008 number.

Up to this point, all costing projections for this subdivision (including the additional assembly lands) had been predicated on no additional road works being required on Dewdney Trunk Road. In March of 2013 we were advised by Municipal staff that the Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw was now tied to OCP designations (August 2012 amendment) and notwithstanding the Suburban zoning for this subdivision the servicing requirement was now based upon an Urban Residential designation. Therefore the developer must now upgrade Dewdney Trunk Road to an urban collector standard, including sanitary sewer which is not even needed in the Suburban Residential zone.

The cost for these works, to create three Suburban Residential lots on Dewdney Trunk Road, essentially went from zero to something in excess of $200,000 for three lots. A cost, that had never been considered or budgeted for in respect of these three lots. A cost, that only came about because of a Bylaw amendment during the process of this subdivision application.

As the financial implications of this requirement were so severe, a meeting with staff was requested to discuss the potential of a Development Variance Permit for the works on Dewdney Trunk Road. Particularly in consideration of; the history of this application, the fact that it is a Suburban Residential subdivision not an Urban Residential subdivision and only three lots were being created. After much discussion back and forth we were advised that staff would not support a Variance for these works unless the number of lots fronting on Dewdney Trunk Road was reduced from three to two. Notwithstanding that the current zoning would permit three lots. Although we did not agree with this approach or determination, we felt that without staff support the Variance may not be approved by Council. The subdivision plan was then amended to show two lots fronting on Dewdney Trunk Road instead of three, so that staff would support a Variance for the now required works on Dewdney Trunk Road. We were then asked to provide a rationale for the Variance.

Under the current Subdivision Control Bylaw, as amended on August 7, 2012, the minimum servicing requirements are now established for lands under various Official Community Plan (OCP) Designations. Under the OCP Designations there is four primary categories and they are; 1) Rural Area, 2) Urban Area, 3) Within Cedar Valley Neighborhood Land Use Conceptual Plan, and 4) Within Silverdale Neighborhood Land Use Conceptual Plan. Under each of these categories is a number of OCP designations with the servicing criteria required for each designation.

The current zoning for the subject property is S36 (Suburban) previously (RS-2, Suburban Residential). However the OCP designation for this land is Urban Residential: 4-5 Units/Acre, within the Cedar Valley Neighborhood Land Use Conceptual Plan. Under this designation the following road works are now required for the subject subdivision:

- Asphalt surface for roads and lanes
- Curb/gutter and sidewalk
- Piped storm sewer system
- Municipal water system when lands are located in water specified area
- Sanitary sewerage system when lands are located in sewer specified area
- Underground electrical and natural gas distribution and telephone system
• Ornamental street lighting
• T = Boulevard tree planting

Prior to the Subdivision Control Bylaw amendment in August 2012, the road works for subdivision under the Suburban zone were Asphalt and Water only.

Also under the Cedar Valley Neighborhood Land Use Conceptual Plan category is the designation “Suburban Residential: Single Family – 3 New Lots or Less Created”. Under this designation the road works that would be required for this subdivision would be:

• Asphalt surface for roads and lanes
• Piped storm sewer system
• Municipal water system

The “Suburban Residential: Single Family – 3 New Lots or Less Created” designation is also included under the Urban Area category of the Subdivision Control Bylaw, with the same servicing requirements of asphalt, piped storm sewer and Municipal water.

As the proposed subdivision is for the purpose of Suburban lots under the existing zoning and only two lots are being created on Dewdney Trunk Road, we would respectfully request Council support for a waiver of the Urban Residential: 4-5 Units/Acre servicing requirement, to the Suburban Residential: Single Family – 3 New Lots or Less Created servicing standard as follows:

• Asphalt surface to an Urban Residential standard.
• Piped storm sewer system
• Municipal water system

This construction standard is consistent with the current Suburban zoning of the property and is close to the construction standard in place at the time of subdivision application for this property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Slade Dyer, Agent
Appendix 8

Engineering Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT SERVICING COMMENTS

FILE: S13-002 November 7, 2013

CIVIC ADDRESS: 33237, 33293 Dewdney Trunk Road & 9321, 9343 Barr Street

The Developer has requested that Council consider a variance to the District of Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw No. 1500-1985 to vary the following standards:

1. Work on Adjacent Highways: Waive the requirement of schedule B-1 requiring the construction of curb/gutter, sidewalk, sanitary sewer, underground hydro/tel, street lighting and boulevard trees, for the portion of Dewdney Trunk Road adjacent to the site;

2. Work on Adjacent Highways: Waive the requirement of schedule B-1 requiring the construction of the portion Larkspur Avenue adjacent to the site;

The Engineering Department has reviewed the proposal as well as the site plan and offers the following comments for Council to consider:

- Staff has worked with the Developer to come up with a site plan that allows for the proposed lots accessed off of Dewdney Trunk Road to be subdivided to urban densities in the future. At the time of future subdivision, the works to be waived by this variance would be required.
- Sanitary sewer is not available in the area and is not required for suburban lots.
- The Developer has cited the large cost of installing the required works and the fact that they would not be creating any additional lots off of Dewdney Trunk Road as the basis of their request for this variance.
- The portion of Larkspur Avenue adjacent to the site cannot be constructed as it is located within an environmentally sensitive area.
- It should be noted that the Developer will not realize additional lot yield due to this variance.
- The Developer will construct road widening and storm sewers along the portion of the site fronting Dewdney Trunk Road.

Prepared by

Sterling Chan
Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by

Rick Bomhof
Director of Engineering
Appendix 9

Fire Department Comments

DISTRICT OF Mission
ON THE FRASER

Fire/Rescue Service Memorandum

File Category: PRO.DEV.ZON
File Folder: R13-003/DV13-007

To: Planning Department
From: Deputy Fire Chief Watkinson
Date: November 19, 2013

Subject: 33293 & 33237 Dewdney Trunk Road, and 9321 & 9343 Barr Street, Mission B.C.

The subject properties on Barr Street do not reside within the urban municipal water works supply system for fire protection. The nearest water supply to the subject property is located at Dewdney Trunk Road. As such, the Mission Fire/Rescue Service has identified safety concerns with regards to fire department access, water supply, fire flows, and/or response time for reaching the lands to attend to any fire calls.

It is my recommendation that the Grantor address all fire safety concerns (i.e. residential sprinklers or water reservoir) through consultation with Mission Fire/Rescue Service at the building permit stage prior to the construction of any structures on the subject property. This would also include the design and construction of any private vehicular access routes as per the requirements of the B.C. Building Code.

The Mission Fire/Rescue Service would also require a full service road and Cul-de-sac turnaround at the end of Strata Road as per the requirements of the B.C. Building Code.

Larry Watkinson
Deputy Fire Chief

[Signature]

[Note: The handwritten comments are not transcribed into the digital text.]
Appendix 10

Parks Recreation and Culture Department Comments

PLANNING APPLICATION REVIEW COMMENTS

Subject Property: 33237, 33293 Dewdney and 9321, 9343 Barr Street

Comments related to the proposed development:

1. These lands are not within walking distance of any developed parkland and there are no plans or recommendations included in the current DOM Parks, Trails and Bicycle Master Plan to create a park in this area of the community.

2. Staff recommend that Council request cash-in-lieu of parkland for future parkland acquisition in the District.

Maureen Sinclair
DIRECTOR OF PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Sharon Fletcher, Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects
SUBJECT: Implementation of the Incentive Program – Adopt Downtown Design Guidelines
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – List of proposed amendments to Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008
Appendix 2 – MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines
Appendix 3 – Map showing the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area boundary

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That a bylaw be prepared to amend the District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008 in accordance with Appendix 1 attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 16, 2013;

2. That, upon due consideration of Sections 879 and 881 of the Local Government Act, and in accordance with Council Policy LAN. 47, consultation referrals be forwarded to:
   a. School District No. 75,
   b. Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure,
   c. Utility Companies, and
   d. Canadian Pacific Railway.

3. That the bylaw be considered for 1st reading at the Regular Council meeting on December 16, 2013.

4. That after 1st reading of the bylaw that Council consider the following motion:
   
   "that in accordance with Section 882 of the Local Government Act, Council has considered the Official Community Plan amending bylaw(s) in conjunction with the District of Mission’s Financial Plan (including the Capital Expenditure Plan and Operating Expenditure Plan) and the Waste Management Plan."

5. That, following 1st reading of the bylaw, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on January 6, 2014.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

With the adoption of the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, a number of amendments are required to existing policies and bylaws in order to implement the plan. This report includes the proposed amendments to the Official Community Plan, including amendments to:

- The Development Permit Area section, which will attach the MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines to the Official Community Plan,
- Map 1 of the Official Community Plan Bylaw to add the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area boundary and include the label for the area in the legend, and
- Numerous policies within the Official Community Plan to update them to reflect the new downtown plan and guidelines.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to amend the Official Community Plan:

- To include the new MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines in the Development Permit Area section of the plan, and
- To update policies in:
  - Section 2 - Building Livable Neighbourhoods, and
  - Section 4 - Developing the Community Core
to reflect the vision, policies and actions in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan and the MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines.

BACKGROUND:

At the Regular Meeting of Council on July 2, 2013, Council adopted the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan as LAN Policy 58. As part of the planning process, the vision in the plan and public input was used to develop downtown design guidelines that, while descriptive rather than prescriptive in nature, will help to clarify the intent of the vision and the plan as the area redevelops.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The proposed amendments to the Official Community Plan (OCP) are required to fully implement the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan. In addition, these amendments are required to ensure that the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan is sufficiently linked to the OCP Bylaw to allow Council to waive the Public Hearing requirement as an incentive for downtown development, which Section 890 (4) of the Local Government Act enables.

The MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines will apply to development applications within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area boundary.

Other proposed policy changes in Sections 2 and 4 of the Official Community Plan are proposed to recognize that the downtown plan is now complete and to ensure that the downtown plan will be part of the development of plans for the Commuter Rail and Waterfront areas in the future. The specific amendments are listed in Appendix 1.
The Downtown Expansion areas adjacent to the new downtown boundary, which allow commercial uses, should be reviewed as part of a future Official Community Plan review. This review is required as consideration should be given to restricting commercial development to the downtown core and not allowing it to expand into the Downtown Expansion area in the short term. Once commercial development is maximized in the downtown core, expansion to nearby areas could be considered. The review should include consideration of Mission’s capacity for commercial uses as part of planning and redevelopment of the waterfront, given that Mission can only absorb a certain amount of commercial square footage. In addition, existing development permit area guidelines outside of downtown and the designations within the adjacent neighbourhood area should be reviewed. This is consistent with an action in the Mission City Downtown Action Plan (Action 5.4). These actions should be part of the next Official Community Plan review.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**

The adoption of the Downtown Design Guidelines completes the first step of Council’s Objective to “Revitalize Downtown by Creating an Environment for Private/Other Investment” and implements the following related action:

- Create a practical and implementable Downtown Revitalization Plan

This report amends the Official Community Plan to include the guidelines in the Development Permit Area section of the Official Community Plan and updates the designation map and policies to reflect the adoption of the Mission City Downtown Action Plan and the Mission City Downtown Design Guidelines.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Council must consider the impact of changes to the Official Community Plan on the Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan based on Section 882 of the Local Government Act. All of the changes proposed are within an area managed by the Waste Management Plan, and therefore, will have no effect on the operation and budget beyond what is already considered as normal growth in the community.

There are some impacts from the plan and guidelines related to implementation costs, which will come forward to Council for consideration on a project by project basis. Implications related to development and property improvements will have an effect on tax assessment and tax revenue from new development. These have been outlined in the Incentive Program, which Council approved on September 23, 2013, and which is being implemented with amendments to a number of policies and bylaws that have been forwarded for Council’s consideration. It is anticipated that the overall financial impact will be positive with renovations, façade improvements and new development in the downtown triggering higher assessed values resulting in new tax revenue and a more diversified tax base for Mission over time.

**COMMUNICATION:**

Communication will occur through the Public Hearing notice process outlined in Council’s Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Public Hearing itself.
SIGN-OFFS:

Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Comment by Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
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APPENDIX 1

That the Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008 be amended by:

a. adding the following to Schedule “A” – Table of Contents in Part IV – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREAS after “Intensive Residential Development Permit Area Guidelines”:

“MissionCity Downtown Design Development Permit Area Guidelines 147”;

b. adding the “MissionCity Downtown Design Guidelines” attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 16, 2013 as Appendix 2, to Part IV – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA.

c. adding the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area boundary to Map 1 as shown in Appendix 3 attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 16, 2013 and include the following in Map 1 Legend:

“MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area”

d. correcting the numbering error and those following in Part II BUILDING LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS Section 2 PLANNING AREAS – Policy 2.2.20 Overall Strategy and Plan for the Central Area, by changing the policy number from 2.2.12 to 2.2.20;

e. deleting the following words and brackets “(Neighbourhood Plan)” in Policy 2.2.20 Overall Strategy and Plan for the Central Area and replacing them with the following phrase:

“using and incorporating elements from the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan”;

f. deleting Policy 4.1.5 Upgrading of Storefronts in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE and replacing it with the following:

“Encourage the upgrading of storefronts in the Downtown; review improvement proposals in accordance with the MissionCity Downtown Design Development Permit Area Guidelines to achieve timeless architecture that emphasizes the human scale.”;

g. deleting Policy 4.1.6 High Quality Streetscapes in the Downtown Core in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE and replacing it with the following:

“Use the MissionCity Downtown Design Development Permit Area Guidelines in Part IV – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREAS to guide high quality streetscape improvements in the downtown core.”;
h. adding the following to the end of Policy 4.1.7 Design of Downtown Entrances in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE:

   “in accordance with the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan and the MissionCity Downtown Design Development Permit Area Guidelines”;

i. deleting Policy 4.1.10 Central Area Comprehensive Development Plan in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE and replacing it with the following:

   “Undertake a Central Area Development Plan for the Downtown, Commuter Rail and Waterfront area. Adopt a new bold vision and future land use concept and design guidelines for the entire central area using the following documents and studies:
   • Waterfront Development Concept Plan (1992),
   • the Mission Landing Waterfront Concept Plan (2006),
   • the Waterfront and Brownfield Redevelopment Study – Technical Overview (2009),
   • the Market and Feasibility Studies (Phases 1, 2, 3 and 4) completed in 2012, and
   • build on the vision and content of the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan (2013).
   The emphasis of the new Plan is to be on establishing a new vision for the area, determining financial feasibility and developing implementation strategies”;

j. adding the following sentence to the end of Policy 4.1.11 Cost Benefit of Central Area Redevelopment in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE:

   “As part of implementing the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, an Incentive Program was developed, which included, among other things, reduced development application fees, tax exemption options and a reduction in residential parking requirements to a minimum of one (1) parking space per residential unit within the downtown plan area.

k. adding the following to the end of Policy 4.1.12 Downtown Marketing in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE:

   “and include relevant opportunities from the Incentive Program intended to stimulate development”;

l. deleting the following words from Policy 4.1.18 Continuous Street Front Retail in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE “especially in the commercial core the three-block stretch” and replacing them with the following:

   “focusing retail uses on the ground floor that fronts onto 1st Avenue along the three-block stretch”;

m. adding the following to end of Policy 4.1.21 Retail at Ground Level in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE:

   “fronting on 1st Avenue”;
n. deleting the first sentence in Policy 4.1.24 High Density Residential in the Downtown in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE and replacing it with the following:

“In order to increase the number of people living downtown, encourage higher density residential development and mixed-use commercial/residential development to a maximum of five (5) storeys within the Downtown area.”

o. adding the following new sentence to the end of Policy 4.1.26 Distinctive Streetscape Elements in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE:

“When developing the detailed design plan for public spaces, incorporate the actions in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan and elements in the MissionCity Downtown Design Development Permit Area Guidelines.”;

p. deleting the following from the beginning of the first sentence in Policy 4.1.28 Acquisition of Land for Downtown Open Space in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE

“Undertake as analysis as to the most appropriate locations for a” and replacing it with the following:

“Using the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, initiate development of”;

q. adding the following phrase to Policy 4.1.29 The Downtown Park Concept in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE after the bracket:

“and refined in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan (2013)”;

r. deleting Policy 4.1.30 Greening the Downtown in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE and replacing them with the following:

“Develop a detailed design for streetscapes and plazas in accordance with the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan and elements in the MissionCity Downtown Design Development Permit Area Guidelines. Consult with staff who are tasked with maintaining the streetscapes and plazas and stakeholders, including but not limited to, business owners and Communities in Bloom.”;

s. adding the following as a new bullet to the end of the list in Policy 4.2.4 Central Area Development Plan in Section 4 – DEVELOPING THE COMMUNITY CORE:

“the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan (2013)”.
Mission City Downtown Planning

Design Guidelines

1. Category

The lands identified on Map 1: Development Permit Areas are designated under the following sections of the Local Government Act:

- 919(1) (e) establishment of objectives for the form and character of intensive residential development;
- 919(1) (f) establishment of objectives for the form and character of commercial, industrial or multi-family residential development;
- 919(1) (h) establishment of objectives to promote energy conservation;
- 919(1) (i) establishment of objectives to promote water conservation; and
- 919(1) (j) establishment of objectives to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

These sections of the Local Government Act allow regulation respecting the character of development within the Development Permit Area, including landscaping, and the siting, form, exterior design and finish of buildings and other structures, as justified by the special conditions and objectives in Section 1.2.

Figure 1. Mission Downtown Development Permit Area
of these Guidelines.

2. Overview and Intent

The Downtown Mission Action Plan sets out a clear vision for Downtown Mission as a highly sustainable and unique urban place that is the cultural, civic and social heart of the District. Key to the success of the Downtown Action Plan will be the emphasis on its unique identity, and its desired future as a compact, mixed use vibrant and pedestrian-oriented Downtown.

Facade improvements along 1st Avenue can play a significant role in the Downtown over the short and medium term. As such, the design guidelines address 1st Avenue as a sub area with specific strategies and guidelines included for facade renovations and upgrades to existing buildings.

The broad intent of these design guidelines is to guide implementation of the Downtown Action Plan by translating the vision and associated objectives and policies for the Downtown into a set of specific design strategies and approaches. In this way, the guidelines provide a visionary and practical framework for use by District Staff, Council, developers and builders to guide the development review process (development permit and zoning) for new development and renovations within the Downtown.

These guidelines are not intended to be prescriptive but rather, to encourage flexibility and innovation in building design. They are focused on form over character, and in achieving a timeless architecture that emphasizes a human scale through the use of articulation and architectural design.

3. Objectives

The urban design principles described below provide the overarching framework for a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented Downtown that acts as the true heart of Mission.

Human-Scale Design
Streets should be for people. The speed at which pedestrians move (roughly 5km/hour) requires a street environment that is in keeping with this parameter. Architectural features, details and site design should provide enough visual interest to add to the experiential dimension of the street.

Street and Open Space Definition
Streets and squares require visual and structural definition. Streets should have clear boundaries that create the feeling of an outdoor room. This sense of enclosure is typically created through continuous building frontages but can be complemented by street trees, lighting, and street furniture. This principle should be paired closely with the next principle, Active Frontages.

Active Frontages
Buildings should always endeavour to present a “friendly-face” to the street. Entrances, windows, balconies and patios should face public streets or open spaces. Buildings should provide active edges with uses that are visible from, and even spill out onto, the sidewalks, and open spaces. This helps to animate the space and improve the safety and security of the public realm. This is most easily achieved when back of house activities such as parking, servicing and access can be provided off a rear lane, as is the case throughout most of the Downtown.

Pedestrian Comfort and Safety
Streets within the town centre are places for people to walk leisurely or with a purpose. They are also places for people to sit. Therefore, streets should have a pleasing experiential and social dimension. Streets should also provide physical comfort derived from both a perceived sense of security and the design elements of the street and sidewalk.

Sense of Place
Incorporate public art, street-scape and building designs that honour the past and contribute to downtown Mission’s unique identity and sense of place.
4.1 GENERAL GUIDELINES

4.1.1 Street Definition

**Intent:** To site and design buildings to positively frame and define streets and other public open spaces and to ensure a positive human response to specific site conditions and opportunities.

**Guidelines**

- Minimize the distance buildings are set back from the sidewalk to create good street definition and a sense of enclosure as shown in Figure 2.
- Build ground floor commercial uses to the front property line so that a continuous commercial street frontage and street definition is maintained (Figure 3). A set back may be considered:
  - For a pedestrian courtyard, a patio or sidewalk cafe, or other features benefiting pedestrian activity; and
  - To allow for projecting balconies and bay windows while not encroaching on public property.

4.1.2 Active fronts

**Intent:** To ensure buildings are sited and designed to encourage pedestrian activity, visual interest and safety.

**Guidelines**

- Orient main entrances, windows, balconies and street-level uses to directly overlook (face) adjacent streets, parks, open spaces, and children's play areas (Figure 4).
- Avoid expansive blank walls (i.e., over 5 metres in length) adjacent to public streets. When blank walls are unavoidable, they shall be mitigated using appropriate design treatments including year round landscape screening such as trellises and climbing vines, providing art such as a mosaic, mural, or relief, incorporating a patio of sidewalk cafe.
- Due to the topography of downtown, retaining walls adjacent to public streets and open spaces will be unavoidable in some circumstances and should be mitigated with stepped retaining walls and landscaping as outlined in Section 2.9.
4.1.3 Parking, Servicing and Access

**Inte**: To ensure the provision of adequate servicing, vehicle access and parking while minimizing negative impacts on the safety and attractiveness of the pedestrian realm. A welcoming pedestrian environment is critical to the quality and character of Downtown Mission, particularly along 1st Avenue.

**Guidelines**

- Vehicular and service functions and other “back of house” activities should remain primarily on the lane where possible, so as not to conflict with pedestrian oriented street activity (Figure 8).
- Structured parking including tuck-under parking or second storey parking accessed from the lane are the preferred approaches for accommodating off-street parking in the downtown.
- Where off-street surface parking is unavoidable, it should be located to the rear of the building with parking access from the lane or side-street and screened with year-round landscaping.

- Off-street parking located between the front face of a building and the public sidewalk is not permitted (Figure 9).
- If located beside the building and adjacent to the public sidewalk, screen surface parking areas from sidewalks and other active open spaces using materials that provide a visual buffer while still allowing clear visibility into the parking areas to promote personal safety and security. Screening could include year round landscaping, a trellis, or grillwork with climbing vines (Figure 10).
- Locate public on-street parking at the curb to provide convenient and easy access to commercial and residential entrances. Angled parking is encouraged along side streets where there is sufficient space.
- In general, vehicular access should be from the lane. Where there is no lane, and where the re-introduction of a lane is difficult or not possible, access may be provided from the street, provided:
  - There is minimal interruption of the pedestrian realm and streetscape treatment.
  - Waiting, or pick-up/drop-off areas are located internal to the site, not in the public right-of-way.
  - There is no more than one interruption per block face and only one curb cut on the street.
- Any vehicular entrance and its associated components (doorways, ramps, etc.), whether from the street or lane, should be architecturally integrated into the building so as to minimize its exposure. In particular, avoid ramps located directly off the street or lane. Minimize negative impacts of parking ramps and entrances through treatment such as enclosure, screening, high quality finishes, sensitive lighting, and landscaping (Figure 11).
- Vehicular entrances and access points to parking, site servicing, and utility areas to enable casual surveillance and safety.
- Shared parking and access is encouraged where possible.
4.1.4 Height and Massing

**Intent:** To reduce the visual mass of large buildings and ensure a sensitive transition to adjacent buildings and open spaces

**Guidelines**

- Break up the visual mass of large buildings to reduce their visual impact on the pedestrian realm, and to create variation along the street. This can be achieved by incorporating minor visual breaks in their façades using vertical set-backs and upper storey (horizontal) step-backs (Figure 12 and 13).
- Where large uninterrupted walls are unavoidable, use landscaping, green walls, material changes and other architectural devices to minimize the visual impact (Figure 14).
- Limit the visual mass of large building façades to lengths of 40m or less. This can be achieved by incorporating a substantial setback such as a courtyard or framed periodic openings to provide public views into private open space features.
- Step upper storeys (3 storeys or higher) a minimum of 1.5m.
- A maximum 5 storey building height and a two storey street wall should be maintained for buildings along 1st Avenue.
- Minimize impacts from sloping sites on neighbouring development, for example, by using terraced retaining walls of natural materials or by stepping a project to respond to the slope (Figure 15).

4.1.5 Architectural Concept: Heritage and Human Scale

Downtown Mission has a rich and varied architectural past. While some historic buildings remaining in the downtown many no longer exist or have been covered over. Some of the best examples of downtown’s architectural heritage are the art deco style Post Office building with red brick facing, the Mission Museum (the only designated heritage building in the downtown) and the large Victorian and craftsman style heritage homes in varying condition. There are also a small number of commercial buildings along 1st Avenue that have traditional or heritage facade treatments.

No single architectural style is prescribed for 1st Avenue or the downtown as a whole. Rather, the architectural elements and details from the range of architectural styles that have occurred here over the city’s history are good precedents, as demonstrated in existing buildings, as well as historic photographs. The use of archival photographs of historic downtown Mission should be used as a design resource to assure authenticity in the replication of missing (or covered over) detail on historic structures, and to guide in the design of appropriate styling details. The Mission District Historical Society and the Mission Museum and their publication “Guide to Mission B.C: What We Had and What We’ve Kept” is an excellent resource for determining heritage features including those of existing buildings whose façades have since been covered over.

The overall intent of the following guidelines is to:

- Reinforce the traditional 2 storey street wall and façade continuity and character of existing retail oriented street-facing development, particularly on 1st Avenue;
- Promote character of development which contributes to the intimate scale of 1st Avenue;
- Ensure new development responds positively to the existing and historical architectural context and contributes to an architectural design that is consistent, if only subtly, throughout adjacent development; and
- Respect, restore, and/or replicate significant architectural detail where such detail contributes to and reinforces the area’s historic and current desirable qualities and character.

A contemporary interpretation of traditional building forms and architectural features and details is also encouraged to emphasize human scale particularly along the 1st Avenue Retail High Street. However, careful consideration must be taken to avoid a faux pioneer look or theme, which is strongly discouraged for Downtown Mission.

- Building design should incorporate both variation and consistency in façade treatments by, for example, articulating buildings façades into a series of intervals (Figure 16, 17, 18). This can be achieved by:
  - Facade modulation – stepping back or extending forward a portion of the façade to create a series of intervals or breaks in the façade;
  - Repeating window patterns at intervals that correspond to extensions and step backs;
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- Providing a porch, patio, deck, or covered entry for each interval;
- Providing a balcony or bay window for each interval; and
- Changing the roof line by alternating dormers, stepped roofs, gables, or other roof elements to reinforce the modulation or articulation interval.

Incorporate a range of architectural features and design details into building facades that are rich and varied in detail to create visual interest when approached by pedestrians (Figure 19 and 20). Examples of architectural features include:
- Building height, massing, articulation and modulation;
- Bay windows and balconies;
- Corner features accent, such as turrets or cupolas;
- Decorative roof lines and cornices;
- Building entries; and
- Canopies and overhangs.

Examples of architectural details include:
- Treatment of masonry such as ceramic tile, paving stones, brick patterns, etc.;
- Treatment of siding - for example the use of score lines, textures and different materials or patterning to distinguish between different floors;
- Articulation of columns and pilasters;
- Ornament or integrated art work;
- Integrated architectural lighting;
- Detailed grills and railings;
- Substantial trim details and moldings; and
- Trellises and arbors.

Locate and design entrances to create building identity and to distinguish between individual ground floor units. Use a high level of architectural detail and, where appropriate, landscape treatment, to emphasize primary entrances, and to provide “punctuation” in the overall streetscape treatment.

Clearly distinguish the roof line of the building’s facade from its walls, for example, through the use of a cornice, projecting over hang, or decorative motif.

- Design balconies as integral parts of buildings. Use glazed or narrow metal spindle guardrails to maximize daylight penetration into dwellings.
- Ensure a good fit and reinforce and enhance the architectural character of a street by ensuring new development responds to the positive architectural characteristics of existing development (Figure 21, 22 and 23). New development can ensure a good fit by ensuring new or renovated buildings refer to distinctive and desirable architectural qualities of existing adjacent buildings in new development such as:
  - Similar building massing, height, articulation and scale;
  - Similar or complementary architectural style;
  - Similar building details;
  - Similar or complementary materials and colour; and
  - The proportion and pattern of windows, doors, and other glazed areas (fenestration).

Materials Guidelines

- An integrated, consistent range of materials and colours should be used, and variety between buildings and building frontages should be provided (Figure 23).
- In general, new residential and mixed use buildings should incorporate substantial, natural building materials into their facade to avoid a ‘thin veneer’ look and feel. A robust and textured, as opposed to skin like treatment, is preferred.
- Materials which are considered for use as an exterior finish should respect the nature and style of traditional materials used in Downtown Mission such as brick, horizontal wood siding, tasteful stucco, cut stone, and limited use of corrugated metal siding for accents and features. Original, historic, building materials should be retained and restored whenever possible during restorative renovations.
- Synthetic materials such as vinyl, and acrylic swirl type stuccos are generally discouraged in favour of natural materials such as masonry, stone and wood.
4.1.6 1st Avenue: Mission’s traditional Retail High Street

1st Avenue is Mission’s traditional Retail High Street and is defined by both its existing and historic character. 1st Avenue is characterized by local shops with narrow frontages, frequent entrances, and enticing shop front windows. This area also includes an eclectic mix of buildings ranging in style and some with traditional and heritage architectural features. The building and streetscape character in this area has and will continue to play an important role in creating a unique identity and sense of place for the downtown and Mission as a whole. As such, it is important that renovations and new developments maintain and enhance the established use and positive character elements of this area, and where possible, restore heritage characteristics from this area’s architectural past.

- A 2 storey street wall is desired along 1st Avenue and for other commercial streets within Downtown Mission. Buildings may be up to 5 storeys in height but should step back from street edge after 2 storeys. Projects with buildings over 4 storeys in height are required to undertake and submit a study showing how the development minimizes shadowing of 1st Avenue sidewalks and adjacent public open spaces.

- New buildings and renovation of existing facades and shop fronts along 1st Avenue should incorporate the following facade elements and details (Figure 25 and 26):
  - Frequent entrances with a maximum spacing dimension of 8 metres (Figure 26);
  - Recessed entryways set back from the ground level facade a minimum of 0.8 metres in order to provide for door swings, to protect the entrance from rain or snow, and to emphasize building entrances;
  - A minimum transparent, non-reflective glazing area of 75% of frontages at grade;
  - Transom window above the entry, often stretching the full width of the shop front above the recessed entry;
  - Paneled display windows;
  - Weather protection, lighting and signage according to guidelines in Sections 2.7.
  - The lower facade of new buildings should be distinguished at its uppermost edge by a continuous intermediate cornice or similar decorative banding element which is generally a reduced version of the main cornice atop the building;

- The upper facades of buildings should:
  - Be ordered by the use of vertical elements such as pilasters, columns, projecting bays and recessed balconies (Figure 27);
  - Incorporate decorative roof lines and cornices to define the upper edges of the façade and at the top elevation of the building (Figure 27); and
  - Incorporate recessed balconies overlooking 1st Avenue (Figure 27).

- Windows incorporated into upper facades should:
  - Be punched (recessed) a minimum of 10 cm and incorporate lintels and sills (Figure 27);
  - Be oriented vertically and organized into repetitive groups in relationship to the vertical elements which frame and divide the façade such as shop front modules, pilasters, columns and vertical step backs; and
  - Incorporate substantial trim and mouldings.

- Large floor plate commercial developments shall respond to the prevailing or planned future street character of 1st Avenue by incorporating frequent entrances and transparent shop front windows according to the above guidelines (see Figure 17).

4.1.7 Integrated Weather Protection, Signage and Lighting

Intent: To provide comfort, safety and convenience to pedestrians, while enhancing the overall appearance and character of 1st Avenue through the provision and architectural integration of weather protection, signage and lighting.

A signage and lighting program for any commercial development should be designed as a totality, with signs, lighting and weather protection architecturally integrated from the outset for commercial and mixed use developments.
Weather Protection Guidelines

- Incorporate integrated weather protection, signage and lighting at building entrances to reflect the building’s architecture and placement of windows and doors. Enhanced weather protection is encouraged at the entrances of major buildings, adjacent to bus zones and street corners where people wait for traffic lights, over storefronts and display windows, and any other areas where significant waiting or browsing by people occurs (Figure 29 and 30).

- Awnings are the preferred form of weather protection along 1st Avenue to reflect its traditional retail character.

- Awnings should have a minimum vertical clearance of 2.5m measured from the sidewalk and shall extend out over the sidewalk a minimum of 1.8m. Greater coverage is desirable in areas of high pedestrian traffic and where sidewalk widths are adequate to offer the greatest amount of protection. Awnings should not occupy more than 2/3 of the total sidewalk width.

- Awnings shall have a minimum slope of 30 degrees to allow for proper drainage and self cleaning action of rain and wind, snow and ice.

- Construct awnings of durable, colour-fast material. This may include reinforced plastic coated fabric provided the look and feel of canvas is maintained.

- 3 or 4-point awnings are preferred. The use of quarter barrel awnings are strongly discouraged and should be avoided.

Canopy Guidelines

- Canopies should have a minimum vertical clearance of 2.8m measured from the sidewalk and should extend out over the sidewalk at least 2.5m while maintaining a minimum 0.6m setback from the outer face of the curb (Figure 31).

- Where canopies and awnings encroach on public property, encroachment agreements may be required.

- Use transparent and translucent canopies to allow natural light to penetrate to storefronts and the sidewalk (Figure 32).

- Break up canopies greater than 30m in length to reduce their apparent scale and length and to reflect the articulation of the building facade.

Signage Guidelines

- Signage on the front face of a 4-point awning is acceptable but shall not exceed 0.3m in height (Figure 33).

- Provide attractive signage on commercial buildings that identifies uses and shops clearly but which is scaled to the pedestrian rather than the motorist.

- Limit signage in number, location and size to reduce visual clutter and make individual signs easier to see.

- The following are preferred or acceptable types of commercial signage in the downtown:
  - Flush mounted fascia signs (Figure 34);
  - Projecting two-dimensional or “blade” type signs suspended from canopies and awnings (Figure 35);
  - Externally lighted signs;
  - Vertical banners; and
  - Individual cut-out or silhouette letter signs mounted on storefronits. Individual letters should not exceed 45cm (18”) in any dimension.

- The following types of signage are not permitted along 1st Avenue, and are strongly discouraged and should be avoided for the rest of Downtown Mission:
  - Signs as awnings/awnings as signs (Figure 33);
  - Internally lighted plastic box signs;
  - Pylon (stand alone) signs; and
  - Rooftop signs.

- A single external (flush mounted) sign band may be applied to each facade at the first storey, and may not exceed 0.9m in height along any length.

- Signage shall be externally lit. Signage within shop front glazing may be back lit, but shall not exceed 0.5m in height and 2 metres in length.

- Vertical projecting signs are permitted provided they don’t exceed 0.9 metres in width and 4 metres in height.
Lighting Guidelines

- Ensure lighting is sensitive to nearby residential uses. Avoid visible, glaring light sources by using down-and/or up-lights with cutoff shields (Figure 36). Incorporate architectural glare-free lighting into the canopy soffit that has either a low level light source or one not directly visible to pedestrians. Fluorescent tube lights are not permitted for this use.
- Gooseneck lights and sconces applied to fascias underneath weather protection are the preferred type of storefront lighting along 1st Avenue.
- Provide pedestrian scaled lighting with a high quality of design detail above sidewalks for night time visibility.
- Incorporate valence lighting into canopies and uplighting to illuminate pathways.
- The use of exterior fluorescent light sources should be avoided along 1st Avenue and throughout the downtown.

4.1.8 Green, Healthy, Livable Buildings and Landscapes

Intent: To encourage building design and site planning that maximize livability, daylight access and energy efficiency and reduce the overall "ecological footprint" (energy use, waste, and pollution) of new development.

Incorporation of green building features such as living walls, green roofs, and roof top gardens can also help create a unique character for Downtown Mission that expresses the aspirations and values of the District.

Guidelines

- Site and design new development to maximize the privacy of adjacent outdoor private open spaces.
- Site and orient new development so that a majority of primary living spaces receive direct sunlight for the daylight hours at Equinox.
- Residential buildings should be designed to receive daylight and natural ventilation from at least two sides of a building, or from one side and a roof. Where possible, dwellings should have a choice of aspect, either front and back, or on two sides for corner units (Figure 38).
- New buildings should be designed with greater floor to ceiling heights (i.e., 9’–10’) to increase the amount of interior space that can be day-lit from windows.

- Dwelling units with exterior access on only one side should always face a good view, the direction of the sun, or ideally both, and are more suitable as wide frontages with shallow floor plans to allow adequate penetration of daylight. Dwelling units with exterior access on two sides are usually suitable with narrow frontages and deep floor plates.

- New developments should ensure that the siting, form, and scale of buildings do not block significant public views and solar access from existing or anticipated development, and that shadowing impacts on adjacent residential buildings and usable open spaces are minimized.

- Residential and mixed-use projects should incorporate courtyards and greenways as defining elements of the project while providing a common garden area, play space, gathering place, walkway, or other uses located to maximize the amount of direct sunlight received (Figure 39).

- Roof top gardens and other types of roof top common open spaces are encouraged, particularly where at-grade space is limited. Where possible, upper storey terraces are encouraged to open onto roof top gardens to increase access to semi-private outdoor amenity space (Figure 40).

- Incorporate green roofs where appropriate to help absorb storm water and provide outdoor amenity space for residents/workers.

- Best management practices for retention and infiltration of rain water shall be used as appropriate (Figure 41).

- Light pollution should be minimized by using full cut-off lighting, avoiding light reflectance. Exceptions may be made for signage and architectural lighting.

- Make use of existing buildings where possible or carefully deconstruct buildings and re-use materials.

- Use of materials with recycled content is encouraged.

- Each dwelling unit in a residential or mixed-use project should incorporate direct access to a usable private outdoor space such as a patio, balcony, or upper level terrace. These should be of adequate size and be covered to ensure comfort and usability.

- Landscaping should incorporate and emphasize existing and native landscape materials and the use of drought

- Avoid visible, glaring light sources by using down-and/or up-lights with cutoff shields (Figure 36). Incorporate architectural glare-free lighting into the canopy soffit that has either a low level light source or one not directly visible to pedestrians. Fluorescent tube lights are not permitted for this use.
- Gooseneck lights and sconces applied to fascias underneath weather protection are the preferred type of storefront lighting along 1st Avenue.
- Provide pedestrian scaled lighting with a high quality of design detail above sidewalks for night time visibility.
- Incorporate valence lighting into canopies and uplighting to illuminate pathways.
- The use of exterior fluorescent light sources should be avoided along 1st Avenue and throughout the downtown.
resistant plants (xeriscaping) to reduce water usage for irrigation needs.

- Use landscaping (i.e. deciduous trees) and architectural features (i.e. recessed balconies, overhangs, and shade devices) to provide shade in the summer months (Figure 42).

- New developments should incorporate a combination of landscaping materials to enhance and integrate new projects into the surrounding landscape and to improve the experience and overall livability of residents and users of new developments.

- The form of buildings should be softened using plants, shrubs and trees, and where necessary, hard landscaping treatments such as terraced retaining walls and planters (Figure 43).

4.1.9 Topography and Views

Overview and Intent: Downtown Mission is located on a south facing hillside overlooking the Fraser Valley and the Cascade Mountains beyond (Figure 44). This results in long distance views of the valley and surrounding mountains from several viewpoints in Downtown Mission, most notably from the north-south street ends. This is a unique feature of Downtown Mission, which could be built upon and enhanced.

Views towards the Fraser Valley and the rail, river and agricultural uses are important to Downtown Mission’s sense of place and identity and represent an important asset to protect and enhance. The intent of the following guidelines is to preserve and enhance key public views.

Guidelines

- Site and design buildings to respond to specific site conditions and opportunities including location on prominent intersections, corner lots, unusual topography and natural features, sites framing important open spaces and sites with buildings that terminate a street end view.

- New development should reflect, rather than obscure, significant natural topographic features. Buildings should be designed to “step down” hillsides to accommodate significant changes in elevation and to connect with and transition well into the sidewalk and street.

- New development and landscaping should frame rather than block public views.

- A view impact study is required as a component of Development Permit submission requirements for steep slope sites to ensure new development does not block significant public views.

- Discourage use of retaining walls except where required to preserve native slopes or address stability requirements.

- Where walls are required, ensure design and materials are context-sensitive and aesthetically pleasing and retaining walls are stepped to help reduce visual impact (Figure 45).

- Set retaining wall steps to be sufficient width for the planting required (e.g. larger step required for trees).
4.1.10 Personal Safety, Security and Accessibility

**Intent:** To enhance personal safety and security through building siting, orientation, and design. To ensure buildings and open spaces accommodate and provide access for all users and abilities.

**Guidelines**
- Site and design buildings and open spaces to maximize opportunities for passive surveillance (Figures 46 and 47).
- Incorporate creative use of ornamental grilles over ground floor windows or as fencing as necessary and where appropriate.
- Provide adequate lighting along streets and at entrances to enhance the sense of personal safety and security.
- Design parking areas to allow natural surveillance by retaining clear lines of sight to and between public sidewalks and building entrances both for those who park there and for users of nearby buildings.
- Eliminate structures and/or landscaping and plant materials that provide hiding places for undesirable activity. Generally, landscaping that is above the head or below the knee is appropriate.
- Ensure all pedestrian routes including those leading to building entrances are accessible to a wide range of persons with disabilities. Generally, such routes should be direct, level, obstacle free, easily identifiable and clearly separated from vehicular routes.

4.2 Streetscape Design Guidelines

The urban streetscape is fundamental to the experience people have when visiting Downtown Mission. The streetscape forms a comparatively large portion of our public realm, but paradoxically is more often than not, relegated to basic sidewalks.

Street right-of-ways are typically viewed as spaces for conveyance, with emphasis on vehicular movement. It is important to recognize the contribution these spaces also make to our pedestrian experience.

To achieve Downtown Mission’s vision of a “thriving, exciting, vibrant, vital, urban, attractive, safe and family-oriented” community and to differentiate it from other urban areas in the region, attention must be given to creating well-designed streetscapes that promote pedestrian safety and comfort, foster investment by private businesses and ultimately define a sense of place for the downtown community.

The Streetscape Design Guidelines proposed for Downtown Mission are an effort to distill a design ‘vocabulary’ for future enhancement of public spaces. Implementation of these guidelines should be an exercise in balancing consistency with diversity, rather than a strict adherence to requirements. As the community develops, creativity, innovative ideas and good design should be supported to help Downtown Mission thrive as a unique entity in the Lower Mainland.

4.2.1 Streetscape Elements

The term ‘streetscape’ generally refers to the exterior public spaces located between vehicle zone and building façade within a road right-of-way. These guidelines address the features that exist within these spaces, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paving</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>street trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boulevard &amp; median plantings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>container plantings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater treatment areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Furnishings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter receptacles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moveable tables &amp; chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bollards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle lock-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transit shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking meters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utility covers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 STREETSCAPE ZONES

Typically, road ROWs can be divided into five zones:

▪ **Vehicle Zone** – This zone provides space for vehicle driving and parking. The streetscape guidelines do not specifically address the vehicle zone.

▪ **Edge Zone** – This zone, closest to the vehicle lanes, provides consideration for vehicle-related facilities, including parking meters, signage and curbs.

▪ **Planting/Furnishings Zone** – This zone is the buffer between the pedestrian realm and the vehicle realm. This area contains a range of elements including buffer plantings, stormwater systems and street furnishings.

▪ **Pedestrian Zone** – This is the area that maintains adequate sidewalk width for pedestrian movement, and is kept clear of all furnishings. Width of the pedestrian zone is based on pedestrian volume.

▪ **Building Frontage Zone** – This is the space immediately adjacent to building façade. This area can contain pedestrian-scale signs, outdoor merchandise stands or seating where space permits.

4.2.3 PAVING

Sidewalk paving materials vary widely. The ground plane is a significant part of our streetscape experience and while many fail to realize it, what is under our feet is one of the key determining factors in how we use a space.

**Sidewalk:**

▪ Use a mix of paving materials to create a varied pedestrian experience, according to the following guidelines:

  **Concrete:**
  - Scoring patterns and varied finishes (e.g. broom, smooth, float) and textures (e.g. exposed aggregate) should be considered to add interest.
  - Expansive runs of concrete should be broken up with accent paving or texture changes.
  - Coloured concrete used with the intent of producing inexpensive replicas of other materials (such as cobblestone or brick) should be avoided, as results over large areas are typically disappointing and degradation over time is apparent.

  **Unit Pavers:**
  - Consider using unit pavers – concrete, brick or stone – broadly for pedestrian areas. Unit pavers provide opportunities to integrate patterns, colours and creativity. Pavers are typically costlier at installation, but offer advantages for maintenance, replacement and access to sub-grade utilities.

  **Accent paving:**
  - Paving changes or accents should be used to enhance or highlight street features (such as tree wells, public art, building entries, etc.)
    - Connected streetscapes should use unified paving materials and accents.
    - All paving materials should have smooth, slip-resistant finishes that meet requirements for accessibility.
    - Asphalt paving in pedestrian areas should be avoided.

**Crosswalks**

▪ Pedestrian crosswalks should be provided at all main pedestrian crossings and/or desire lines to raise driver awareness.
Consider raised pedestrian crosswalks at key pedestrian crossings to provide traffic calming (e.g. adjacent to schools, or public facilities).

Consider incorporation of corner bulges at pedestrian crossings to calm traffic and empathize crossing locations.

Consider using decorative crosswalk materials, such as unit pavers or textured paving to create a visual continuation of the pedestrian realm.

Traffic signals or standard crosswalk signage should be provided to mark pedestrian crossings.

All crosswalks should meet accessibility guidelines (including textured markers for the visually impaired).

4.2.4 PLANTINGS

More than any other streetscape component, plantings enliven public spaces, define the pedestrian scale and soften the hard edges of an urban environment. Vegetation helps to buffer undesirable views, reduces detrimental effects of wind and noise, provides shade, colour and seasonal interest, lowers energy consumption and helps mitigate pollution. Street trees are also known to provide traffic calming by visually narrowing a street. In short, vegetation makes a community truly livable, because it takes decades for trees to mature, existing trees are key to short-term livability and vibrancy. Existing street trees should be preserved and protected, provided they are healthy and appropriate to street character.

Street Trees

Selection of tree species is critical to the health and longevity of a community’s urban forest therefore, street trees species should meet the following guidelines:

- Efforts should be made to maintain visual cohesiveness by using repeated tree species through urban blocks (e.g. 1-2 species should be selected for a single block). However, monocultures (use of only a single species) should be avoided over large areas or multiple blocks, to reduce possibility of eradication due to disease or pests.

- Selected species must be capable of tolerating harsh urban conditions. Tree species with the following characteristics should be avoided:
  - Extensive shallow root systems that could lift or damage pavements.
  - Excessive fruit, branches or very large leaves/flowers that create extensive litter. This should be tempered with the expectation that all trees produce some litter.
  - High levels of susceptibility to pests and diseases.
  - Low tolerance to pollutants, salt, sun exposure, drought, reflected heat from pavements, high winds, snow loading or limited root zone volumes.
  - Weak branching structure susceptible to breakage.

- Branching structure of selected species should provide at minimum 3 m (10’) clearance where crown overhangs adjacent pedestrian and vehicular zones.

- Trees should have a minimum 13 cm (5”) caliper size at time of installation.

- Street tree placement should meet the following guidelines:
  - Street tree layout should be designed with street lighting to ensure that sufficient levels of illumination will be available as trees mature.
  - Street tree layout should be planned with other street elements including, but not limited to: traffic signals, signage, underground utilities, utility poles and lines, driveways, catch basins, manholes and fire hydrants, to avoid conflict.
  - Typical spacing for street trees is suggested to be 8m–12m (26’-40’), subject to specific species requirement and layout of other street elements.

- Street tree installation techniques must be followed to reduce incidences of stunted or poor tree growth, adjacent pavement heaving or tree death.

  - Street trees should be planted within continuous soft landscape wherever possible.

  - For street trees encased in paving, continuous trenches of void structures (e.g. Silva cells), structural soil or other appropriate planting technologies should be provided under the planting/furnishing zone pavement. These trenches should be located parallel to curb lines and will provide sufficient volumes of soil for root growth.

  - Where trees are in pavement, decorative metal tree grates that are removable for cleaning litter or unit pavers should be used. Heavy concrete tree grates should be avoided.
Boulevard & Median Plantings
Low-level vegetation, including shrubs and groundcover can help soften urban edges and provide a buffer between pedestrians and motorists. This vegetation also supports mitigation of pollution and stormwater effects.

- Planting beds should be considered to create vegetated buffers between pedestrians and vehicles to screen undesirable views on adjacent properties (e.g. parking).
- Selected plant species should be drought tolerant, salt tolerant and non-invasive.
- Plantings should be selected and placed to maintain sightlines for both pedestrians and motorists.
- Plantings should be selected to provide year-round seasonal interest.
- Consideration should be given to the use of vines or plant support structures on blank facades and fences to enhance vertical greening.

Container Plantings
Containers typically provide space for seasonal or planting space in locations where existing conditions preclude in-ground planting.

- Containers should be large enough to prevent soil from drying too quickly – minimum 1.2m (4’) dia.
- Containers should be selected to complement other streetscape elements.
- Seasonal annuals, bulbs, vines and shrubs should be selected for drought tolerance and specific micro-climatic conditions such as wind and shade.
- Seasonal plantings should be selected to provide year-round interest.
- Hanging baskets should be considered as potential components on streetscape lighting and signage poles.
- Private businesses should be encouraged to provide and maintain container plantings in the building frontage zone.

Stormwater Treatment Areas
The pedestrian realm yields an opportunity to manage and treat stormwater runoff from urban pavements. In addition to environmental benefits, streetscape stormwater treatments raise visibility of stormwater initiatives and can complement street plantings.

- Where feasible, utilize planted boulevards and medians to collect and treat street runoff from storm events.
- Provide appropriate connections to storm system for overflow during major storm events.
- Sub-surface infiltration trenches may also be considered for the collection and treatment of stormwater.

4.2.5 STREET FURNISHINGS
When properly selected and placed, street furnishings can enhance the function and character of a downtown. These elements work best when their designs are coordinated, giving the streetscape a unified appearance. As Downtown Mission continues to develop, there is an opportunity to implement a cohesive approach to furnishings.

Benches
In addition to comfort and convenience, provision of benches in urban areas encourages social interaction, which is the foundation for a successful downtown.

- Benches used in Downtown Mission should be coordinated around a theme so that a cohesive style is apparent. Cues from the community’s historical and natural character should be considered when selecting a style.
- Materials should be durable through all seasons, resistant to vandalism and require minimal maintenance. Metal, wood, recycled plastic or a combination of these materials may be used.
- Black is recommended for the colour of all metal bench components.
- Donor programs could be considered for benches, with small, tasteful plaques for commemoration.
- At minimum, two benches (or other seating opportunities) should be provided on every standard block. Groupings of additional benches should be provided in high-use areas.
- Benches are best placed in proximity to street corners, mid-block crosswalks, bus stops and other desirable resting locations. Consideration to shade should be given.
- Bench locations should not obstruct building entrances, fire hydrants or other streetscape features.
- Benches are best provided within the Building Frontage zone, oriented toward the pedestrian and vehicular zones of the street. Seating opportunities may also be provided.
within the Planting/Furnishings zone, oriented toward the pedestrian zone.

**Litter and Recycling Receptacles**
Conveniently located litter and recycling receptacles within the pedestrian realm encourage residents to keep their community clean.

- Litter receptacles should be coordinated to complement selected bench styles and colours.
- Litter receptacles are best placed near street intersections, at mid-block crosswalks and near proposed bench locations.
- A minimum of two receptacles per typical city block should be provided.
- Consideration should be given to receptacles that provide opportunities for division of waste streams to recyclables and trash.

**Moveable Furnishings**
Outdoor café and restaurant seating creates interest in the streetscape, enhances the quality of the pedestrian experience and adds to economic vitality. Moveable furnishings are typically installed by individual business owners and are thus subject to their aesthetic preferences.

- The use of moveable furnishings by street-fronting businesses should be encouraged.
- Streetscape paving should endeavour to delineate pedestrian zones from building zones to minimize encroachment.
- Moveable furnishings should be maintained by the business owner and should be stored out of the public right-of-way during non-business hours.

**Bollards**
Bollards are used to create barriers between pedestrian and vehicle realms. While safety is the primary objective of bollards, they are also an important component of streetscape character.

- Styles and colours of decorative bollards should match the quality and appearance of site furnishings and lighting selected for Downtown Mission.
- Bollard material should be metal (aluminum or cast iron); wood bollards should not be used.
- Bollards should typically be set 1.8m (6’) O.C. where chains are not used; 3m (10’) O.C. where chains are used.
- Consideration should be given to selecting bicycle lock-up bollards in locations where space permits.

**Bicycle Lock-up**
The community has shown a desire to create a more cycling-friendly environment. As more people begin to work in, live in and visit Downtown Mission, facilities will be required to support alternative modes of transportation.

- Bicycle racks and/or stands should be provided in high-use, visible locations throughout Downtown Mission.
- Styles and colours of bicycle racks or stands should match the quality and appearance of site furnishings selected for Downtown Mission.
- Racks should be located to ensure parked bikes do not encroach into the pedestrian or vehicle zones.
- Consideration should be given to creative or ‘art’ stands that provide visual interest, as well as a functional service.

**Lighting**
Pedestrian-oriented lighting is vital in high pedestrian areas. Lighting should create a safe streetscape while adding character to Downtown Mission.

- A unifying pedestrian lighting style should be selected for streets with high pedestrian movement.
- Black is recommended for the colour of light standards.
- Incorporation of features such as hanging baskets and banners on light stands should be considered.
- Lighting selections should use full-cut off shields to minimize light pollution.

**Banners**
Banners are used in communities to celebrate seasonal changes, holidays, special events, local history, unique neighbourhood distinctions or public art. They are a cost effective way to introduce streetscape colour and interest.

- Consider using repeated neighbourhood banners to solidify Downtown Mission’s identity and character.
- Where banners are used, ensure graphic designs are clear and simple to quickly convey messages to both pedestrians and motorists.

**Signs**
Signs provide us with vital information about our environment. Typically the approach to signage is to erect information as needed, without consideration to the physical appearance as signs accumulate over time. Signage within the public realm should be approached as a streetscape element and be...
Pedestrian-oriented sandwich boards invite people into shops.

An address sign is incorporated into paving.

thoughtfully integrated into the street design.

▪ Where possible, minimize and consolidate street signs to reduce visual clutter.
▪ Do not permit free-standing business signs within the public streetscape realm.
▪ Consider permitting local business owners to use sandwich board signage in the streetscape, as long as signs do not encroach on the pedestrian zone.

Public Art
Public art can reflect an area’s history, be inspiring or playful, be functional, make a statement – or all of these. Public art can include sculptures, statues, murals, functional pieces or a range of other forms and should engage viewers of all ages.

▪ Consider incorporation of public art into the streetscape at key nodes such as gateways, entry points or destinations.
▪ Consideration should be given to Mission’s unique history and natural character when selecting public art.
▪ Public art with touchable or experiential elements should be encouraged to promote active engagement by the public.

Walls & Raised Planters
The vertical landscape is an important design consideration. Large, smooth, blank walls are not only austere, but can be magnets for vandalism.

▪ Reduce large expanses of blank walls through the use of material changes, architectural cues, texture or planting.
▪ For walls in the public realm, consider use of natural materials (e.g. stone) that complement and integrate with paving materials.
▪ Look for opportunities to incorporate public art and interest into walls.

Fences
In all cases where fencing is visible from the public streetscape, fencing design should contribute to, not detract from, street character.

▪ Wherever fencing is part of or directly adjacent to the public streetscape, high quality aluminum, steel or wrought iron picket fencing should be used. Wood, chainlink and metal bar fences should be avoided.
▪ Fencing height should not exceed 1.2m (4’) in height.

▪ Where possible, screening of fences through the use of low shrubs or vines should be considered.
▪ Encourage custom designed fences that contribute to the character of the streetscape.

Bus Stops
Bus stops should be spaced approximately 250m from one another.

▪ Bus stops should be located at curb-side to minimize service interruption (rather than bus bays).
▪ Bus stops should include an identification pole and sign, as well as schedules and route maps.
▪ Bus stops should include shelters, benches, and garbage bins.
▪ Bus stops may include “real-time” transit information in coordination with the regional system.
▪ Bus stops may incorporate advertising or public art in accordance with existing bylaws and regulations.

Transit Shelters
Public transit will become increasingly important as Mission’s population grows. Shelters provide improved waiting conditions for commuters and form important components of the downtown streetscape.

▪ Consider providing covered shelters at high-volume public transit stops.
▪ Styles and colours of transit stops should match the quality and appearance of site furnishings selected for Downtown Mission.
▪ Transit shelters should be well-lit and visible for safety.
▪ Transit shelters should be placed with consideration to architectural features on adjacent building facades and to avoid obstruction to building entrances.
▪ Consideration should be given to tasteful art or advertising near or incorporated into transit shelters.

Transit Exchange
The style of the transit exchange and bus stops throughout Downtown Mission can be customized to complement the aesthetics of Downtown Mission.

▪ Transit exchanges should be designed using the guidelines from BC Transit’s Infrastructure Design Guidelines.
▪ The transit exchange should include:
» Curb-side bus bays;
» Lighting;
» Passenger facilities including: shelters, benches, and transit information;
» Convenient pedestrian street crossings; and
» Well designed sidewalks and curbs in all directions approaching the transit exchange.

Parking Meters
Currently parking meters are not used within Downtown Mission. As the community develops, paid parking may be considered. Should this occur, design and placement of parking payment facilities to reduce visual street clutter will be important.
- Consideration should be given to using automated meter boxes on each block in lieu of individual parking meters.
- If individual parking meters are required, simple, durable styles should be used.
- Consider future needs for electrical charging stations.

Utility Covers
While utility covers are the lowliest of streetscape components, they are one of the most prevalent and comment elements within our public realm. Misplaced or ‘ugly’ covers can detract from the streetscape image.
- All utility covers should be carefully placed to integrate with the streetscape paving patterns.
- Visible covers in high-use areas should be considered for upgrades, including potentially higher-quality materials and unique or distinctive designs.
5. Exemptions

1. While the Design Guidelines must be followed, a Development Permit application is not required; however, a development proposing to construct a new building(s) or an addition to an existing building(s) less than 111.5 sq. m. will be evaluated by staff ‘in-house’ to ensure consistence with the intent of Development Permit Area Guidelines and will be exempt from requiring a Development Permit.

2. A Development Permit is not required for minor alterations including and limited to:
   » Changes of use that conform to the Zoning Bylaw;
   » Interior renovations;
   » Exterior maintenance requiring only the repair or replacement of existing surface materials and colours, provided that the structures/site does not have identified heritage value as determined by the Director of Planning;
   » Changes to plant material in established landscape areas; and
   » Changes to signage, other than free standing signs.
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Director of Development Services
SUBJECT: Calculation of Park Land Fees
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Section 941 of the Local Government Act

This report is provided for information purposes only. No recommendation accompanies this report and no Council action is required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information as to how the District calculates park land contributions associated with development applications.

BACKGROUND:
In response to a delegation by Debbie Roy, Council, at their November 4, 2013 regular meeting, resolved:

That staff provide a report to Council explaining the method used to determine the park land contribution requirement under the Local Government Act, and the process by which the District collects the cash-in-lieu of neighbourhood park land.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Section 941 of the Local Government Act (Appendix 1) sets out the requirements and options for how park land is provided as part of subdivision applications.

When the District receives an application for subdivision, the owner of the land being subdivided must provide park land to the local government. Section 941 of the Local Government Act then establishes specific criteria in which this park land must be collected, the value of what is collected, the method of collection, and when the park land can be collected.

The owner has two options for providing park land:

i) Provide park land in an amount and location acceptable to the local government, or

ii) Pay to the local government an amount that equals 5% of the market value of the land in the proposed subdivision calculated as that value on the date of the Preliminary Layout Approval (PLA) letter and under the target zone.

The local government has the ability to collect park land or money under the above two options. The District requires that when the land that is subject to the development application includes land that is designated as Park on the District of Mission’s Official Community Plan, the owner must provide land as park land. The Local Government Act states that the amount of land being provided must not
exceed 5% of the land being proposed for subdivision. However, if the portion of land designated as Park equates to only 3% of the land then staff negotiates with the applicant to provide 2% as cash to equate to a 5% contribution.

If there is no Park designation on the Official Community Plan, staff includes in their reports a recommendation to receive “cash in lieu”, which must not exceed 5% of the value of the land. When cash is being paid the amount must be received by the District prior to final approval of the subdivision. When park land is dedicated to the District it is shown as “Park” on the subdivision plan that is registered with the land titles office.

In the case where cash in lieu of land is being provided, the value of land is calculated at the time the preliminary layout approval letter is issued or within 90 days before final approval of the subdivision. The value of the land is based on the zone that permits the proposed use but excludes the cost of any works and services necessary for the subdivision. The value of the land is either determined by an appraisal, which the developer pays for or the amount is agreed upon by the local government and the owner. Staff will use a recent appraisal or BC Assessment information (excluding improvements) of a number of similar sized and zoned properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development as a starting point for negotiations. Using assessed values is conservative for the developers as assessment values are typically lower than market values and it also saves time and money for the developer as they do not have to wait or pay for an appraisal.

One change that staff would like to make is to complete an appraisal of a typical urban and rural lot at the beginning of each year to use as a starting point for negotiations as it is believed it will be an improvement over using BC Assessment information and still saves the developer time and money. The developer will always have the opportunity to complete their own appraisal if desired. In addition, staff could research in more detail the amount of money required to service a lot that is deducted from the land value – about $60,000 per lot is being used at the current time.

Section 941 also includes requirements of when park land or cash is not required:

- a subdivision by which fewer than 3 additional lots would be created, (Diagram A)
- a subdivision by which the smallest lot being created is larger than 2 hectares, or
- a consolidation of existing parcels.

It is unclear why the province only permits local governments to charge park land fees where subdivisions result in 3 or more additional lots.

![Diagram A](image)

Park land payments must be deposited in a reserve fund established for the purpose of acquiring park lands. The current balance of the District’s Park Land Reserve is approximately $2,400,000. Unfortunately, these funds cannot be used for the purchase of park amenities or regular maintenance nor can the interest on these funds.

Staff will look at developing a procedure that clearly sets out the steps and options available when calculating park land fees that can be provided to developers to provide clarity.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. Developing a procedure that clarifies how parkland contributions can be calculated will lead to greater certainty for developers and staff.

COMMUNICATION:
Further communication is not required at this time. The park land dedication requirements are reviewed with developers during established planning processes. Staff do need to ensure that financial implications of any changes to proposed developments that are negotiated as part of the development process are fully discussed with developers and owners prior to formalizing the changes.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Council resolved for staff to provide information as to how the amount or value of park land that is provided to Mission at time of subdivision is calculated. Staff calculates the park land contribution either as land or money in a manner consistent with section 941 of the Local Government Act. Staff do need to remember to make developers aware of the financial implications associated with any changes to a proposed development prior to formalizing the changes.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services  Reviewed by:
Marcy Bond, Planner

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Appendix 1

Section 941 of Local Government Act

Provision of park land

941  (1) Subject to section 905.1 (4) (h) and (4.1), an owner of land being subdivided must, at the owner's option,

   (a) provide, without compensation, park land of an amount and in a location acceptable to the local government, or
   (b) pay to the municipality or regional district an amount that equals the market value of the land that may be required for park land purposes under this section determined under subsection (6).

(2) Despite subsection (1), if an official community plan contains policies and designations respecting the location and type of future parks, the local government may determine whether the owner must provide land under subsection (1) (a) or money under subsection (1) (b).

(3) Despite subsections (1) and (2), if a regional district does not provide a community parks service, the option under subsection (1) (b) does not apply and the owner must provide land in accordance with subsection (1) (a).

(4) The amount of land that may be required under subsection (1) (a) or used for establishing the amount that may be paid under subsection (1) (b) must not exceed 5% of the land being proposed for subdivision.

(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to

   (a) a subdivision by which fewer than 3 additional lots would be created, except as provided in subsection (5.1),
   (b) a subdivision by which the smallest lot being created is larger than 2 hectares, or
   (c) a consolidation of existing parcels.

(5.1) Subsection (1) does apply to a subdivision by which fewer than 3 additional lots would be created if the parcel proposed to be subdivided was itself created by subdivision within the past 5 years.

(6) If an owner is to pay money under subsection (1) (b), the value of the land is whichever of the following is applicable:

   (a) the average market value of all the land in the proposed subdivision calculated as that value would be on either
      (i) the date of preliminary approval of the subdivision, or
      (ii) if no preliminary approval is given, a date within 90 days before the final approval of the subdivision, as though
      (iii) the land is zoned to permit the proposed use, and
      (iv) any works and services necessary to the subdivision have not been installed;

   (b) if the local government and the owner agree on a value for the land, the value on which they have agreed.
(7) If an owner and a local government do not agree on the market value for the purpose of subsection (6), it must be determined in the manner prescribed in the regulations that the minister may make for the purpose.

(8) If an area of land has been used to calculate the amount of land or money provided or paid under this section, that area must not be taken into account for a subsequent entitlement under subsection (1) in respect of any future subdivision of the land.

(9) Subject to subsection (11), land or payment referred to in subsection (1) must be provided or paid to a municipality or regional district before final approval is given, or the owner and the local government may enter into an agreement that the land or payment be provided or paid by a date, specified in the agreement, after final approval has been given.

(10) Notice of an agreement under subsection (9) must be filed with the registrar of land titles in the same manner as a notice of a permit may be filed and section 927 applies.

(11) Despite subsection (9), the minister may, by regulation,

(a) authorize the payment that may be required by this section to be made by instalments, and
(b) prescribe the conditions under which instalments may be paid.

(12) If an owner pays money for park land under this section, the municipality or regional district must deposit this in a reserve fund established for the purpose of acquiring park lands.

(13) If land is provided for park land under this section, the land must be shown as park on the plan of subdivision.

(14) Section 107 of the Land Title Act applies to park land referred to in subsection (13), except that

(a) in the case of land within a municipality, title vests in the municipality, and
(b) in the case of land outside a municipality, title vests in the regional district if it provides a community parks service.

(15) Any reserve fund established by a regional district under the Park (Regional) Act must be continued on the repeal of that Act as a reserve fund under this Act held for the purpose of acquiring regional parks or regional trails.
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Marcy Bond, Planner
SUBJECT: Mission Community Heritage Commission Accomplishments for 2013 and 2014 Work Plan
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 - Mission Community Heritage Commission 2014 Work Plan

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Mission Community Heritage Commission’s 2014 work plan, as included within the Planner’s report dated December 16, 2013, be approved; and

2. That $3,600 of the unused 2013 budget be carried forward to the 2014 budget to cover the costs of finalizing the Context Study.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend approval of the Mission Community Heritage Commission’s (Commission) 2014 work plan and to summarize the Commission’s work completed in 2013.

BACKGROUND:
The Commission is required to submit an annual work plan for Council approval each year (Appendix 1). This is also an opportune time to summarize the work completed in 2013.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Mission Community Heritage Commission Accomplishments 2013

In addition to the routine tasks and events the Commission participates in, a major accomplishment this year was the near completion of the Context Study. The purpose of the Context Study was to help the Community and the Commission identify a broad range of heritage aspects that the community values. The Context Study also helps the Commission determine what places should be on the District of Mission’s Community Heritage Register. The research and writing of the Context Study was undertaken by members of the Commission; thus saving a significant amount of funds in not hiring a professional heritage consultant to undertake the project. Now that 90% of the Context Study has been completed there is a need for professional editing and tidying up of the document, prior to its finalization. To accomplish this last task the Commission is requesting that $3,600 from the 2013 budget be carried forward to the 2014 budget.

The Context Study enables the Commission and the District to identify those properties that should be included in the District of Mission’s Community Heritage Register. Once Council has approved
properties for the District’s Community Heritage Register, they are forwarded to the Province for inclusion on the Provincial government’s Heritage Register. The province then forwards the properties that are on the Register with a Statement of Significance to the Federal Government for inclusion on the Federal Heritage Register. A Statement of Significance summarizes the description, heritage values and character of each historic place. Research has shown that the Federal Government’s website, Canada’s Historic Places (http://www.newwestcity.ca/business/planning_development/heritage.php), receives 66,000 hits per month. The amount of public interest in culturally important sites can have an economic spinoff for those communities that are identified on the federal register.

Another major accomplishment of the Commission was their ability to hire a heritage professional to write two Statements of Significance for properties identified in the Context Study and one values statement. These three properties include: Canada Post Office, CPR Train Bridge and the old Mission Fair Grounds. The documentation on these properties will be completed by the end of the year with subsequent submission for inclusion on the District’s Register. The Statement of Significance identifies what part of history a place represents, and how and why it is of value and of importance today. Statements of Significance are written by professionals who must back up each fact with a minimum of two sources of information to verify that the information being presented is accurate. A values statement is done where there is not sufficient information to develop a statement of significance but the community values the place.

Last year the Commission was actively involved in promoting the Regional Heritage Fair in Mission schools. They were able to get one school to participate in the Regional Heritage Fair. The Commission was responsible for arranging for poster boards for the students, arranging judges and providing refreshments for everyone as well as ensuring all the necessary information was received by the school.

**Mission Community Heritage Commission Work Plan for 2014**

The Context Study will be completed in early 2014 and will be posted on the web site and made available to the public.

The other major projects in Commission’s work plan for the upcoming 2014 year include the identification of one more heritage site, identified in the Context Study, which could be included on the District's Register after a Statement of Significance is developed.

The Commission is also looking to improve their web site with the development of a virtual tour to help attract visitors to Mission. The Commission will be encouraged to work with the District’s Economic Development Officer and Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives.

The Commission’s goal this year is to increase the participation in the Regional Heritage Fair. They will undertake the same role as last year with arranging judges, and ensuring the schools have the correct information to submit the applications.

With the completion of the Context Study in late January 2014, adding places to the District’s Register and continuing to promote the Heritage Strategic Plan and participation in the Regional Heritage Fair the Commission will have a full work schedule for 2014.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The financial implication associated with this report include carrying forward $3,600 from the 2013
Mission Community Heritage Commission budget to their 2014 budget to enable the completion of the Context Study. The 2013 budget for the Heritage Commission is $11,800. Estimated costs for 2013 are $7,270. Estimated amount available for carry forward is $4,530.

COMMUNICATION:
Staff will let the Commission know Council's decision regarding the 2014 workplan and budget carry forward request.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
A Context Study and Statements of Significance were developed by the Heritage Commission in 2013. The 2014 work plan includes the following tasks:

- Completion of the Context Study;
- Hold monthly meetings open to the public & continue to implement the Heritage Strategic Plan;
- Renew memberships in local, provincial and federal organizations that support heritage;
- Continue a program of recognition and awards to be held during Heritage Week;
- Continue to develop the web site that will attract residents and visitors interested in our Heritage;
- Continue to develop criteria for the Context Study that will be used to add more sites to our Heritage Register; and
- Increasing school participation in the Provincial Heritage Fair.

It is recommended that Council approve a carry forward of $3,600 from the Commission’s 2013 budget to their 2014 budget to complete the Context Study.

SIGN-OFFS:

Marcy Bond, Planner

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie Director of Development Services

Reviewed by:
Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Mission Community Heritage Commission

2014 Work Plan & Budget

Executive Summary

As with last year the members have been very busy this year. First off in November 2012 we sent a member of the Heritage Commission to represent Mission at the Heritage Networking Conference in Nanaimo. Nanaimo has done a revitalization of their downtown area with Heritage as a key point of the revitalization, so we felt we had to be in attendance. The date for this year's Networking Conference has not been set as yet, but will be held in November.

We have retained our memberships in organizations at all levels of government that support heritage conservation.

Late last year we finished off the Context plan for the district and in the early part of the new year, 2013, it was accepted by the members of the commission. In the past the Provincial Government funded the cost of putting these plans together, but with funding removed we did this using funding provided by the District of Mission. Generally these studies came in at about $16,000 to $20,000. Since we tried to do this as economical as possible, we did most of the work ourselves using the Prince George Context Plan as a basis for our plan. With that in mind we did not use most of the $6000.00 that were allocated for the Context plan Study. The surplus money was held over to this year to be used to add three more properties to the Heritage Registry. With that in mind we put out a RFP with the help of the Planning Department in early February, for a professional to write three Statements of Significance.

In Early April 2013 we were able to hire Leslie Gilbert to write three Statements of Significance, which she is in the process of finishing up. This year we will be adding the Fraser River CPR Bridge, the area called the Fair Grounds at Seventh Avenue & Talbut Street, and the Post Office Building located at First Avenue & Welton Street. These three spots were noted in our Context Plan as sites that have been special to the development of Mission. In the coming years we would like to add one property annually.

We are going to modify some of the content of the Context Plan to bring it more in line with other reports in the province. To do this we have contacted Leslie Gilbert and she has agreed to do the necessary work that needs to be done. With that in mind we are carrying forward $3,600.00 from our 2013 budget.

The next thing we have planned to do this year is to get more of the Mission schools involved with Historica. This is a Regional Heritage Fair with schools throughout the region participating. It works on the same idea as the already in place Regional Science Fair. The regional fair has been going on in Abbotsford for a number of years, but schools in Mission were not involved for the first 17 years. Last year we were able to get one school interested; Hatzic Elementary. Twenty-five students from Mr. Gwynn’s class put projects together & we sent 10 projects to the 2013 Historica held at Tradex. Last year
there were over 450 projects up for judging with Madison Stroet of Hatzic winning first place in the History of Technology.

This year during Heritage Week we presented awards of recognition to, Valerie Hundert for her many years of work to preserve the heritage of Mission, Dr. Kulidp Kaur Gill for her books on life in the Fraser Valley, and to the Royal Canadian Legion Branch # 57 for their continuing effort to preserve the memory of the men & women from the Mission area who gave their lives to preserve freedom in Canada.

The budget for 2014 has been prepared in accordance with part (c)(1) of the Commission Terms of Reference. The budget is in line with the amount approved by Council in December 2007. The work plan is for one year January 2014 to December 2014.

Central to the Commissions work is the implementation of the District of Mission Heritage Strategic Plan that is based on a five year cycle. For 2014 the Commission has made a commitment to carry on with public education and awareness of heritage conservation. We are also committed to adding one more site to our Heritage Register.

Work Plan

Between January 2014 & December 2014, the Mission Community Heritage Commission plans to carry out the following activities from the District of Mission Heritage Strategic Plan (hereafter, DMHSP) (the relevant section(s) of the Heritage Strategic Plan are referenced in brackets).

- Hold monthly meeting open to the public and continue to implement the Heritage Strategic Plan. (DMHSP-Terms of Reference Part 3 (B-3)
- Renew memberships in local, provincial, and federal organizations that support heritage conservation (DMHSP goal #7 – Objective 2 – Actively participates with local, regional and provincial organizations and maintain these connections.)
- Continue a program of recognition and awards to be held during Heritage Week (third week in February of each year) that acknowledges individuals, groups and businesses. (DMHSP Goal # 6, Objective 6 – Develop a program of recognition and awards.
- Continue developing our web site for a virtual tour that will attract residents and visitors interested in our heritage and also develop social networking technology. (DMHSP Goal #5 – Object 3 Utilize electronic communication resources.)
- Continue to develop criteria for Context planning that will be used to add more sites to our Heritage Registry (DMHSP Goal # 4 – Objective 3 – Continue to compile an inventory of Heritage resources.)
- Try to get schools in the District involved in the Provincial Heritage Fair ( DMHSP Goal # 6 Objective 2 – Encourage development and use of school heritage programs.)
Financial Management

In keeping with the section on budget and Expenditures in Part 3: Operating Procedures (c) (1) of the Commission's terms of Reference, the Commission has prepared the following budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core funding for the Mission Community Heritage Commission</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money carried forward from last year.</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conferences/Workshops/Seminars</td>
<td>$ 677.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society/Associations memberships</td>
<td>$ 523.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards &amp; Recognition Program</td>
<td>$ 700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Edit of Context Plan</td>
<td>$ 3,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heritage Registry additions</td>
<td>$ 2,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Web site Development</td>
<td>$ 700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historica</td>
<td>$ 800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 9,600.00</td>
<td>$ 9600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed by: Janis Schultz Chair
Jim Hinds co-chair

Budget 2014
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: MAYOR AND COUNCIL
FROM: Marcy Bond, Planner
SUBJECT: Rescind 1st, 2nd and 3rd Readings of Official Community Plan amending Bylaw 5247-2011-4052(17) and Zone amending Bylaw 5248-2011-5050(55); Close Rezoning Application R11-007 and Development Permit Applications DP11-004 and DP11-005 for the Property Located at 32921 14th Avenue

CIVIC ADDRESS: 32921 14th Avenue

APPLICANT: Keystone Architecture

ATTACHMENT: Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer

LOCATION: 32921 14th Ave
LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Council consider and resolve:

1. That 1st, 2nd and 3rd readings of Official Community Plan amending Bylaw 5247-2011-4052(17) and Zone amending Bylaw 5248-2011-5050(55) be rescinded; and

2. That Rezoning Application R11-007 and Development Permit Applications DP11-004 and DP11-005 be closed.

BACKGROUND

The applicant, Keystone Architecture, has advised that the property owner does not intend to pursue the 23-unit townhouse development of the property at this time and has requested that the applications be closed.

The rezoning and development permit applications were submitted in February 2011 and 1st reading was granted on October 3, 2011. The public hearing was held on October 24, 2011 and 2nd and 3rd readings were granted the same evening.

A one-time, one year rezoning extension was granted in October 2012; however, the extension has now expired and the rezoning requirements have not been met.

Now that the extension has expired and the property owner has advised that they do not intend to pursue the development of the property at this time, the rezoning and development permit files can be closed.

SIGN-OFFS:

Marcy Bond, Planner

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer Reviewed.

G:\COMDEV\MARCY\APPLICATIONS\REZONING\2011 Applications\R11-007 Rescind Readings Close files 2013-12-16 COW.docx
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 32921 14th Avenue

PID: 011-402-857

Legal: Lot “A” Except: Firstly: East 102.31 Feet Secondly: Part Subdivided by Plan 16787, Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8999
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Director of Development Services
SUBJECT: Development of Waterfront

This report is provided for information purposes only. No recommendation accompanies this report and no Council action is required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide follow-up information that Council requested with regards to promoting development in the waterfront.

BACKGROUND:
Several waterfront studies have been completed, namely:

- Highway 7 Bypass study (2008)
- Preliminary Assessment of the Market & Feasibility study (2011)

All of this work has resulted in the conclusion that a residential and commercial market opportunity on the waterfront exists, that there is financial viability for developers and investors to consider these underutilized lands, and that it is possible for the District to manage land defragmentation through various policy and land use management options, which need to be put in place.

The most recent Phase 4 study (Implementation Strategy) of the Market and Feasibility Study for Waterfront Planning was completed in late 2012 and contained seven recommendations that staff were asked to follow-up on and report back to Council as well as a possible strategy to move forward with developing the waterfront lands.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Traditionally, the next step in the planning of the waterfront area would be to initiate a comprehensive planning exercise similar to what was undertaken in the downtown area. The downtown planning process cost approximately $170,000 and the cost of a waterfront planning process would likely be of the same magnitude. However, staff recommends that such a process for the waterfront wait at least until the downtown revitalization is well underway as the District needs to be cautious about initiating a new comprehensive planning process that could reduce the improvement in downtown that private and public investment will have. In addition, the need for a planning process can be reconsidered as
staff work with individual developers that want to move forward with waterfront development now. There are opportunities to move forward with the recommendations from the Phase 4 report that would not be in direct conflict with the revitalization of downtown. Acting on several of the Phase 4 report’s seven recommendations would serve as pre-planning and inform the waterfront planning process.

If a planning process is initiated, it will be important to ensure the vision, goals and objectives for the waterfront are complementary and not in direct competition with the downtown’s and that they build on the momentum generated by investment in downtown.

Phase 4 Report Recommendations

This section lists the seven recommendations from the Phase 4 report and provides some commentary as to how the District could move forward with implementing the recommendations and promoting waterfront development in general.

1. That the District of Mission explores opportunities to facilitate an initial phase of development in the strategic location identified in the Baseline Concept Plan at the south end of Horne Street.
   - This recommendation can be met by working with current developers who are showing an interest in this area.

2. That the District of Mission conducts a high-level visioning workshop to establish planning, urban design, community amenity, and public realm objectives, resulting in a visioning document for the waterfront planning area.
   - This is a critical first step in any planning process.
   - It is recommended that a comprehensive visioning exercise not be completed at this time but wait until the downtown revitalization process is well underway and wait until staff have some experience working with a developer on a waterfront application.
   - Staff recommends that, once the downtown marketing materials are distributed and all bylaw, policy changes are in place and revitalization is occurring, they begin work on a preliminary visioning process that uses information from the studies already completed. This could occur in 2014 with minimal staffing time and financial resources.
   - In addition, staff should continue to take advantage of any opportunities to engage property owners and developers about the waterfront development process. An example of this would be the meeting that Mr. Norm Tapp is proposing (see below).

3. That the District of Mission create a series of individual planning areas in the waterfront district and recommend a planning approach for each area.
   - This recommendation would occur for the first area when and if a developer initiates development.
   - Subsequent areas would use the template created by the first proposal to create a plan that would fit within a comprehensive waterfront planning process. As individual developments proceed, staff would bring a recommendation back to Council to have a comprehensive planning process initiated once interest in the waterfront reaches a level where planning the larger area becomes critical to ensuring a well planned community.

4. That the District of Mission proceeds with a conceptual plan and engineering for the re-alignment of the highway bypass through the waterfront.
   - This recommendation would be met as part of a comprehensive waterfront planning
5. That the District of Mission proceed with a conceptual plan and engineering study to establish an approach and requirements for servicing, flood-control, flood-plain management, and proposed approach to cost recovery.

- Contamination, seismic stability, servicing and flood related issues should be included when developing the approach.
- All of these issues will need to be addressed as part of a comprehensive waterfront planning process and would need to be addressed by each individual developer should a development proceed in advance of a comprehensive planning process. The information and experience learned from working with individual developers will help to inform the larger planning process.
- As with the contaminated sites work currently underway, these initiatives will require funds to leverage grant money and/or collaboration with private property owners and would come to Council for consideration as required.

6. That the District of Mission considers an active role in facilitating the reclamation and remediation of soil contamination in the waterfront lands.

- The ability for the District to assist with remediation will need to be looked at once the extent and type of contamination becomes known, likely through the contamination studies that are currently being worked on.
- Once a clear picture of contamination becomes clear, the type of remediation versus the ability to address contamination through construction (risk assessment) can be assessed - likely through the contamination studies that are currently being worked on.

7. That the District of Mission considers a range of roles that would promote or provide incentive to encourage redevelopment of the waterfront lands.

- Working with developers on active proposals ahead of a planning process will help to identify the incentives that provide the best return on investment.
- The District’s Development Corporation may have an important role to play in terms of land assembly.
- The development of the downtown incentive program and its success will serve as the basis for developing an incentive program for the waterfront.

Interest in the Waterfront

The District has been discussing the potential to develop the waterfront with several developers on an individual basis and at several recent functions. Mr. Norm Tapp approached Council several months ago with a development concept for the area along Harbour Avenue and behind Captain’s Cabin Pub. At this time, Mr. Tapp would like to arrange a meeting with property owners in the area to discuss waterfront development in general terms as well as some of the constraints and potential solutions to move development forward. Mr. Tapp would like staff to attend which would provide a good opportunity for the District to promote its current approach to developing the waterfront. The meeting will likely occur early in 2014 and staff would confirm the date with Council.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This report addresses objectives and actions set out in Council’s Economic Development Goal. Council established an objective of Providing for Interim Development Opportunities on the Waterfront
with one of the actions being to Finalize a Waterfront Planning Implementation Strategy. This report is the first step to developing the strategy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this report. Over time, there will be constraints to development that are recognized by developers and staff. Proposals that attempt to mitigate these constraints may be brought back for Council’s consideration and those proposals may have their own financial implications for the District. The recent commitment of funds to completing contaminated sites assessment in the waterfront would be an example. Eventually, staff may recommend completing a comprehensive planning process for the waterfront which will require funds in the range of what the recent downtown planning process cost.

COMMUNICATION:

Communication with developers is important to take advantage of any interest and opportunities that may present themselves in the waterfront. The Economic Development Officer is actively engaged with the development community and available to discuss opportunities at any time.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Interest in development of the waterfront appears to be increasing. Traditionally, the next step would be to initiate a comprehensive planning process that would start with developing a vision similar to what was done with the recent downtown planning process. However, staff does not recommend initiating a new planning process until the downtown revitalization process is well underway. In the meantime, staff can work with individual developers to bring forward their proposals and continue to work to explore solutions to identified constraints (contaminated sites, flood control, seismic and servicing). Developers proceeding ahead of a comprehensive planning process will need to create a plan for their property and the surrounding area to ensure that their proposal will be consistent with the comprehensive plan developed later. In addition, staff can start preliminary work on a visioning exercise in 2014 using the studies completed to date and can work with developers and property owners to collect as much information as possible to inform a future planning process.

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Reviewed by:
Sharon Fletcher, Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Director of Development Services
SUBJECT: History of Building Permit on 32562 Richards Avenue

This report is provided for information purposes only. No recommendation accompanies this report and no Council action is required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the history of a building permit issued for an outbuilding at 32562 Richards Avenue.

BACKGROUND:
At their regular meeting on November 4, 2013, Council directed staff to provide Council with a report on the history of the building permit for the outbuilding on Susan Cameron’s property located at 32562 Richards Avenue. Staff has used microfiches and a current development application for the property to gather the information.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The building permit (#20020180) for the outbuilding was issued on July 17, 2002 after the application had been received on July 9, 2002. The permit lists the use of the building as an accessory building for farm use and the construction value was $11,520.00. The permit was issued to Susan and Keith Cameron and the construction was being completed by the Cameron’s.

There were two inspection slips associated with the construction of the outbuilding:

1. Foundation Inspection dated August 13, 2002
2. Final Inspection dated November 24, 2005

Both inspections were approved and did not note any issues or concerns. Today as in 2002, site plans were required to be submitted with the building permit application but those plans do not necessarily require a survey. There was a site plan that was submitted with the building permit application but it did not include a survey. The site plan was hand drawn but did have what appeared to be lineal measurements taken from a lot survey. There was a notation that the distance between the property line and the corner of the building in question was to be set back 5+ feet from the property line and the notation was initialed by SC (presumably Susan Cameron). The site plan was stamped with the following statement:

I certify that the site plan includes all buildings R.O.Ws, easements, covenants, streams, rivers, lakes on property.

The statement was signed by Susan Cameron. The survey that has been completed as part of the
new development application clearly shows the corner of the building in question over the property line and the building is also shown in a different orientation from what was on the building permit site plan.

In 2002, surveys were not required prior to pouring concrete for the foundation of accessory buildings in rural areas whereas today, a survey is required to be completed for any building in a rural area that proposes minimum setbacks. Surveys are required for all buildings in urban areas regardless of proposed setbacks to confirm the footing location prior to pouring of concrete.

Staff has contacted the developer to let him know that the Fire Department may be interested in using the outbuilding as a practice burn / fire fighting exercise if the owner is interested in that method of building removal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

COMMUNICATION:

No further communication is required.

SUMMARY:

Council directed staff to provide a report on the history of the building permit for the outbuilding on Susan Cameron’s property located at 32562 Richards Avenue. A permit was issued in 2002 and inspected on at least two occasions. The site plan, submitted with the permit, showed the proposed building to be set back by 5+ feet from the property line. The new development application survey shows a different orientation of the building and that one corner is clearly over the property line. A survey prior to the foundation concrete being poured was not required in 2002 for rural buildings. Today, surveys are a requirement for all rural buildings where the proposed setback from property line is a minimum.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Reviewed by:
Al Hooge, Building Inspector

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Zoning Amending Bylaw 5386-2013-5050(123) (R13-017 – Schill) – a bylaw to rezone property at 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RR7s)

The purpose of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property located at 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road and legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 010-515-356
Lot 20 South West Quarter Section 23 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan 2929
from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RR7s) to accommodate a two (2) lot subdivision with a secondary dwelling unit permitted on each lot.

Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. application information;
2. purpose and outline of the proposal;
3. subject property map and site photos;
4. surrounding area designation;
5. proposal details;
6. development requirements; and
7. land use question.

The Acting Manager of Corporate Administration stated that no correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5386-2013-5050(123) (R13-017 – Schill), closed.
DATE: November 4, 2013
TO: MAYOR AND COUNCIL
FROM: Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning application (R13-017 – Schill) to accommodate a 2-lot rural residential subdivision with a secondary dwelling unit permitted on each lot

CIVIC ADDRESS: 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road
APPLICANT: Patricia Schill on behalf of Bert Roulston
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current OCP designation: Rural Residential

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: October 2, 2013

ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Orthophoto 2012
Appendix 3 – Watercourse/Topography
Appendix 4 – Subdivision Draft Plan
Appendix 5 – Engineering’s Comments

LOCATION:
LAND USE RECOMMENDATION(S):

Council consider and resolve:

1. That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by rezoning the property located at 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 (RU16) zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) zone.

2. That the bylaw be considered for 1st and 2nd readings at the Regular Council meeting on November 4, 2013.

3. That following these readings, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on November 18, 2013.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

Council consider and resolve:

4. That the Final Reading of the amending bylaw be held until the following has been satisfied:
   a. The community amenity contribution in the amount of $2,815 (for one new lot) is received.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Development Services Department is in receipt of an application to rezone the property located at 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road from Rural 16 (RU16) zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) zone to facilitate a two (2) lot subdivision of the property. In addition, the rezoning application will allow a secondary dwelling unit on each proposed lot.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property has a land area of approximately 2.1 hectares (5.2 acres) and contains a single family dwelling, a mobile home and a shed. A wetland has also been identified on the property on the eastern portion of the site, distant from the existing and the proposed buildings (Appendix 4 shows the location of existing/proposed buildings and the wetland). The north portion of property is comprised of young coniferous-deciduous forest growing around the wetland.

From topographic point of view, the land within the property slopes gently from west to the north–east and levels out near the eastern edge where it forms a low–lying forest swamp (Appendix 3, show the topography and the location of the swamp). The property is cleared on its south end where the existing structures are located (Appendix 2). There is no visible inflow channel from the property into the swamp.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009)

The subject property is currently zoned Rural 16 (RU16). According to the Zoning Bylaw, the minimum lot area of the zone is 1.6 hectares (4.0 acres). The applicant proposes to rezone the property to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling zone (RR7s) with the minimum lot area of
0.7 hectares (1.73 acres) in order to allow a 2 lot subdivision and a secondary dwelling unit on each lot.

Currently, there is a single family dwelling on the proposed lot 1 and a mobile home on the proposed lot 2 (Appendix 4). Should the rezoning application be approved, the existing mobile home, which is a permitted use in the current zone, will no longer be permitted; therefore, the mobile home will be removed as part of the subdivision process.

The proposed location of the new residence on lot 2 is in the vicinity of the existing mobile home to avoid further land clearing and vegetation removal. The proposed development meets all of the requirements of Zoning Bylaw including minimum lot area, setbacks and lot coverage.

**PLANNING ANALYSIS**

**General – Official Community Plan (OCP)**

The proposed rezoning application is supportable due to the OCP designation of the property as Rural Residential.

Secondary dwelling units within the District of Mission are further supported by the following OCP policies:

- **Policy 2.4.4.:** Encourage secondary dwelling units as a form of infill housing. Secondary dwelling units may be considered on lots that are large enough to accommodate the following associated elements:
  - On-site parking.
  - Private outside space.
  - Separate Entrance that is clearly secondary to the primary dwelling.
  - Scale of the secondary dwelling must clearly be ancillary to the primary use.

- **Housing Choice for Different Lifestyles and Income Levels - Policy 2.5.1:** Encourage the development of a variety of housing types, tenure, accessibility and cost to provide for a diversity of lifestyle and income levels.

- **Affordable Housing through Innovative Housing Forms - Policy 2.5.3:** Facilitate the development of affordable, rental and special needs housing through supporting multi-family housing developments, small house/small lot housing, secondary suites, duplexes in appropriate locations, mixed market/non-market housing projects, coach houses, granny flats and other innovative housing forms.

The application to allow a secondary dwelling on each lot is supportable providing that the proposed units are compatible with the principal building and provide additional parking and a separate entrance.

**Neighbourhood Character**

The subject property with the minimum lot area of 0.7 hectares (1.73 acres) is part of a neighbourhood with rural residential characteristics. The area comprises of a single family dwellings on rural and rural residential lots where lot areas range from 0.3 hectares (0.74 acres) to 3.0 hectares (7.4 acres). Considering the existing density of the property, the proposed development containing a house and a secondary dwelling in each lot is consistent with the density of the neighbourhood and will have minimal impact on the neighbourhood character.
Environmental Protection

Due to the location of a wetland within the property, a Riparian Area Regulation (RAR) assessment report was prepared by Equipoise Environmental Consulting. According to the assessment, the wetland is connected to downstream fish habitat via subterranean and intermittent surface flow to the fish bearing Bob Brook. The terrain in the swamp is strongly mounded with both deciduous and conifers growing on elevated microsites separated by low-lying pockets which fill with water in the wet seasons. The wetland is classified as a Western red cedar – Western hemlock – Skunk cabbage swamp according to the classification system in the Wetlands of BC.

According to the RAR assessment:

- The Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA) width for the wetland varies from 30 metres (98.4 ft.) on the south to 15 metres (49.2 ft.) on the west and north sides of wetland. (Appendix 4)
- The proposed future activities and works are expected to occur in the southernmost portion of the property (where the existing residences are locating) and at adequate distance from the SPEA boundary. The proposed location will not pose a risk to the riparian habitat and forest swamp.
- Due to the proposed location of the future development and its separation from the wetland by a dense layer of shrub, installation of a fence barrier to prevent encroachment is not recommended at the time. However, any development and land alteration within the area may require a signage around the SPEA advising of the sensitive nature of the wetland.
- The proposed development is not likely to cause sediment and erosion and increase of stormwater input that affect the forest swamp area.
- The project should follow construction best management practices.

Tree Retention

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 - TREE RETENTION REPLANTING POLICY, the applicant will be required to plant four (4) trees as part of the subdivision approval process. No significant trees will be removed as a result of future development activities within the property.

COMMUNITY AMENITY CONTRIBUTION

It is recognized that residential development imposes a unique financial burden on the community by creating a need or demand for new/upgraded public facilities or amenities. In order to address this unique financial burden, rezoning applicants are requested to make a contribution to the District’s Community Amenity Reserve Fund for new/upgraded public facilities or amenities. The applicant has agreed to contribute $2,815 ($2,815 per new residential unit) as part of this rezoning application, in accordance with Council Policy LAN. 40 – COMMUNITY AMENITY CONTRIBUTIONS.
COMMUNICATION

In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the applicant has posted one (1) development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development. Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

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

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

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

REFERRALS

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the rezoning application (Appendix 5).

Mission Fire/Rescue Service

The Mission Fire/Rescue Service has no objection to the proposed development.

SIGN-OFFS:

Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner

Reviewed by:
Barclay Pitkethly, Deputy Director of Development Services

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

Civic Address: 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road

PID: 010-515-356

Legal: Lot 20 South West Quarter Section 23 Township 15 New Westminster District Plan 2929
Appendix 2
Orthophoto 2012

The existing forest swamp

Southern portion of the property to accommodate the existing/proposed buildings has been cleared.
Appendix 3
Watercourse/Topography

Subject Property

Existing Wetland - swamp
Appendix 4
Subdivision Draft Plan

Existing mobile home to be removed prior to issuance of final occupancy permit for the new residence on lot 2

Existing residence on the proposed lot 1 to be remained

Grey area shows the SPEA as identified 30 m on the south and 15 m on the west and north from the western boundary of the wetland

New residence in the proposed lot 2

Approximate western boundary of the wetland
Appendix 5
Engineering's Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

August 28, 2013

CIVIC ADDRESS: 29809 Dewdney Trunk Road

CURRENT ZONING: RU16

REZ. FILE: R13-017

PROPOSED ZONING: RR7s

1. DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
No Municipal water is available.

2. SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
No municipal sanitary sewer is available.

3. STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
No municipal storm sewer is available.

4. ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Dewdney Trunk Road provides paved access to the site, no further upgrading required.

RECOMMENDATION
From an engineering point of view the rezoning application may proceed to final adoption

Prepared by

Signature

Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by

Signature

Director of Engineering
DATE: December 16th, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator
SUBJECT: Compost Receiving/Processing Building at Mission Landfill
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A – Completed Safety Upgrade Pictures in Garbage and Recyclables Drop-off Areas

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
That the remaining funds ($115,000) from the completed safety upgrade at the Mission Landfill be carried over and transferred from the Washroom Building and Safety Upgrades Budget (GL 46789) to the Compost Receiving Building Budget (GL 46788).

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to request Council’s approval for carrying over and transferring the remaining funds from the Washroom Building and Safety Upgrades Budget (GL 46789) to the Compost Receiving Building Budget (GL 46788) for 2014.

BACKGROUND:
Following minor incidents at the Mission Landfill and a 2006 incident at the Kamloops Landfill, in which a landfill customer fell into a drop-off bin and consequently had to have his leg amputated, prompted a safety inspection of the Mission Landfill, which was conducted by Risk Management Services Inc. in late 2009. Consequently, Conestoga Rovers and Associates (CRA) was retained to address identified concerns and submitted a redesign of the public drop-off areas in early 2012, which involved raising the guardrails and adding vertical pickets, as well as the installation of concrete sidewalks along the four drop-off bins.

Due to inherent conflict between keeping customers out of the drop-off bins, while facilitating the deposit of garbage into the bins, staff conducted its own review of the drop-off site and proceeded with different and less costly safety upgrades that will accommodate both safety and accessibility purposes. The safety upgrades at the public garbage and recyclables/metal drop-off area are now complete (Appendix A). Outstanding upgrade items include the replacement of two staircases for landfill staff’s use and the installation of a washroom building with safety shower. The total budget for the public safety upgrades, staircase replacement and washroom construction is $250,000.

In addition, the 2013 budget included a line item for the construction of a compost receiving building, the construction of which forms part of the District’s contractual agreement with the processing facility operator. The original purpose of the receiving building was to reduce potential odours from fresh feedstock and provide covered working space for proper mixing of incoming materials. The budget for this project, as per the agreement, was $100,000.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The expense for the safety upgrades at the Mission Landfill to date amounts to $55,000, with outstanding upgrades to the staircases and the washroom facility expected to add no more than $80,000 for a total of $115,000, and approximately half of the dedicated budget remaining.

The construction of the compost receiving building has been delayed by changes in facility operators, as well as desired purpose and function of the building. While the initial purpose, as per the existing agreement, was to provide a receiving building to minimize odours, ongoing challenges at the site have been less related to odours than to excess water at the site. The landfill site receives up to two metres of rain per year, which far exceeds the moisture requirements of any composting operation, and thus results in the generation of excess leachate. The treatment capacity for leachate at the landfill is limited to that of the current aeration lagoon, which during the winter months, is at times already operating near capacity.

Preventing leachate from being generated would best be accomplished by keeping rainwater from contacting compost in the first place. To this end, staff recommends that the initial plan of establishing a receiving building be amended to constructing a larger roof structure to cover the receiving area, as well as the active composting area.

The proposed size of the structure is 20 by 30 metres, which is twice the size of the original design. The estimated cost of engineering, supplying, delivering and installing a fabric and steel structure of this size is $100,000 before foundations (lock blocks) and slab work. The additional funds would be used to purchase lock blocks for foundations (~$35,000), install clean water diversion trenching, doors, lights and electrical works as applicable. If the budget re-allocation is approved, staff will finalize the draft Request for Proposals for a more suitable building, which could also include separate options for leachate collection and recirculation, as well as compost aeration.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Total budgets for the Washroom Building and Safety Upgrades and the Compost Receiving Building Budget amounted to $350,000. It is expected that the washroom building and safety upgrades at the landfill will come in at about 50% savings, leaving $115,000 in that budget. The compost receiving building, which was budgeted for at $100,000, would be of better use as a larger roof structure with appropriate flooring to address the need for improved water and leachate management at the composting site. Re-allocating the remainder of the Washroom Building and Safety Upgrades Budget to the Compost Receiving Building Budget would result in no net increase in funds allocated to improvements at the landfill. Funding for the works would be provided from the Landfill Reserve, by way of reallocating budget savings from the noted projects.

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Upgrades to the washrooms and public drop-off areas at the Mission Landfill are expected to come in at 50% under budget. Proposed improvements to the compost facility at the landfill could benefit from an increased budget, in order to allow for a larger covered area for compost processing, minimizing the generation of leachate which requires management or treatment. Staff recommends carrying over both budgets to 2014 and re-allocating remaining funds from the washroom and safety upgrades budget to the compost building budget at no net cost increase to taxpayers.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
## APPENDIX A

### Completed Safety Upgrade Pictures in Garbage and Recyclables Drop-off Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Before" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="After" /></td>
<td>Curbstops in this area are intended to prevent customers from standing in truck boxes while depositing garbage. Higher barriers with wire mesh were installed between offset drop-off bins to prevent customers from standing in truck boxes to deposit items into the neighbouring bin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Before" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="After" /></td>
<td>Due to the weight of some metal items, customers may pull right up to the bins in this area, rather than being forced to unload on the ground first. Higher, passive retention bars were added to the recycling and metal drop-off bins to prevent people from falling into bins while lifting heavy items directly from truck boxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Before" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="After" /></td>
<td>Gaps in railings were closed. The staircase is slated for replacement with the washroom installation. Remaining gaps in the fencing were left on purpose to facilitate installation of the new staircase and will be addressed at that time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE:       December 16, 2013  
TO:         Mayor and Council  
FROM:       Maureen Sinclair - Director Parks, Recreation & Culture  
SUBJECT:    Fraser River Heritage Park – Observatory Proposal

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:

1. That the Mission Heritage Association be given approval to proceed with the construction of the observatory project at Fraser River Heritage Park, subject to MHA receiving the other necessary approvals and permits;

2. That the MHA be responsible for covering all of the costs related to the development and ongoing operation of the observatory;

3. That the District of Mission provide up to $6,500 of value in logs from the Municipal Forest to be used for the observatory project, with funding for the logs coming from Council’s 2014 contingency account; and


PURPOSE:

This report is provided to Council as a follow-up to the presentation that will be made by the Mission Heritage Association (MHA) regarding the construction of an observatory at Fraser River Heritage Park.

BACKGROUND:

On May 21st, 2013 the MHA came as a delegation to Council and presented their plans to construct an observatory at Fraser River Heritage Park (Park). The notes and motion from that meeting are as follows:

“Mr. Brian Antonson appeared before Council to provide an update on the construction of the Clayburn building in Fraser River Heritage Park, and to present information about the Rotary Observatory concept.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the Rotary Observatory concept as presented by the Mission Heritage Association at the regular Council meeting of May 21, 2013 be approved in principle.”
The MHA were asked to return to Council with additional details once their plans were more developed. As a result of the positive feedback from Council the MHA have undertaken additional design work and completed drawings in order to move this project into its development phase.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The MHA have completed a number of improvements within the Park over their tenure as park operators and stewards. The concept of developing an observatory has been included within the context of the last two workplan documents submitted to Council.

The MHA have, since 2011, been pursuing the concept of developing an observatory to be located on the south side of the Park giving a broad, almost uninterrupted view of the night sky across the Fraser Valley. The project will be outlined in detail through the presentation by the MHA at the December 16th Committee of the Whole meeting; the presentation speaks to issues related to the capital costs of the project as well as the operational and programming costs and challenges.

The MHA feel confident that there is significant community support for this project as well as support from the School District who will use the observatory as a teaching opportunity for a variety of curriculum streams. The operational and staffing costs for the observatory will be the sole responsibility of the MHA.

The MHA have been exploring a number of funding options to support the project design, construction and operation. At this time the MHA are requesting Council approval to proceed with the observatory project at Fraser River Heritage as well as project support in the form of logs from the Municipal Forest to offset some of the construction costs. The value of the logs has been estimated by District of Mission (DOM) Forestry staff at approximately $6,500.

The observatory will also, upon completion, need to be added to the DOM fire insurance policy as the observatory will be housed in a new separate building. Responsibilities to manage and maintain this structure will be the sole responsibility of the MHA as this project is beyond the scope of the current maintenance agreement between the DOM and the MHA.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The MHA are seeking up to $6,500 from the DOM in the form of logs from the Municipal Forest. The estimated value will be refined and the actual costs will be based on the current market value at the time that the logs are transferred to the mill for processing. The Forestry Department needs to be credited with this log revenue and the cost of the logs needs to be charged against an appropriate expense budget. As the 2014 budget has been finalized, staff respectfully suggests that Council’s 2014 contingency budget would be an option. Staff have discussed this option with the Mayor who supports this funding source.

COMMUNICATION:

Parks, Recreation & Culture staff met with MHA representatives as well as Forestry staff to prepare this report. The Finance staff has also been provided with a copy of this report to review the financial aspects of this project.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

MHA were provided with approval in principle and have invested time and resources to move their observatory project forward. MHA are now in the position to move the project forward for building permit approval and are seeking Council’s support.

SIGN OFFS:

M. Sinclair
Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture

K Bysouth Manager of Parks and Facilities

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
DATE:   December 16, 2013  
TO:     Mayor and Council  
FROM:  Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector  

RECOMMENDATION(S):  
This report is provided for information purposes only.

PURPOSE:  
The purpose of this report is to advise Council that the following bylaws are on the December 16, 2013 Regular Meeting of Council Agenda for their first three readings:  

BACKGROUND:  
At the December 2, 2013, Regular Meeting of Council staff provided a report regarding the 2014 Financial Plan/Budget and related bylaws. At this meeting, the following recommendations were approved:

1. “That the District's 2014 Financial Plan include a 0% increase in the property tax levy, and a 2% increase in water, sewer, refuse, and recycling/composting rates.”;
2. That Council approve for inclusion into the financial plan bylaw the policy and objectives noted in the report dated December 2, 2013 from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector;
3. That the Financial Plan Bylaw be forwarded to Council on December 16, 2013 for first three readings, and final adoption on December 18, 2013; and
4. That the following bylaws
   a) Water Rates Bylaw #2197-1990;
   b) Sewer User Rates Bylaw #1922-1989;
   c) Refuse Collection and Disposal Bylaw #1387-1984; and
   d) Collection, Removal and Marketing of Recyclables Bylaw #2639-1993

each be amended to include a 2% rate increase and be forwarded to the December 16, 2013, regular meeting of Council for first three readings with final adoption on December 18, 2013.”
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Staff have completed the preparation of the 2014-2018 Financial Plan Bylaw that includes a zero percent increase in the property tax levy and this bylaw is listed on this evening’s agenda for first three readings. Staff have also prepared the four utility bylaws (water, sewer, refuse, and recycling/composting), incorporating a 2% increase in the rates. These four utility bylaws are listed on this evening’s agenda for first three readings.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

Council’s Financial Sustainability goal of having the annual operating and capital budget approved by the end of each year will be accomplished when the 2014-2018 Financial Plan Bylaw is adopted before the end of December 2013.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report, only those associated with the budget.

COMMUNICATION:

No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

As part of Council’s Financial Sustainability goal of having the 2014 annual operating and capital budget approved by the end of 2013, staff would like to present the 2014 financial plan bylaw and the four separate utility bylaws for first three readings on December 16, 2013 and final adoption on December 18, 2013.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector

Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Comments from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
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DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration
SUBJECT: Correction to Road Closure and Sale Policy and User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 – Non-refundable deposit for a road closure application
ATTACHMENT(S): Road Closure and Sale Policy STR.34 Page 4 of Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007

RECOMMENDATION:
Council consider and resolve:
That both the Road Closure and Sale Policy STR.34 and the User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 be amended to reflect the “payment of a non-refundable deposit of 10% of the purchase price up to $2,000” for a road sale and closure application.

PURPOSE:
To correct the difference between the Road Closure and Sale Policy STR.34 and the User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 regarding the payment of a non-refundable deposit to accompany a road closure and sale application.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The Road Closure and Sale Policy STR.34 provides that an applicant for a road closure and sale must “pay a non-refundable deposit of $2,000 or 10% of the purchase price (whichever is greater)…..while section 8 (a) of the User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 as amended states “The applicant agrees to pay a non-refundable deposit of $2,000 or 10% of the purchase price.” These two documents should reflect the same deposit amount. If Council agrees, both documents will now read: “pay a non-refundable deposit of 10% of the purchase price up to a maximum of $2,000”.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
To make the Road Closure and Sale STR.34 policy and the User Fees and Charges Bylaw the same for a non-refundable deposit to accompany a road closure and sale application.

SIGN-OFFS:
Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration
Reviewed by:
Gina Mackay, Planner

Comment from Chief Administrative Office
Reviewed.
STREETS & ROADS

ROAD CLOSURE AND SALE

STR.34

Date Policy Adopted: January 4, 2005
Date Policy Amended: November 1, 2006
Date Policy Amended: May 7, 2007
Date Policy Amended: October 1, 2007
Date Policy Amended: April 7, 2008
Date Policy Amended: July 21, 2008
Date Policy Amended: December 15, 2008
Date Policy Amended: May 4, 2009
Date Policy Amended: January 1, 2010

Council Resolution Number: 05/010
Council Resolution Number: IC2006/261
CAO Approval
Council Resolution Number: 07/878
Council Resolution Number: 08/297
Council Resolution Number: 08/617
Council Resolution Number: 08/1064
Council Resolution Number: RC09/249
Bylaw 5070-2009

Council may consider closing and selling portions of roads, based on the following criteria:

1. The Director of Engineering and Public Works determines that the subject portion of road is not required in the future.

2. The portion of road to be closed and purchased is adjacent to and contiguous with the applicant’s property.

3. The applicant agrees to the following requirements, all to be completed solely at the applicant’s expense:
   a) pay an administration fee for the road closure and sale process as set out in the District of Mission’s Fees and Charges Bylaw No. 4029-2007, and amendments thereto;
   b) provide proof of ownership of the property adjacent to and contiguous with the requested road closure area;
   c) provide signed consent(s) from any other property owner(s) adjacent to and contiguous with the subject road that they have no objections to the applicant’s purchase of the property;

Should the applicant be unable to obtain these consents, council will be advised of this fact and the reasons for the withholding of consents, and may determine that any of the withheld consents are unreasonable, or alternatively that the closure and sale are not in the best interests of the District;
d) pay a non-refundable deposit of $2000 or 10% of the purchase price (whichever is greater) payable within 14 days of Council’s adoption of a resolution to proceed with the road closure and subsequent sale of the property. The deposit is deducted off of
**Applicable Description of Existing Fee/Charge Taxes to be Added**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Existing Fee/Charge</th>
<th>Applicable Taxes to be Added</th>
<th>Effective January 1, 2012</th>
<th>Effective January 1, 2013</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) - Water Overlays entire water service area - additional cost</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$1,248.00</td>
<td>$1,298.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) - Sanitary Overlays entire sanitary service area - additional cost</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td>$540.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) - Storm Overlays entire District - additional cost</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$2,080.00</td>
<td>$2,163.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) - Storm Overlays with topography entire District - additional cost</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$3,120.00</td>
<td>$3,245.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) - OCP Maps - all including all cadastral base</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$2,080.00</td>
<td>$2,163.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) - Zoning Maps A2, A3 (urban areas) each</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$676.00</td>
<td>$703.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) - Zoning Maps (outer areas-two maps) each map</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) - OCP maps and Zoning maps - all including cadastral</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td>$2,704.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) - Gravel Pit Topographical Map - each</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td>$540.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 Microfiche Copies**

| (a) - per copy (8 1/2 x 11) | H | $1.10 | $1.10 |

**6 Photocopies or Computer Generated Copies**

| (a) - Property Owners - first five black & white copies | H | $0.00 | $0.00 |
| (b) - Property Owners six copies & up (per black & white copy) | H | $0.57 | $0.57 |
| (c) - Non-Residents or Businesses (per black & white copy) | H | $0.57 | $0.57 |
| (d) - Property Owners, Non-Residents or Businesses (per colour copy) | H | $1.19 | $1.19 |

**7 Paper Prints**

| (a) - A1 or 24"x36" (single original) | H | $6.00 | $6.25 |
| (b) - Oversize (single original) | H | $6.00 | $6.25 |

**8 Road Closure and Sale**

| (a) The applicant agrees to pay a non-refundable deposit of $2,000 or 10% of the purchase price. | STR.34 |
| (b) The applicant agrees to pay an administration fee for the road closure and sale process. | $160.00 | $160.00 | STR.34 |
| (c) The applicant agrees to pay all costs associated with advertising and to complete all legal documents and register them at the Land Title Office. | At Cost | At Cost | STR.34 |
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration
ATTACHMENTS: Report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture regarding the New Horizon Lawn Bowling Society
Report from the Director of Development Services regarding the Fraser Valley Humane Society

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
    That Municipal Partnership Fee for Service grant funding be approved for the following organizations for 2014:
    New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society $5,700
    Fraser Valley Humane Society $30,000

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide a synopsis of the two remaining applications to be considered for the Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grant funds, the reasoning behind the sub-committee’s grant allotment recommendations and to seek Council’s approval of the two remaining grant requests.

BACKGROUND:
The subcommittee met for a third time on December 6, 2013 to discuss the last two Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Applications. The subcommittee consisted of Councillors Hensman and Stevens, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Acting Manager of Corporate Administration. At that meeting, the Director of Development Services and the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture were also in attendance, along with Celia Durst, the Executive Director of the Fraser Valley Humane Society and Evelyn Boon, President of the New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
2014 Municipal Partnership Fee for Service grant funding is budgeted at $234,094 (including Mission Adopt a Block and Mission Search and Rescue). The following table has been provided to give Council a brief outline of the two remaining grant application details and what the sub-committee has recommended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>2013 Fee for Service Received</th>
<th>Amount Requested for 2014</th>
<th>Amount recommended to be awarded for 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FV Humane Society</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Increased by $1,160 from 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons Lawn Bowling</td>
<td>$2,812</td>
<td>$5,623</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(reduced by $2,811 from 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staff reports that the subcommittee considered during the December 6, 2013 meeting are attached. Concern was expressed by the subcommittee that these two organizations need a long term solution and business plan that doesn’t rely on increased municipal contributions in the future. Consideration should also be given to consolidating their functions with other organizations to make the service more effective and economical. The subcommittee is recommending the continuation of municipal grant funding for 2014 but both organizations will be required to report to the District mid-way through 2014 as to the progress they are making to become more efficient, viable and self-sufficient. To assist these two organizations and the other grant applications previously approved, a staff member will be assigned to be the liaison to each group. Hopefully this will help.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

- 2014 Budget for Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grants $234,094
- Grants approved by Council, Nov 18, 2013 $140,093
- Grants approved by Council, Dec 2, 2013 $26,500
- Grants proposed to Council Dec 16, 2013 $35,700
- Balance of Funds remaining within the budget allocation $31,801

**COMMUNICATION:**

The two groups will be advised of Council’s decision on their requests.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Bob Wilson,  
Acting Manager of Corporate Administration

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer  
Reviewed.
DATE: December 16, 2013  
TO: Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Sub-Committee  
FROM: Maureen Sinclair - Director Parks, Recreation & Culture  

RECOMMENDATION(S): The Sub-Committee consider and resolve:
That the Municipal Partnership Fee for Service grant request from the New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society in the amount of $5,623 be approved.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide further information to the Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Sub-Committee related to the New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society’s 2014 Fee for Service request.

BACKGROUND:
The New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society (the Society) is a non-profit registered charity whose mandate is to “provide lawn bowling and other recreational activities for Senior Citizens” who reside in the District of Mission. The Society have received a Fee for Service grant for a number of years and this fee combined with the members annual membership allows the Society to function. The purpose of this report is to provide additional support for the 2014 Fee for Service request of $5,623 recently submitted by the Society.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The New Horizons Lawn Bowling Society constructed the existing facility, located at 7560 Hurd, commencing in 1973. The lawn bowling facility includes the outdoor bowling greens as well as a small clubhouse used for social gatherings and carpet bowling during the fall and winter. The Society raised the necessary funds through various means to construct the building and develop the outdoor bowling greens and oversee the operation of the lawn bowling club.

The Society operates the lawn bowling club on municipal property under the terms of a License of Use Agreement between the Society and the DOM. The Society has indicated that they
would like to renew the License for a further five year term and this request will be before Council at their December 16th meeting.

Moving forward the Society will be working more closely with the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department to try to encourage more seniors to become involved with the Society and participate in lawn bowling and carpet bowling. Given the current demand for additional seniors programming both parties are hoping to increase the club membership in 2014.

Staff has met several times with Society representatives and recommends that the Fee for Service amount of $5,623 be approved. The Society covers the costs to not only provide recreational opportunities but also cover the costs to operate the club house and maintain the bowling greens. Without the Fee for Service grant the Society will not be in a position to continue to operate the club that they were instrumental in creating.

With an ageing population the merits of providing a variety of senior’s activities is important to the overall health and well-being of the community. The location of the club in close proximity to several retirement residences is viewed as a benefit and provides some opportunities to increase the overall membership of the club.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

The recreational opportunities provided to District seniors by the Society support several key recommendations included in the 2009 District of Mission Parks, Trails and Bicycle Master Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Staff is recommending to the subcommittee that the $5,623 funding request from the New Horizon Lawn Bowling Society be approved and funded through the Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grants budget leaving a balance of $61,878.

COMMUNICATION:

Parks, Recreation & Culture staff has worked with the Society members to develop this report and will continue to support the Society’s efforts and encourage more community seniors to participate in the Society’s activities. A follow-up letter will also be provided to the Society regarding the final status of their grant application.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Staff is seeking the Sub-Committee’s and Council’s support for the 2014 New Horizon’s Lawn Bowling Society’s Fee for Service grant request.

SIGN OFFS:

M. Sinclair
Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture
DATE: December 6, 2013  
TO: Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grant Selection Subcommittee  
FROM: Mike Younie, Director of Development Services and Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services  
SUBJECT: Fraser Valley Humane Society’s Financial Situation and Operating Model

No staff recommendation accompanies this report and Subcommittee action is not required.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grant Selection Subcommittee regarding the Fraser Valley Humane Society’s financial position and their operating model.

BACKGROUND:

At their October 21, 2013 regular meeting, Council resolved:

“That staff meet with the Fraser Valley Humane Society to review the society’s financial situation with a view to creating a viable business plan that supports a sustainable service going forward, and that staff report back to Council”.

This report is being provided to the subcommittee as information for considering the Fraser Valley Humane Society’s (FVHS) 2014 fee for service grant application. Staff met with representatives of the FVHS to learn about their operating model and financial situation. Staff also spoke with the manager of Senior Animals in Need Today Society (SAINTS) and did some preliminary research into other similar animal care organizations. SAINTS is a Mission based organization operating on private property that provides care and adoption services to mostly senior cats and dogs.

FVHS has a no kill policy and was incorporated under British Columbia’s Society Act in 1999 and provides care for stray cats, spay and neuter programs, lost and found program and public education out of their offices on Railway Avenue near James Street. FVHS has received approximately $24,000 from the District of Mission in each of 2011 and 2012 and $27,500 (not including $8,267 in additional funds recently provided) in 2013. Given a significant increase in their rent and other operating costs, they have requested $60,000 from Mission in 2014.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Financial Position

The following table details the FVHS’ 2012 revenue and expenses based on their auditor’s review of their financial position. A small operating deficit also occurred in 2011.

2012 Expense and Revenue Summary for FVHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoptions $14,817</td>
<td>Accounting $3,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations $41,402</td>
<td>Administration and Office $2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising $24,738</td>
<td>Advertising $733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants $33,381</td>
<td>Bank Charges $868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest $36</td>
<td>Grant Expenses $5,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues $364</td>
<td>Insurance $2,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $114,738</td>
<td>License and Dues $209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rent $9,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies $3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone $1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel $134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities $4,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Fees $15,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages $65,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Down Office Equipment $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $116,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was clear after the meeting with FVHS that the operation is under financial stress and steps are being taken continuously to reduce expenses. FVHS’s largest expense is wages. Currently there are three paid staff at FVHS although they do not receive benefits. The executive director works full time while one staff works half time at just above minimum wage and the other about 6 hours a week at minimum wage. Staff have not had a pay increase for four years. FVHS stated that there is no opportunity to reduce wages. FVHS has approximately 50 volunteers who work about 450 hours per month. Hours of operation are somewhat constrained by operating expenses but appointments can always be made outside of normal operating hours.

District staff did suggest that a small cost savings may be able to be achieved by exploring the possibility of having a “compilation” engagement rather than undergoing a “review” engagement for their year end financials with their accountant’s office. Depending on the Society Act’s requirements and the preference of the FVHS Board of Directors this may be worth considering, however, this is just a fraction of overall expenses. Other ideas such as reduced telephone costs had already been investigated by FVHS staff and there were no other obvious cost savings with FVHS’ current operating model. FVHS’ rent is being increased by 20% in 2014.
Fundraising, grants, donations and adoption fees provide the majority of revenue. Council did provide $8,267 additional funds to FVHS in 2013 to assist with the dire financial situation and this is expected to allow FVHS to stay open until the new year. Fundraising events are generally small events such as bake sales, plant sales, pub nights, etc. By their own admission, FVHS staff could search for new revenue sources, particularly corporate ones but it is difficult to do with the small amount of staff and priority to focus on assisting the cats. Adoption fees were recently raised and a cat and kitten will now cost $125 and $175, respectively, to adopt. These are not overly different from the cost to adopt a cat or kitten from the Maple Ridge Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals’ run shelter and about $125 to $200 cheaper than adopting a dog from Maple Ridge. Mission Animal Control charges $150 and $200 for adopting large dogs and puppies/small dogs, respectively. Approximately 10 cats per month are adopted from the FVHS facility while approximately 10 cats are taken in.

The FVHS actively explores ways to keep their costs down. They search out donations of food, building supplies, pen supplies, etc. Riverside College students routinely build pens and do other maintenance. While District staff was at the FVHS, several people came in to donate food and their time. FVHS has an excellent working relationship with local veterinarians and receives services and medicine at a savings of approximately 65% (i.e: 35% of retail cost). Their bookkeeper charges a fraction of her actual costs. The decision was made several years ago to not heat the facility other than with small space heaters to save money. Other grants are also sought when possible. There are no significant reserves or capital assets under the control of the FVHS.

Operating Model Options

Staff has looked at information, supplied by FVHS, from other similar facilities in the Fraser Valley. In addition, staff spoke with the management of SAINTS to determine how they are able to fund their operation.

For the most part, the successful facilities are located within buildings operated by local governments who also pay, in part, for the services the not for profit organization is delivering. Other organizations that seem to be successful are operating on privately owned land without having to pay rent such as is the case with SAINTS or own the building and have to pay nominal rent for the land or operate without a facility on a fostering basis only.

The most successful ones seem to receive a significant amount of fundraising and donation revenue. For example, SAINTS receives upwards of $250,000 from these sources. Their largest annual fundraising event brings in about $30,000 with another $20,000 coming from smaller fundraising events.

There is no doubt that operating FVHS on a sustainable basis without significant government grants or external funding will be challenging but other organizations seem to meet the challenge. Although District staff do not possess the knowledge required to develop a set of sustainable long term options for FVHS’s operation, preliminary research has identified some options that could be explored in more detail – perhaps as a condition of a grant given to FVHS in 2014.

One option could be based entirely on fostering which would preclude the need for a facility to house cats. A large amount of fostering already occurs with the FVHS, particularly in spring and summer when kittens are prevalent. Mission’s funds could be used to advertise and entice additional foster homes to assist FVHS with the aim of relieving the requirement for a facility. FVHS already does have a website and Facebook page used for raising awareness and the need for adoption.
A second option involves comprehensive fundraising and donation solicitation. Some facilities have reserve funds that allow them to leverage the funds through aggressive annual fundraising galas. This model is typically used by large and well organized not for profit groups such as Ducks Unlimited Canada. SAINTS has demonstrated that this option is viable although they do focus on senior animals, which is much more appealing to donors. Cats alone do not stimulate the same emotional response from people that dogs do and this is a significant challenge for FVHS. District grant funds could be provided to FVHS up to a certain amount and possibly with a minimum amount. For example, the District could provide $10,000 beyond which the District would provide $1 for every $5 received by FVHS from fundraising or donations up to a maximum of $30,000. This would encourage the FVHS to secure $100,000, up from the current $65,000, in fundraising and donations. Regardless, the ability to raise funds should be evaluated by the FVHS to ensure they are doing as much as possible in this area as similar organizations seem to be able to raise impressive sums of money. Those organizations are using social media, donor lists, frequent correspondence and other engagement techniques to their advantage and it is not clear whether FVHS is doing all that can be done.

A third option would see a trap, neuter and return (TNR) program be implemented in Mission which has been successful with reducing the number of stray cats in other communities. FVHS has operated a TNR program in the past but has not for the last several years as it requires a significant volunteer base. This option is not recommended by staff as the majority of cats housed by the FVHS are not feral or community cats and a reduction in their numbers would not reduce the operating costs or facility needs of the FVHS.

A fourth option would see a cat licensing program established in Mission to fund cat programs the same way the dog control program is funded in today. This option is not recommended by staff as it is likely to be poorly received in the community. This option would require additional animal control or bylaw enforcement staff to be hired.

Given that there are likely other options, a condition of the 2014 grant could require staff at the FVHS or pay for a qualified person to develop a longer term sustainable operating model(s) that can be presented to Council for consideration ahead of the 2015 fee for service grant decision.

Of note is the fact that the FVHS provides people with learning disabilities, students and difficult to employ people with an opportunity to work on a volunteer basis at the facility on a variety of tasks - cleaning pens and litter boxes, general building maintenance to simply spending time with the cats. These benefits to members of the community were not anticipated but the opportunity clearly provides value to a number of Mission residents and the FVHS. In addition, the FVHS does provide food to families that are unable to afford cat food for their pets depending on their supply at the facility. The FVHS’ hotline is well used by the community and the FVHS is the first stop for people with any questions about cats.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The FVHS received $27,500 as a fee for service grant in 2013 from the District and are asking for $60,000 in 2014. Without a significant change to FVHS’ operational model, continued funding will be required and is likely to increase as operating costs increase.

**COMMUNICATION:**

No further communication is required at this time. Communication with FVHS will occur as part of the fee for service grant selection committee’s decision.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Staff were directed to meet with staff from the Fraser Valley Humane Society to review the society's financial position and to examine options to move the society to a more sustainable operating model without the need for continued fee for service grants from the District. Like most not for profit organizations, FVHS makes good use of volunteers and donated supplies to keep costs down and are completely committed to the welfare of cats. Staff were not able to identify obvious cost savings but did identify some options for changing the operational model. Other options may be available but assistance by more knowledgeable people would be required to assess these options as to which one or combination of might lead to a more sustainable operation.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Reviewed by:
Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Chief Administrative Officer’s Comment:
This report is provided for information purposes only. The Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Program Bylaw is included under the Bylaws section of the December 16, 2013 Council agenda.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Bylaw, which is listed on this agenda for first three readings.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
We have encountered some legal challenges to implement the Early Benefit Option of the Revitalization Tax Exemption program, so we are recommending the bylaw proceed without that option.

We have made some minor changes to the Tax Exemption Certificate option to make it more attractive. The minor changes include allowing the tax exemption to commence at a later start date (date of the Tax Exemption Certificate rather than the application date) to the tax exemption which would allow for a greater tax savings during the higher taxation years. We have included in the bylaw, the right of the property owner to stratify the development provided the agreement has been assigned to the strata corporation. Prior written consent of the District must be obtained before the property can be sold to a subsequent owner in fee simple.

The Revitalization Tax Exemption (RTE) Certificate Option is a 10-year program, whereby the taxes are frozen at the pre-development level for the first 5 years and then normalizes the tax level by increasing it incrementally (20%) over the remaining 5 years until the current tax level in the final (10th) year is achieved. A building permit must be issued by December 31, 2016 and construction must be completed and an occupancy permit issued by December 31, 2018.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
It is one of Council's Goals to implement a Development Incentive Program. There is authority under the Community Charter for Council to create such a program and the proposed bylaw will achieve the tax exemption portion of the program. The Tax Exemption Option of this program will expire December 31, 2018 and Council at that time, will review the program to determine if it should be concluded or extended – depending upon the success of the tax exemption program.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The RTE Certificate program will not result in a cash outlay from the District but will result in a delay of future additional tax revenue based on increased assessments as a result of the development for the first 5 years and increasing incrementally until the 10-year certificate expires, at which time, full taxes will be paid on the current assessment. The financial implications of such a Tax Exemption Certificate will be detailed in a report to Council accompanying such an application.

SIGN-OFFS:

Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer Reviewed.
A bylaw to establish a revitalization tax exemption program

WHERAS Council has established a Downtown Revitalization program;

AND WHEREAS Council may, by bylaw, establish a revitalization tax exemption program as part of the District’s Downtown Development Incentive program;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission wishes to establish a revitalization tax exemption program in the downtown area as outlined in Schedule “A”, attached to and forming part of this Bylaw;

AND WHEREAS Council’s objective in establishing the revitalization tax exemption program under this Bylaw is to encourage the revitalization of the downtown of the District of Mission through the encouragement of accelerated private investment in stand-alone or mixed commercial and residential new development and major redevelopment projects within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan Area;

AND WHEREAS the Community Charter requires a municipality to set out in its Financial Plan, the objectives and policies in relation to the use of permissive tax exemptions and such provisions have been set out in the District of Mission 2013-2017 Financial Plan Bylaw 5329-2012 and are consistent with this Bylaw;

AND WHEREAS the Community Charter requires that notice be provided of the creation of such a revitalization tax exemption, and such notice has been provided;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “District of Mission Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Bylaw 5391-2013”.


3. In this Bylaw:

   “Agreement – Revitalization Tax Exemption” means a Revitalization Tax Exemption agreement between the owner of a Parcel and the District, in the format attached to and forming part of this Bylaw as Schedule “B”.

   “Base Amount” means:

   (a) for a Project that includes the demolition of all existing improvements, the amount of Municipal Property Tax payable with respect to the land value of the Parcel during the Base Amount Year;

   (b) for a Project that involves the renovation or rehabilitation of existing improvements, the amount of Municipal Property Tax payable with respect to land and improvements during the Base Amount year.

   “Base Amount Year” means the calendar year prior to the first calendar year in respect of which a Tax Exemption applies to a Parcel.
"Council" means the council of the District of Mission.

"Full Assessment" means the amount of municipal property tax that would be payable in respect of a Parcel without any Tax Exemption.

"Manager of Corporate Administration" means the District’s Corporate Officer appointed under Section 148 of the Community Charter, and includes his or her designate.

"Municipal Property Tax" means the property value tax imposed by the District of Mission to raise municipal revenue under Section 197(1)(a) of the Community Charter.

"Parcel" or "Parcels" means any lot, block or other area in which land is held or into which it is subdivided, but does not include a highway and, for the purposes of this Bylaw, means a parcel(s) situated within the Revitalization Area upon which an owner proposes a Project.

"Project" means a revitalization project on a Parcel involving the construction of a new improvement, the alteration of an existing improvement, and demolition work that is necessary for such construction or alteration.

"Revitalization Area" means the area in the downtown of the District of Mission as shown in Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.

"RTE Program" means a Revitalization Tax Exemption Program of the District of Mission as described in Schedule “B” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.

"Tax Exemption" means a revitalization tax exemption pursuant to this Bylaw.

"Tax Exemption Certificate" means a revitalization tax exemption certificate issued by the District of Mission pursuant to this Bylaw and pursuant to the provisions of Section 226 of the Community Charter.

4. There is hereby established a Revitalization Tax Exemption program under Section 226 of the Community Charter for the granting of Tax Exemptions and the issuance of Tax Exemption Certificates in order to encourage stand-alone or mixed commercial and residential new development and major redevelopment projects within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan Area, in order to enhance the economic growth of the Revitalization Area.

5. The RTE Program is intended to accomplish the objectives set out in section 4 by providing relief from Municipal Property Tax for eligible Projects within the Revitalization Area, in order to reduce financial obstacles to the development of such Projects.

6. The terms and conditions upon which a Tax Exemption may be granted and a Tax Exemption Certificate may be issued are:

(a) the Project must have a construction value in excess of $15,000.00, as certified by the owner’s design professional pursuant to section 9 of this Bylaw;

(b) the Project must be developed on a Parcel that is located within the Revitalization Area;

(c) the owner must enter into an Agreement – Revitalization Tax Exemption with the District in the form attached as Schedule “B” to this Bylaw;
(d) the owner must apply for a Tax Exemption in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of this Bylaw, by no later than December 31, 2016;

(e) the Project must be completed and an occupancy permit for the Project issued by the District by no later than December 31, 2018.

7. The amount of a Tax Exemption that may be provided under this Bylaw is such that the Municipal Property Tax payable for each year that the Tax Exemption Certificate is in effect is:

(a) in years one to five, the Base Amount;

(b) in year six, the Base Amount plus 20% of the difference between the Base Amount and Full Assessment;

(c) in year seven, the Base Amount plus 40% of the difference between the Base Amount and Full Assessment;

(d) in year eight, the Base Amount plus 60% of the difference between the Base Amount and Full Assessment;

(e) in year nine, the Base Amount plus 80% of the difference between the Base Amount and Full Assessment;

(f) in year ten, Full Assessment.

8. The maximum term of a Tax Exemption is ten years from the date a Tax Exemption Certificate is issued by the Manager of Corporate Administration.

9. In order for a Parcel to be eligible for a Tax Exemption, the owner must:

(a) apply to the District of Mission in writing, no later than August 31 of the year immediately preceding the year in which a Tax Exemption certificate is to come into effect, and must submit the following with the application:

(i) a certificate that all taxes, charges and fees imposed on the Parcel have been paid, and, where taxes, rates or assessments are payable by instalments, that all instalments owing at the date of application have been paid;

(ii) a completed and signed Agreement under Schedule “B”;

(iii) a description of the Project;

(iv) a certificate from the owner’s design professional, in a form satisfactory to the District’s Director of Development Services, certifying the construction value of the Project; and

(v) a fee in the amount prescribed by the “District of Mission User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007” as amended and “Land Use Application Processing Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, as amended.
10. If, pursuant to the terms and conditions specified in the Agreement or the Tax Exemption Certificate, the Tax Exemption Certificate is cancelled, the owner of the Parcel for which the Tax Exemption Certificate was issued, must remit to the District:

(a) an amount, as determined by the District, of Property Taxes payable for the balance of the year in which the Tax Exemption Certificate is cancelled, calculated pro rata based on the annual amount of Municipal Property Tax that would have been payable but for the Tax Exemption; and

(b) an amount, as determined by the District, of Municipal Property Taxes payable to the District, calculated pro rata based on the annual amount of Municipal Property Taxes that would have been payable but for the Tax Exemption, for any period during which the conditions and obligations specified in this Bylaw, the Agreement or the Tax Exemption Certificate were not satisfied.

11. Any amounts owing to the District pursuant to Section 10 will be deemed to be Municipal Property Taxes and any such amounts that are not paid by December 31 of the taxation year in which they fall due, will become taxes in arrears in the following year and collectable as taxes in arrears.

12. Despite the repeal of District of Mission Revitalization Tax Exemption Bylaw 3828-2005 (“Bylaw No. 3828”), the owner of a Parcel for which a Certificate was issued under Bylaw No. 3828 shall continue to receive the Tax Exemption authorized under that Bylaw, and an agreement between the owner of such Parcel and the District, and a Certificate issued under the authority of Bylaw No. 3828 shall continue in force and to the extent necessary shall be deemed to have been issued under the authority of this Bylaw.

13. The Manager of Corporate Administration for the District is the designated municipal officer for the purpose of Section 226 (13) in the Community Charter.

14. Council delegates to the Manager of Corporate Administration, the authority to receive and review applications for a Tax Exemption, approve qualifying Projects, enter into Agreements under this Bylaw on behalf of the District, issue and cancel Tax Exemption Certificates.

READ A FIRST TIME this
READ A SECOND TIME this
READ A THIRD TIME this
ADOPTED this

WALTER (TED) ADLEM, MAYOR  KEN BJORGAARD, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (Interim Corporate Officer)
SCHEDULE “A”
SCHEDULE “B”

REVITALIZATION TAX EXEMPTION AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT dated for reference the __day of __________, 20__ is

BETWEEN:

(the “Property Owner”)

AND:

DISTRICT OF MISSION
8645 Stave Lake Road, PO Box 20
Mission, BC V2V 4L9

(the “District”)

WHEREAS:

A. The purposes of a municipality under Section 7 of the Community Charter include providing for services, laws and other matters for community benefit and fostering the economic, social and environmental well-being of its community;

B. The District’s objectives include undertaking or procuring services, activities and works to stimulate the economic well-being of the District through housing developments, façade improvements and other commercial and “green” construction;

C. The District has developed an incentives program for the District’s downtown area, known as the “Downtown Incentives Program,” to achieve the District’s objectives;

D. The District has requested qualifying property owners in the District’s downtown area to partner with and assist the District with meeting the District’s objectives by providing revitalization services under the Downtown Incentives Program;

E. The Property Owner has applied to the District for a partnering relationship under the Downtown Incentives Program and the District has approved the Property Owner’s application;

F. Council’s objective in establishing the revitalization tax exemption program under the Bylaw is to encourage the revitalization of the downtown area of the District of Mission through the encouragement of accelerated private investment in stand-alone or mixed commercial and residential new development and major redevelopment projects within the Mission City Downtown Action Plan area;

G. The Property Owner proposes to make the alterations, upgrades and improvements, at a cost in excess of $500,000, described in Appendix “C” on the Property (the “Project”) and has applied to the District to partake in the revitalization tax exemption program in respect of this Project and the District has agreed to accept the Project under the program; and

H. The District and the Property Owner have agreed to enter into this agreement (“Agreement”) to provide for the Property Owner’s obligations regarding the Project and the District’s grant of a tax exemption, all in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein.
NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSES that in consideration of the premises and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties covenant and agree as follows:

1. **Definitions** – In this Agreement unless something in the subject matter or context is inconsistent therewith, the terms herein will have the meanings set out below:

   (a) “**Agreement**” means this agreement including the recitals and the Appendices to this agreement as amended from time to time in accordance with this agreement;

   (b) “**Business Day**” means a day other than a Saturday, Sunday or statutory holiday in the Province of British Columbia;

   (c) “**Commencement Date**” means the date upon which the District issues a Revitalization Tax Exemption Certificate;

   (d) “**Downtown Incentives Program**” means that program created by the District for the revitalization and development of the District’s downtown area;

   (e) “**Expiry Date**” means the day before the 10th anniversary date of the Commencement Date of this Agreement;

   (f) “**Governmental Authority**” means any federal, provincial, territorial or municipal government, and any government agency, tribunal, commission or other authority exercising executive, legislative, judicial, regulatory or administrative functions of, or pertaining to, government;

   (g) “**Person**” or “**person**” means any individual, corporation, limited-liability company, partnership, firm, joint venture, association, trust, or other entity or organization, including a Government Authority;

   (h) “**Property**” means the property owned by the Property Owner as more particularly described in Appendix “B” to this Agreement;

   (i) “**Term**” means a period of ten (10) years, commencing on the Commencement Date and ending on the Expiry Date.

2. **Appendices** – The following attached Appendices are incorporated in and deemed to be part of this Agreement and any reference to this Agreement shall mean this Agreement including such Appendices:

   Appendix A  -  Revitalization Tax Exemption Certificate
   Appendix B  -  Property Description
   Appendix C  -  Revitalization Works

3. **Obligations of the Owner** – Throughout the term of the Tax Exemption, the Property Owner will:

   (a) use its best efforts to ensure that the Project is constructed, maintained, operated and used in a manner that will be consistent with and will foster the objectives of the revitalization tax exemption program;
(b) ensure that the Property and the Project are used, operated and occupied in compliance with the permitted use and zoning for the Property under the “Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009”, as amended, consolidated or replaced from time to time;

(c) not apply to amend the permitted use and zoning for the Property while this Agreement is in effect;

(d) the Property Owner will operate, repair and maintain the Project and will keep the Project in a state of good repair as a prudent owner would do;

(e) not allow any property taxes due in relation to the Property to go into arrears or become delinquent; and

(f) if the Property is sold during the term of the Tax Exemption, subject to Section 14 of this Agreement, assign this Agreement to any new fee simple or strata owners of the Property to ensure that the new fee simple or strata owners will be bound by the terms of this Agreement, failing which the Tax Exemption may be cancelled at the District’s discretion. Upon completion of a sale of the Property, the Property Owner will provide the District’s Manager of Corporate Administration with a copy of the assignment agreement evidencing that the new fee simple or strata owner(s) has/have legally assumed the obligations of the Property Owner under this Agreement.

4. **Revitalization Tax Exemption** – Subject to fulfillment of the conditions set out in this Agreement and in the Bylaw, the District will issue a revitalization tax exemption certificate (the “Certificate”) to BC Assessment Authority entitling the Property Owner to a property tax exemption in respect of municipal property taxes (as described in Section 197(1)(a) of the Community Charter) only due in relation to the Property (the “Tax Exemption”) for the calendar years and in the amount as set out in this Agreement. The Certificate will be in the form attached to this Agreement as Appendix “A”.

5. **Conditions** – The following conditions must be fulfilled before the District will issue a Certificate to the Property Owner:

   (a) The Property Owner must enter into a Revitalization Tax Exemption Agreement;

   (b) The Property Owner will submit a complete building permit application on or before December 31, 2016;

   (c) The Property Owner will complete or cause to be completed, construction of the Project in a good and workmanlike fashion and in strict accordance with the building permit and the plans and specifications attached hereto as Appendix “C” and the Project must be officially opened for use and an occupancy permit issued by the District by no later than December 31, 2018; and

   (d) The Property Owner will provide the District with the following:

      (i) a certificate from the Property Owner’s design professional, in a form and content satisfactory to the District’s Director of Development Services, certifying the actual cost to construct the completed Project (the **Certified Cost of the Project**);

      (ii) a certificate that all taxes assessed and rates, charges and fees imposed on the Property have been paid, and, where taxes, rates or assessments are payable by instalments, that all instalments owing at the date of application have been paid; and

      (iii) all applicable fees as required under the Bylaw and other applicable District of Mission bylaws.
6. **Term of Revitalization Tax Exemption** – Subject to early cancellation of the Certificate under Section 8 of this Agreement, the term of the Tax Exemption shall be ten years commencing on January 1 of the first calendar year after the calendar year specified in the date of issuance of the Certificate by the District of Mission’s Manager of Corporate Administration (the “Term”).

7. **Calculation of Revitalization Tax Exemption** – during the first 5 years following the Commencement Date, the municipal property assessment and taxes shall remain the same as they were as of the Commencement Date (hereinafter referred to as the “Current baseline”). In year 6 of this program, the municipal property taxes would increase by 20% of the difference between the current assessed value on land and improvements and the baseline assessment in the year the certificate was issued. Similarly, in years 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the program, a 20% increase in Municipal Property Taxes would take place so that in year 10, the owner(s) would be paying municipal property taxes at the current level based on the current assessment of land and improvements.

8. **Compliance with Laws** – The Property Owner will construct the Project and, at all times during the term of the Tax Exemption, use and occupy the Property and the Project in compliance with all statutes, laws, regulations and orders of any authority having jurisdiction and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, all federal, provincial, or municipal laws or statutes or bylaws, including all the rules, regulations, policies, guidelines, criteria or the like made under or pursuant to any such laws.

9. **Effect of Stratification** – If the Property Owner stratifies the Property under the Strata Property Act, the Tax Exemption shall be prorated among the strata lots in accordance with the unit entitlement of each strata lot for:
   
   (a) the current and each subsequent tax year during the term of this Agreement if the strata plan is accepted for registration at the Land Title Office before May 1 in the year of stratification; or
   
   (b) for the next calendar year and each subsequent tax year during the term of this Agreement if the strata plan is accepted for registration at the Land Title Office after May 1 in the year of stratification,

   provided that the Property Owner has assigned this Agreement to the strata corporation as required under Section 3(f) of this Agreement.

10. **Cancellation** – The District may cancel the Certificate:

   (a) on the written request of the Property Owner; or

   (b) at any time, if the Property Owner breaches or does not fully satisfy any of the obligations and conditions in the Certificate or this Agreement, as determined by the District acting reasonably, effective immediately upon delivery of a notice of cancellation to the Property Owner.

   (c) A Property Owner who receives a notice of cancellation, will be provided with an opportunity to be heard before Council.

11. **Recapture** – It is agreed that:

   (a) in the event of cancellation as provided in Section 10, the Property Owner will remit to the District, no later than 30 days after receiving notice from the District of the cancellation and the amount owing, all municipal property taxes payable for the balance of the year from the date of cancellation of the Certificate, calculated pro rata based on the annual amount of municipal taxes that would have been payable but for the Tax Exemption;
(b) in the event that the Property Owner does not meet the obligations in Section 3 of this Agreement, the Property Owner will pay to the District municipal property taxes for any period during which the obligations in Section 3 were not in fact met, calculated pro rata based on the annual amount of municipal taxes that would have been payable but for the Tax Exemption; and

(c) any amounts owing pursuant to Sections 11(a) or 11(b) are municipal property taxes and any such amounts that are not paid by December 31 of the taxation year in which they fall due will become taxes in arrears in the following year and collectable as taxes in arrears.

12. No Refund – For greater certainty, under no circumstances will the Property Owner be entitled under or pursuant to this Agreement or under or pursuant to the revitalization tax exemption program to any cash credit, any carry forward tax exemption credit or any refund for any property taxes paid, other than refunds that may result from or be associated with error corrections or assessment appeals.

13. Notices – Any notice, request, demand and other communication required or permitted to be given under this Agreement shall be in writing and will be sufficiently given if, to the District, it is delivered by hand, facsimile transmission, e-mail or prepaid registered mail (return receipt requested), or if, to the Property Owner, it is posted visibly on the Property or is delivered by hand, facsimile transmission, e-mail or prepaid registered mail (return receipt requested) as follows:

(a) in the case of a notice to the District, at:

    DISTRICT OF MISSION
    8645 Stave Lake Road, PO Box 20
    Mission, BC    V2V 4L9
    Attention:    Manager of Corporate Administration
    Facsimile:    604-826-1363

(b) in the case of a notice to the Property Owner, at:

    [Address]
    Attention:
    Facsimile:
    E-mail:

or at such other address as the party to whom the notice is sent may specify by notice given in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any such notice, request, demand or other communication given as aforesaid will be deemed to have been given, in the case of posting on the Property, at time of posting, delivery by hand, when delivered, in the case of facsimile transmission or e-mail, when a legible facsimile or e-mail is received by the recipient if received before 5:00 p.m. on a Business Day, or on the next Business Day if such facsimile or e-mail is received on a day which is not a Business Day or after 5:00 p.m. on a Business Day, and in the case of delivery by prepaid registered mail, as aforesaid, on the date received. In the event of discontinuance of postal service due to strike, lockout, labour disturbance or otherwise, notice, demands, requests and other communications shall be delivered by hand or facsimile transmission or e-mail.

14. No Assignment – The Property Owner may not assign its interest in this Agreement except to a subsequent owner in fee simple or strata title of the Property.
15. **Severance** – If any portion of this Agreement is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the invalid portion shall be severed and the decision that it is invalid shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this Agreement.

16. **Interpretation** – Wherever the singular or masculine is used in this Agreement, the same shall be construed as meaning the plural, the feminine or body corporate where the context or the parties thereto so required. The headings and sub-headings in this Agreement are for convenience of reference only, do not constitute a part of this Agreement and will not be taken into consideration in the interpretation or construction of, or affect the meaning of, this Agreement. Words importing the singular include the plural and vice versa.

17. **Further Assurances** – The parties hereto shall execute and do all such further deeds, acts, things and assurances that may be reasonably required to carry out the intent of this Agreement.

18. **Waiver** – Waiver by the District of a default by the Property Owner shall be in writing and shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any subsequent or other default.

19. **Powers Preserved** – This Agreement does not:
   (a) affect or limit the discretion, rights or powers of the District under any enactment (as defined in the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c.238, on the reference date of this Agreement) or at common law, including in relation to the use or subdivision of the Land;
   (b) affect or limit any enactment relating to the use or subdivision of the Property, or
   (c) relieve the Property Owner from complying with any enactment, including in relation to the use or subdivision of the Property, and without limitation shall not confer directly or indirectly any exemption or right of set-off from development cost charges, connection charges application fees, user fees or other rates, levies and charges payable under any bylaw of the District.

20. **References** – Every reference to each party is deemed to include the heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors, assignees, servants, employees, agents, contractors, officers, licensees and invitees of such party, wherever the context so requires or allows.

21. **Enurement** – This Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and permitted assigns.

22. **Execution by counterpart** – This Agreement may be executed in counterpart, and its delivery may be made by facsimile or other electronic transmission, and each such counterpart so executed will be as valid and binding as if it were an originally signed copy of a single agreement executed by both parties.

23. **No right of action** – The Property Owner will have no cause of action for any losses incurred if this Agreement is found, for any reason, to be illegal, invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction and in the event of the finding of such illegality, invalidity or unenforceability, the Property Owner will be obligated to pay all municipal property taxes which would otherwise have been payable by the Property Owner during the Term.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first above written.

Signed, Sealed and Delivered by the DISTRICT OF MISSION
by its authorized signatories:

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
Manager of Corporate Administration

Signed, Sealed and Delivered by ___________________________ (the Property Owner)
by its authorized signatories:

______________________________
Name:

______________________________
Name:
Appendix "A" to Schedule B of Bylaw 5391-2013

DISTRICT OF MISSION

REVITALIZATION TAX EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE

In accordance with District of Mission Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Bylaw 5391-2013 (the “Bylaw”), and in accordance with a Revitalization Tax Exemption Agreement dated for reference the _____ day of ________, 20____ (the “Agreement”) entered into between the District of Mission (the “District”) and ________________________________ (the “Owner”), the registered owner(s) of the property described below, this Tax Exemption Certificate certifies that the Property (as defined below) is subject to a revitalization tax exemption in an amount equal to 100% of the municipal property taxes payable in respect of any increase in the assessed value of land and improvements on the Property in the calendar years _________ to ________ inclusive (the “First 5 years of the Term”) [over the previous year].

In the next 5-year term _________ to __________ inclusive of this certificate, the municipal property taxes payable shall increase by 20% in each year so that in year 10 of the program, the municipal property taxes shall be at their current level for that year of assessment.

The parcel(s) to which the Tax Exemption applies is in the District of Mission and is legally described as:

Folio_____________ , PID: _______________, Lot ____, Block _____, District Lot _____, Plan _______ (the “Property”).

The Tax Exemption is provided on the following conditions:

1. the Owner does not breach any covenant, condition or obligation in the Agreement and performs all obligations to be performed by the Owner set out in the Agreement;

2. the Owner has not sold all or any portion of his or her equitable or legal fee simple or strata interest in the Property without the transferee taking an assignment of the Agreement, and agreeing to be bound by it;

3. the Owner, or a successor in title to the Owner, has not allowed any non-exempt property taxes for the Property to go into arrears or to become delinquent;

4. the Owner, or a successor in title to the Owner, has not applied to amend the Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009, as amended, consolidated or replaced from time to time, to rezone the Property from its Core Commercial Downtown zoning to any other zone; and

5. the Property is not put to any use that is not permitted by the zoning for the Property.

If any of the above-noted conditions are not met, then the District may cancel this Tax Exemption Certificate.
In the event of such cancellation, the Owner will remit to the District, no later than 30 days after receiving notice from the District of the cancellation, an amount, as determined by the District, of municipal property taxes payable for the balance of the year from the date of cancellation of this Tax Exemption Certificate, calculated pro rata based on the annual amount of municipal taxes that would have been payable but for the Tax Exemption.

The Owner will also pay to the District any amount of municipal property tax exemption enjoyed by the Owner while the Tax Exemption Certificate was in effect for any period during which the Owner was in breach of one or more of the above-noted conditions.

Manager of Corporate Administration

Date
Appendix "B" to Schedule B of Bylaw 5391-2013

PROPERTY

[insert legal and street description of the property]
Appendix "C" to Schedule B of Bylaw 5391-2013

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jennifer Russell, Legislative Assistant
SUBJECT: Council Procedure Bylaw – Delegations

This report is for information only.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with background information pertaining to the management of delegations at regular Council meetings.

BACKGROUND:
The following excerpt is the entire section on Delegations from Council Procedure Bylaw 5345-2013:

11. DELEGATIONS
   (a) Delegations are permitted to appear at the Council Meetings occurring on the first and third Mondays of the month, with the number of delegations for Meetings on the first and third Monday Meetings limited to two. Delegations shall be placed on the agenda on a first come basis.
   (b) No individual delegation may speak to the same topic again until the passage of at least two months’ time from the date of their most recent presentation or as space permits.
   (c) Persons or groups of persons wishing to appear as a delegation before Council shall request permission to appear by 4:00 pm Friday, 10 days in advance of the date of the Council Meeting. This request must be made to the Corporate Officer and must include the name and address of the person who wishes to speak on behalf of the delegation and the purpose of the presentation. Written submissions that will form part of the presentation must be provided at the time of application.
   (d) Every delegation shall be allowed a maximum time of ten (10) minutes to present its petition or submission unless extended by a two-thirds vote of the Council, after which the Council may dispose of the petition or submission at the Meeting, refer the subject matter to a Committee, or take such other action as is deemed expedient.
   (e) Persons or groups wishing to appear as a delegation before a regular Council Meeting, and who have not submitted a request in accordance with Section 6(c), will be permitted to appear only with the agreement of a majority of the members of Council, and shall be limited to a presentation of not more than five (5) minutes unless extended by a majority of the members of Council, after which the Council may dispose of the petition or submission at the Meeting or take such action as is
deemed expedient and appropriate.

(f) Every petition presented to Council shall include the name of the petitioner and the petitioner's address. In the case of a corporation, society or other registered body the authority given by the same to sign the petition shall be produced in connection therewith. The notice of petition shall name a spokesman for the delegation, and shall indicate the purpose for which it is desired to appear. Petitions given to Council may appear in an Agenda as well on the District of Mission’s website. Addresses, signatures and names appearing on the petitions will not be removed.

(g) Where a Public Hearing has been held in accordance with an enactment as a prerequisite to the adoption of a Bylaw, an individual or delegation must not address a Meeting of the Council regarding that Bylaw unless a further Public Hearing has been scheduled.

(h) The Corporate Officer may schedule delegations to another Council Meeting, a Committee, or ask staff to address the delegates issue, as deemed appropriate according to the subject matter of the delegation.

(i) The Corporate Officer may decline to place a delegation on the Agenda if he or she considers that the issue is not within the jurisdiction of Council. If the delegation wishes to appeal the Corporate Officer’s decision, the appeal must be in writing and will be distributed under separate cover to Council for their consideration.

(j) Late delegations for emergent matters may be accepted at that Meeting by Council resolution and speakers will be limited to a 5 minutes speaking time.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Staff book delegations to Council on a first come, first served basis. Once the two available spots for a particular meeting are booked up, staff encourage the applicant to book a spot at the next available meeting. Sometimes staff are booking delegations two or more months into the future. The delegation request form asks the applicant to acknowledge the ten minute time limitation. The written or verbal confirmation from staff also includes a reminder of the time limit.

On occasions where a delegation applicant insists that their matter is time sensitive and they must be heard on a specific date, they are always advised by staff that they can be listed on the agenda as a delegation, however permission to appear must be granted by a majority vote of Council at that meeting. The applicants in those instances are advised that Council may or may not allow them to speak, and there is no way for staff to know this in advance. They are also informed that they will likely be limited to five minutes.

If someone wishes to appear as a delegation because they have been informed that there will be a staff report directly related to their issue on the agenda, it has been standard practice in the past to allow that delegation to appear as an “extra”. The reasoning behind this was to allow people to speak to an issue being considered by Council that night, and not be constrained by the rules of question period, which is always held after the decisions have been made. This situation does not arise more than a couple of times a year, however if this practice was taken to the extreme, it could potentially mean that every individual or special interest group directly affected by a staff report could appear as an “additional” delegation.

As an aside, “Presentations” are not counted as “Delegations” to allow time at the open meetings for the occasional brief presentation of an award or special recognition.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Should Council wish to make an amendment to the Procedure Bylaw to further manage delegations, staff will draft a separate report with the appropriate recommendation and present it at the next regular Council meeting for its first readings.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Russell, Legislative Assistant

Reviewed by:

Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
DATE: December 16, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Christine Brough, Executive Assistant
SUBJECT: Adoption of Recommendations from the December 3, 2013 Committee of the Whole (Engineering & Public Works Committee) Meeting
ATTACHMENT: December 3, 2013 Committee of the Whole (Engineering & Public Works Committee) Meeting Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

That the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in items COW13/076 through COW13/080 of the minutes of the Engineering & Public Works Committee meeting held on December 3, 2013, be adopted.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present Council with an opportunity to formally adopt the recommendations of the December 3, 2013 Committee of the Whole meeting.

BACKGROUND:
All recommendations made at “Committee of the Whole” meetings must be formally adopted by Council when they are convened as the formal decision-making body. This is usually done during “Regular” Council meetings when Council resolves to adopt the Committee of the Whole report.

When separate Committee meetings are held, such as the Engineering & Public Works Committee meeting referenced above, the formal adoption of any recommendations made, if applicable, has to be done during a Regular Council meeting when the committee minutes are presented for adoption. It is a two-step process: any recommendations contained in the minutes must be adopted and the minutes themselves must be adopted.

SIGN-OFFS:

Christine Brough, Executive Assistant

Comment by Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
Minutes of the Freestanding Committee of the Whole (Engineering & Public Works Committee – Pavement Management; Water Meters) meeting of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Tuesday, December 3, 2013 commencing at 1:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Mayor Ted Adlem  
Councillor Jeff Jewell  
Councillor Tony Luck  
Councillor Larry Nundal  
Councillor Jenny Stevens

Committee Members Absent: Councillor Dave Hensman  
Councillor Nelson Tilbury

Staff Members Present: Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer  
Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration  
Kris Boland, Manager of Finance  
Rick Bomhof, Director of Engineering & Public Works  
Matt Dunham, Operations Manager  
Jennifer Kinneman, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives  
Alan Reggin, Manager of Assets and Infrastructure  
Christine Brough, Executive Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Jewell, seconded by Councillor Luck, and
RESOLVED: That the order of agenda item 3a and 3b be reversed.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and
RESOLVED: That the December 3, 2013 Engineering & Public Works committee agenda be adopted as amended.
CARRIED

3. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Case for Water Meters: Equitability, Sustainability and Responsibility (Report by Councillor Jewell)

A report dated December 3, 2013 from the Councillor Jeff Jewell, Co-Chair of the Abbotsford Mission Water & Sewer Commission (AMWSC), regarding water meters was provided for the committee’s consideration.
Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED: That Item 3(b) - The Case for Water Meters: Equitability, Sustainability and Responsibility be deferred to the December 18, 2013 Committee of the Whole agenda.

CARRIED

**Short and Long-Term Pavement Rehabilitation Funding Needs Analysis**

A report dated December 2, 2013 from the Manager of Assets and Infrastructure, the Director of Engineering & Public Works, and the Operations Manager regarding pavement management was provided for the committee’s consideration.

The Manager of Assets and Infrastructure provided an overview of his report; Council discussed the report findings, and it was:

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED: That staff develop funding options for Pavement Management with the goal of increasing the annual ongoing budgetary allotment and that staff report back to Council.

CARRIED

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.
Minutes of the REGULAR MEETING of the DISTRICT OF MISSION COUNCIL (for the purpose of going into a closed meeting) held in the Conference Room of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Monday, December 2, 2013 commencing at 2:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Ted Adlem
Councillor Dave Hensman (joined the meeting at 2:03 p.m.)
Councillor Jeff Jewell (joined the meeting at 2:03 p.m.)
Councillor Tony Luck
Councillor Larry Nundal
Councillor Jenny Stevens
Councillor Nelson Tilbury (joined the meeting at 2:03 p.m.)

Staff Members Present: Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer
Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration
Jennifer Kinneman, 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 Stevens, seconded by Councillor Luck, 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)(a) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;
- Section 90(1)(b) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who is being considered for a municipal award or honour, or who has offered to provide a gift to the municipality on condition of anonymity;
- Section 90(1)(c) of the Community Charter – labour relations or other employee relations;
- Section 90(1)(e) of the Community Charter – the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality; 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
3. **RECESS TO CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING**

The meeting recessed at 2:00 p.m.

4. **RECONVENE TO REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL**

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and
RESOLVED: That the meeting be reconvened.
CARRIED
The meeting reconvened at 3:58 p.m.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and
RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

_________________________        _____________________________________
WALTER (TED) ADLEM      KEN BJORGAARD
MAYOR  CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(Interim Corporate Officer)
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION
held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on December 2, 2013 commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Ted Adlem
Councillor Dave Hensman
Councillor Jeff Jewell
Councillor Tony Luck
Councillor Larry Nundal
Councillor Jenny Stevens
Councillor Nelson Tilbury

Staff Members Present: Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer
Bob Wilson, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration
Jennifer Russell, Legislative Assistant
Tina Mooney, Administrative Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Adlem called the meeting to order.

2. RESOLUTION TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL DELEGATION

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That Kim Walker be permitted to appear as an additional five minute delegation at the Regular Council meeting of December 2, 2013.

OPPOSED: Councillor Hensman
Councillor Stevens

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of December 2, 2013 be adopted.

CARRIED

4. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Presentation of Good Samaritan Certificate – Jack Janousek

Mayor Adlem presented Jack Janousek, a student at Christine Morrison Elementary School, with a Good Samaritan Certificate in recognition of his efforts to alert authorities about possible harm being done to streams and wildlife in Mission.
Artur Gryz  
Re: Charter for Compassion

Artur Gryz appeared before Council to provide information about the Charter for Compassion, which is a document that calls upon people all over the world to transcend all differences and embrace the core value of compassion. Mr. Gryz asked Council to sign the Charter on behalf of the District of Mission and to implement a measurable plan to encourage compassionate behaviour in the community.

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That staff provide a report containing information on the Charter for Compassion movement including recommendations of how the District can participate.

OPPOSED: Mayor Adlem  
Councillor Hensman  
Councillor Luck  
Councillor Nundal

DEFEATED

Gurleen Bhatia, Fraser Health Authority  
Re: Healthy Built Environment

Gurleen Bhatia, Anne Todd, and Hardeep Sidhu appeared before Council to provide information about the key principles of a Healthy Built Environment and to explain Fraser Health’s role in planning healthier communities. They also provided information about the Mission Food Access Network (MFAN) and invited Council to attend an MFAN meeting, which are held on the second Wednesday of every month from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. in the conference room of the Leisure Centre.

Kim Walker  
Re: Request to Rename Silverdale Park to Fujikawa Park

Kim Walker appeared before Council to provide additional information about the history of the Fujikawa family and to ask Council to consider renaming Silverdale Park to Fujikawa Park.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5387-2013-5050(124)  
(R13-018 – Hodgson) – a bylaw to rezone property at 32645 Richards Avenue from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RR7s)

The purpose of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment is to rezone the property located at 32645 Richards Avenue and legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 000-788-376  
Lot 9 Section 5 Township 18 New Westminster District Plan 29036
from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RR7s) to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into four (4) lots of a minimum 0.7 hectare (1.73 ac.) lot size, each allowing for a secondary dwelling unit.

Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. application information;
2. purpose and outline of the proposal;
3. subject property map and site photos;
4. surrounding area designation;
5. proposal details;
6. development requirements; and
7. land use question.

The Acting Manager of Corporate Administration stated that no correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5387-2013-5050(124) (R13-018 – Hodgson), closed.

6. ADOPTION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the following items be received as information:
(a) Mission Institution Report – September and October 2013; and
(b) Minutes of the Cultural Resources Commission meeting held on October 10, 2013.

CARRIED

7. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

8. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

Councillor Tilbury assumed the Chair.

Park Naming Requests – Silverdale Park and Tunbridge Avenue

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the garden in Silverdale Park be named to honour the Fujikawa family who were early settlers in the Silverdale community;
2. That the Fujikawa name be added to the current District of Mission Street Naming Policy STR.28 for future consideration; and
3. That the new park site on Tunbridge Avenue be named Tunbridge Common as suggested during the recent playground opening event.

CARRIED

Energy Conservation Project- FortisBC Incentives

Moved by Mayor Adlem, and

RECOMMENDED:
1. That staff award additional energy conservation measures in the amount of $144,622 to Coral Engineering, based on added Energy Conservation Project funding from FortisBC, notwithstanding the District purchasing policy; and
2. That the overall budget for the Energy Conservation Project be increased to $1,306,210 and that the 2013 District of Mission financial plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

9. PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH

Councillor Nundal assumed the Chair.

City Watch Program

Moved by Councillor Luck, and

RECOMMENDED: That the City Watch Program, as outlined in the report from the Crime Prevention Coordinator dated December 2, 2013, be approved for implementation, with start-up funding being covered by CUPE and Mission RCMP, and with an annual status report as to the impact of the program being provided to Council.

CARRIED

10. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Councillor Jewell assumed the Chair.

150mm Asbestos Cement Watermain Replacement Tender

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED: That the Asbestos Cement (AC) Watermain Replacement Program Contract, ITT 2013 – 005, be awarded to the low bidder, Mission Contractors Ltd. in the amount of $349,865 (includes applicable taxes) subject to the contractor fulfilling the mandatory requirements as specified in the tender documents.

OPPOSED: Mayor Adlem

CARRIED
11. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Councillor Hensman assumed the Chair.

Development Variance Permit Application DV13-020 (Toor/McPherson) – 8414, 8434 and 8478 Stave Lake Street

Gina MacKay, Planner, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information about the proposal to vary a limited portion of Cherry Avenue east of Stave Lake Street:

1. application information;
2. location of the variance on the portion of Cherry Avenue;
3. subject property map and site photos; and
4. the Subdivision Control Bylaw requirements.

The Acting Manager of Corporate Services stated that the following correspondence had been received and read out each submission:

- email from Maureen Bisgrove dated November 21, 2013 in opposition to the variance,
- email from Barry Johnson dated November 22, 2013 in opposition to the variance.

Tony Miniaci, speaking on behalf of the developer, stated there has been a misunderstanding of the finished road width and dedication, and clarified that the road will be completed to the proper width as set out in the Subdivision Control Bylaw.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the public input session for Development Variance Permit Application DV13-020, closed.

Moved by Councillor Jewell, and

RECOMMENDED: That Development Variance Permit Application DV13-020 to vary the Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985 as it pertains to “SCHEDULE A” Required Highway Widths:

a. for an Urban Local Residential Highway from 18.0 metres (59 ft.) to 12.2 metres (40 ft.)

be approved in principle.

CARRIED

Amendment of LAN.58 – MissionCity Downtown Action Plan to include a new Proposed Core Commercial Downtown Two (CCD2) Zone

Moved by Mayor Adlem, and

RECOMMENDED: That Council Policy LAN.58 Mission City Downtown Action Plan be amended by inserting “Schedule B – Proposed Core Commercial Downtown Two (CCD2) zone” as attached as Appendix 1 to the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects’ report dated December 2, 2013.

CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED: That consideration of which uses shall be permitted uses in the new Core Commercial Downtown Two Zone (CCD2) be referred to a special meeting of Council or to a workshop where more time can be dedicated to the discussion.

CARRIED

Implementation of Downtown Incentive Program – Policy Amendment to Waive the Requirement for a Public Hearing

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003 be amended by adding a new Section 10 as follows and renumbering the remaining sections:

   “10. Waiving the Public Hearing

   Where an amending bylaw for a property within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “B”) is consistent with the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, and where the application is received before December 31, 2016, Council may waive the requirement for the amending bylaw to be forwarded to a Public Hearing pursuant to Section 890(4) of the Local Government Act. The process for notifying the public about a rezoning application will follow section 9 above. Any and all comments will be forwarded in a report prior to Council considering third reading of the amending bylaw. Final reading will be considered at the next meeting of Council following consideration of third reading.”

2. That the bylaw be considered for first, second and third readings at the regular Council meeting on December 2, 2013.

CARRIED

Implementation of Downtown Incentive Program – Bylaw Amendments to Reduce Fees

Moved by Councillor Tilbury, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003 be amended by:

   (a) adding an asterisk (*) behind the following fees listed in Schedule “A”:

   i. Rezoning – Multi-family Residential, Commercial and Residential Mixed Use and Comprehensive Development

   ii. Permits – Development Permit (Commercial), Development Permit (Downtown Façade Review – LAN.42), Development Permit (multi-family residential) and Development Permit (commercial and residential mixed use)

   iii. Miscellaneous Fees – Commercial Façade Review and Development Inquiry Fee
(b) adding the following to “Development Permit (Downtown Façade Review – LAN.42) in Schedule “A” after the word “Review”:

“and Downtown Façade Improvement Grant Program”.

(c) adding the following to the Schedule “A” preamble after “in accordance with the following schedule”:

“, except for those applications received on or before December 2016 for projects where fees marked with an asterisk (*) apply”.

(d) Adding the following clause at the end of Schedule “A”:

“If an application is received for a project on a property within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “B”) and the Building Permit for the project will be received on or before December 31, 2016, those fees marked with an asterisk (*) will be reduced by ½ (50%) of the amount shown.”

(e) adding Appendix 4 attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 2, 2013 to the Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003 as Schedule “B”.

(f) deleting the heading “Land Title Office Fee” and the row within the Schedule “A” table as a housekeeping amendment.

2. That Building Bylaw 3590-2003 be amended by:

(a) adding the following new clause to Schedule “A” section (1):

“(f) Building Permit applications for properties located within MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “C”) received on or before December 31, 2016, will be calculated based on 50% of the prescribed fees as listed in 1(a) to (e) above.”

(b) adding the following new clause to Schedule “A” section (2):

“(f) Building Permit applications for properties located within MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “C”) received on or before December 31, 2016, will be calculated based on 50% of the prescribed fees as listed in 2(a), (b), (d) and (e) above.”

(c) adding Appendix 4 attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 2, 2013 to the Building Bylaw 3590-2003 as Schedule “C”.

(d) deleting Part (8) of Schedule “A” in its entirety and replacing it with the following:

“8. Demolition Permit Fees

(a) The application fee for a demolition permit shall be $150.00

(b) The application fee for a demolition permit for properties located within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “C”) received on or before December 31, 2016 shall be 75.00

3. That Schedule 1 of User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 be amended by:

(a) adding the following as a second clause to section E Inspection Services part 3 Land Title Fees (b):

“Title Search for development applications within the Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “2”) prior to December 31, 2016”; and
(b) adding the following fee to section E Inspection Services part 3 Land Title Fees
   (b) “– Title Search for development applications within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “2”) prior to December 31, 2016” under “Effective January 1, 2013” - “$0.00”;

(c) adding Appendix 4 attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 2, 2013 to the User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 as Schedule “2”.

4. That the bylaws be considered for first, second and third readings at the regular Council meeting on December 2, 2013.

CARRIED

Implementation of Downtown Incentive Program – Policy Amendment to Waive Community Amenity Contributions

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED: That Financial Contributions for Community Amenities Policy LAN.40 be amended by:

(a) adding the following new paragraph after paragraph 2:

   “Under the rationale that the downtown was identified as the top Council priority in 2012, and that initially, construction of new units within the downtown will trigger ongoing investment in the downtown, and where:
   
   ▪ a rezoning application is consistent with the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan,
   ▪ a development project will have a residential component,
   ▪ a complete Building Permit application is received on or before December 31, 2016, and
   ▪ the development applications are for projects on properties located within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area (Schedule “A”);

   In place of the Community Amenity Contribution, a 219 covenant shall be registered on title stating that the zone amending bylaw is in place until December 31, 2018 and that if the residential units have not received a final occupancy permit by December 31, 2018, Council may consider rescinding the zone amending bylaw.”

(b) adding Appendix 2 as attached to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated December 2, 2013 to the LAN.40 policy as Schedule “A”.

(c) adding the following new category after the Multi Family Residential contribution:

   “Multi Family Residential within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area as shown on Schedule “A” $0
   
   (for multi-family projects, and mixed use and comprehensive development applications submitted before December 31, 2016 with construction completed by December 31, 2018)"

CARRIED
Implementation of the Downtown Incentive Program – Land Use Policy Amendment to LAN.42 Downtown Façade Review

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Council Policy LAN.42 Downtown Façade Review be repealed in its entirety, as per Appendix B in the report from the Economic Development Officer dated December 2, 2013;

2. That Council Policy LAN.42 Downtown Façade Review and Façade Improvement Grant Program be approved, as per Appendix C in the report from the Economic Development Officer dated December 2, 2013; and

3. That funding for the new Downtown Façade Review and Façade Improvement Grant Program of up to $15,000 come from the District’s Gaming Reserve Fund and that the financial plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Program Bylaw

A report from the Acting Manager of Corporate Administration dated December 2, 2013 regarding Mission’s Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption Program Bylaw was provided for the Committee’s information.

Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearings held on September 10 and November 26, 2012 and related Staff Reports dated August 20 and November 5, 2012 (R12-017)

An excerpt from the minutes of the Public Hearings held on September 10 and November 26, 2012 and copies of the related staff reports dated August 20 and November 5, 2012 were provided to the Committee as background information to assist in the consideration of adoption of Zoning Amending Bylaw 5312-2012-5050(88) for 8351 and 8367 Cedar Street.

Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on October 21, 2013 and related Staff Report dated October 7, 2013 (R13-023 – Iozzo)

An excerpt from the minutes of the Public Hearing held on October 21, 2013 and a copy of the related staff report dated October 7, 2013 was provided to the Committee as background information to assist in the consideration of adoption of Zoning Amending Bylaw 5385-2013-5050(122) for 31725 Oyama Street.

12. CORPORATE SERVICES

Councillor Luck assumed the Chair.
Public Feedback on 2014 Financial Plan/Budget and Related Bylaws

Moved by Councillor Hensman, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Council provide final direction to staff in terms of the District’s 2014 financial plan/budget and related tax and utility rate increases by considering the following motion:

   “That the District’s 2014 Financial Plan include a 0% increase in the property tax levy, and a 2% increase in water, sewer, refuse, and recycling/composting rates.”;

2. That Council approve for inclusion into the financial plan bylaw the policy and objectives noted in the report dated December 2, 2013 from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector;

3. That the Financial Plan Bylaw be forwarded to Council on December 16, 2013 for first three readings, and final adoption on December 18, 2013; and

4. That the following bylaws
   a) Water Rates Bylaw #2197-1990;
   b) Sewer User Rates Bylaw #1922-1989;
   c) Refuse Collection and Disposal Bylaw #1387-1984; and
   d) Collection, Removal and Marketing of Recyclables Bylaw #2639-1993

   each be amended to include a 2% rate increase and be forwarded to the December 16, 2013, regular meeting of Council for first three readings with final adoption on December 18, 2013.

CARRIED

2014 Municipal Partnership Fee for Service Grants

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Municipal Partnership Fee for Service grant funding to the following organizations for 2014 be approved:

   Mission Arts Council $23,500.00
   Mission Association for Seniors Housing – Busy Bus $3,000.00
   Total $26,500.00

2. That the 2014 Mission Arts Council (MAC) Fee for Service grant fund be used for youth, seniors and children programs or classes, with a reasonable amount of overhead charged to these activities, and that the District’s true subsidy for these classes be communicated to the participants by the MAC.

CARRIED
Establishing a Board of Variance

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That District of Mission Board of Variance Bylaw 1351-1983 be repealed.
2. That Bylaw 5390-2013 to create a new Board of Variance be considered for first, second and third readings at the regular Council meeting on December 2, 2013; and
3. That User Fees and Charges Bylaw 4029-2007 be amended to add Board of Variance fees in the amount of $500.00 and be considered for first, second and third readings at the regular Council meeting on December 2, 2013.

CARRIED

Adoption of Recommendation from the November 19, 2013 Mission Healthy Community Council Meeting

Moved by Councillor Jewell, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That a budget of $6,000 be approved for the Back to Health…For Good 2014 health fair scheduled to be held at the Mission Leisure Centre on Saturday, January 11, 2014, with $3,000 each to be provided by District of Mission Council and Fraser Health Authority;
2. That the $3,000 District of Mission portion of the budgeted funds come from the 2014 Council Contingency account, as requested by Mayor Adlem; and
3. That the Financial Plan be amended accordingly

CARRIED

Appointment of Council Representative to the Fraser Valley Regional Library (FVRL) Board

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Councillor Jenny Stevens be appointed as Mission’s representative to the Board of the Fraser Valley Regional Library for 2014, and that Councillor Jeff Jewell be appointed as the alternate; and
2. That the Fraser Valley Regional Library Board be notified of the above appointments.

CARRIED
Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) and Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District (FVRHD) 2014 Financial Plans

A report from the Deputy Treasurer/Collector dated December 2, 2013 regarding the Fraser Valley Regional District and Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District 2014 Financial Plans was provided for the Committee’s information.

Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 1267 and District of Mission Collective Agreement

A report from the Chief Administrative Officer dated December 2, 2013 regarding the upcoming labour negotiations with Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 1267 and the hiring of an experienced labour relations negotiator was provided for the Committee’s information.

Renewal of the Business Improvement Area Funding

A report from the Acting Manager of Corporate Administration dated December 2, 2013 regarding a request from the Mission Downtown Business Association to renew Business Improvement Area funding for another five years was provided for the Committee’s information.

13. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

Mayor Adlem resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the Committee of the Whole now rise and report.
CARRIED

14. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC13/754 to RC13/775, except item RC13/757 (AC watermain replacement tender), be adopted.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in item RC13/757 (AC watermain replacement tender), be adopted.
OPPOSED: Mayor Adlem
CARRIED
15. BYLAWS

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED:

1. That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5387-2013-5050(124), a bylaw to rezone property at 32645 Richards Avenue from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RR7s), be read a third time; and

2. That the final reading of District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5387-2013-5050(124) be held until the following requirement(s) have been satisfied:
   a. The community amenity contribution in the amount of $8,445 (for three new lots) is received.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5312-2012-5050(88), a bylaw to rezone property at 8351 and 8367 Cedar Street from Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Urban Residential Compact 372 Zone (RC372), be adopted.

OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5385-2013-5050(122), a bylaw to rezone property at 31725 Oyama Street from Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Suburban 36 Secondary Dwelling Zone (S36s), be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Intermunicipal Business Licence Amending Bylaw 5388-2013-5334(1), a bylaw to extend the length of the pilot program to December 31, 2015, be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Street Naming (Lindsay Terrace) Bylaw 5389-2013, a bylaw to name a road in a new subdivision, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Board of Variance Establishment Bylaw 5390-2013, a bylaw to establish a Board of Variance for the District of Mission, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission User Fees and Charges Amending Bylaw 5397-2013-4029(4), a bylaw to add Board of Variance fees, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Amending Bylaw 5398-2013-3612(13), a bylaw to make the necessary amendments to implement the incentive program in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Amending Bylaw 5399-2013-3612(14), a bylaw to add a new section to allow the option to waive a Public Hearing for rezoning applications on properties within the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan area, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Building Amending Bylaw 5400-2013-3590(3), a bylaw to make the necessary amendments to implement the incentive program in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Tilbury, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission User Fees and Charges Amending Bylaw 5401-2013-4029(5), a bylaw to make the necessary amendments to implement the incentive program in the MissionCity Downtown Action Plan, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED
16. MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:
(a) Special Council Meeting – November 18, 2013;
(b) Regular Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a Closed meeting) – November 18, 2013;
(c) Regular Council Meeting – November 18, 2013; and
(d) Special Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a Closed meeting) – November 19, 2013.

CARRIED

17. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED:
1. That Development Permit Application DP12-006 to ensure the form and character of the development be approved.
2. That Development Variance Permit Application DV12-009 to vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by:
   a. reducing the rear setback for proposed Lots H and I from 7.5 metres (24.6 ft.) to 6 metres (19.7 ft.), and
   b. reducing the lot frontage requirement for proposed Lot H from 6 metres (19.7 ft.) to 3.65 metres (11.9 ft),

be approved.

CARRIED

18. MAYOR’S REPORT

The Mayor reported on various activities, meetings and events attended since the last regular Council meeting.

19. MEMBERS’ REPORTS ON COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND ACTIVITIES

Councillors Stevens, Tilbury, Nundal, Jewell and Hensman reported on various activities, meetings and events attended since the last regular Council meeting.

20. QUESTION PERIOD

Council and staff responded to questions from the following people:

Ron Taylor asked if Council would consider renaming Silverdale Park to “Silverdale Fujikawa Park”, and if Council had considered the dangers of having a Board of Variance if the process is not handled properly.
The Mayor responded that Council will carefully consider any appointments to the Board of Variance.

21. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

WALTER (TED) ADLEM, MAYOR

KEN BJORGAARD, CHIEF
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(Interim Corporate Officer)
BC Communities in Bloom 2014 Membership

with NEW Community & Business Membership Categories

This is a great opportunity to recognize your contribution to this province and support our organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES &amp; BENEFITS</th>
<th>Newsletter</th>
<th>Newsletter Listing</th>
<th>Invite to Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Individual Membership* - $20</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW! SHOWCASE COMMUNITY MEMBERSHIP*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Membership included with a Showcase Entry - $100</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW! CORPORATE or CITY SUPPORTER*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Basic - $500</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Enhanced - $1000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Logo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Membership Benefits**

- Newsletters (8-10 issues/year)
- Invitation to fall Awards and Conference
- Invitation to Annual General Meeting
  *one vote per membership category
- Entry point for judging
  (upon approved application)

**POTENTIAL MEMBERS:**

- Individuals, Communities or Businesses with an interest in furthering the objectives of the BC Communities in Bloom society.
- Groups or individuals from past, present and future local CiB committees
- Future BC CiB Board Members and Judges

**LEGAL:**

- Applicant must reside in BC to be a member or with permission from the BC CiB Board.
- Per the BC CiB Constitution and Bylaws our Board has the right to refuse membership.

**Name of Individual:**

**Name of Community or Business:**

**Address:**

**City/Province/Postal Code:**

**Phone**

**Email (required)**

**# Membership Category**

$ Fee enclosed

Or please send an invoice

**REQUEST FOR MORE INFO:**

- Judging
- Board Member
- Promotions or Tradeshows
- Conference
- Sponsorship Program
- Other

**Fee payable to:**

BC Communities in Bloom,
#102 - 5783 176A Street,
Surrey, BC V3S 6S6
(604) 576-6506

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:**

- Fee Paid or
- Send Invoice

Invoice or receipt number:

Membership number:

BCcommunitiesinbloom.ca